

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

October 7, 1997  
Barratt Inn  
Anchorage, Alaska

**VOLUME I**

**COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Mr. Roy S. Ewan, Chairman  
Mr. Gilbert Dementi  
Mr. Donald Kompkoff, Sr.  
Mr. Benjamin E. Romig  
Mr. Gary V. Oskolkoff  
Mr. Fred John, Jr.  
Mr. Ralph Lohse

**Regional Council Coordinator:**

Ms. Helga Eakon

0002

## P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2

3 MR. LOHSE: Our Chairman Roy Ewan's not here right at  
4 the moment, so as Vice Chair, I'd like to call this October  
5 7th, 1997 meeting of the Southcentral Alaska Subsistence  
6 Regional Advisory Council to order. Helga, roll call.

7  
8 MS. EAKON: Gilbert Dementi.

9  
10 MR. DEMENTI: Here.

11  
12 MS. EAKON: Don Kompkoff, Sr.

13  
14 MR. KOMPKOFF: Here.

15  
16 MS. EAKON: Ben Romig.

17  
18 MR. ROMIG: Here.

19  
20 MS. EAKON: Roy Ewan. Gary Oskolkoff.

21  
22 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Here.

23  
24 MS. EAKON: Fred John, Jr.

25  
26 MR. JOHN: Here.

27  
28 MS. EAKON: Ralph Lohse.

29  
30 MR. LOHSE: Here.

31  
32 MS. EAKON: A quorum is established, Mr. Chair.

33  
34 MR. LOHSE: Okay, we have a quorum. At this point I'd  
35 like to take the opportunity to have everybody introduce  
36 themselves. Most of us know each other, but I see new faces  
37 out here. So what I'd just like to do is start at this end of  
38 the table and we'll go around and then we'll start in the front  
39 row and we'll just work our way back all the way to the back.  
40 Tell who you are and where you're from and we'll go from there.

41  
42 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Gary Oskolkoff from Ninilchik.

43  
44 MR. JOHN: Fred John, Jr., Mentasta.

45  
46 MR. LOHSE: Ralph Lohse from Cordova.

47

48 MR. ROMIG: Ben Romig from Cooper Landing.

49

50 MR. KOMPKOFF: Don Kompkoff, Chenega.

0003

1 MR. DEMENTI: Gilbert Dementi, Cantwell.

2

3 MS. EAKON: Helga Eakon, coordinator and I reside in  
4 Anchorage.

5

6 MS. MASON: Rachel Mason, anthropologist here in  
7 Anchorage.

8

9 MR. WILLIS: Robert Willis, wildlife biologist,  
10 Anchorage.

11

12 MR. KNAUER: Bill Knauer, policy and regulations  
13 specialist with Subsistence Management here in Anchorage.

14

15 MS. WILKENSON: I'm Ann Wilkenson and I'm the  
16 Southcentral Regional coordinator for the Alaska Boards of Fish  
17 and Game.

18

19 MR. BRADY: James Brady with the Alaska Department of  
20 Fish and Game, Division of Commercial Fisheries.

21

22 MR. FALL: Jim Fall, ADF&G Subsistence Division.

23

24 MR. RABINOWITCH: Sandy Rabinowitch, National Park  
25 Service, Staff to the Federal Subsistence Board.

26

27 MR. CRAWFORD: John Crawford, Seldovia Native  
28 Association.

29

30 MR. CARPENTER: Tom Carpenter, Copper River/Prince  
31 William Sound Advisory Committee Chair.

32

33 MR. GREENWOOD: Bruce Greenwood, National Park Service  
34 here in Anchorage.

35

36 MR. CARTER: I'm Alex Carter with the National Park  
37 Service here in Anchorage.

38

39 MR. COFFEEN: Mike Coffeen, Bureau of Land Management,  
40 Glennallen.

41

42 MR. LOGAN: Dan Logan, wildlife biologist, U.S. Forest  
43 Service, Cordova.

44

45 MR. McDONALD: Mike McDonald, wildlife biologist, Fish  
46 and Game here in Anchorage.

47

48                   MR. SPRAKER:   Ted Spraker, wildlife biologist, Fish and  
49 Game from Soldotna.  
50

0004

1 MR. CHASE: Mark Chase, Kenai Wildlife Refuge in  
2 Soldotna.

3  
4 MR. LOHSE: There's two more in the back.

5  
6 MS. CHIVERS: Michelle Chivers, Subsistence Management.

7  
8 MS. BAIER: Ellen Baier, Subsistence Management.

9  
10 MR. LOHSE: Thank you. At this point in time we would  
11 like to take an opportunity to honor somebody that's given good  
12 service to the Southcentral Regional Subsistence Council and to  
13 the Staff and that's Mr. Bruce Greenwood. Bruce, would you  
14 come forward. We have a small plaque for you, we'd like to  
15 thank you for your help with all the C&T and for standing in  
16 for Rachel.

17  
18 MR. GREENWOOD: Thanks Ralph.

19  
20 MR. LOHSE: And in fact, for anybody when they need  
21 help, can call on you and you'll come.

22  
23 MR. GREENWOOD: Thanks a lot, I appreciate it.

24  
25 MR. LOHSE: Bruce has been working on this since 1994  
26 and I hope he's working for a while longer.

27  
28 MR. GREENWOOD: I plan on it, thanks a lot.

29  
30 MR. LOHSE: You're welcome.

31  
32 (Applause)

33  
34 MR. LOHSE: At this point in time we'd like to look at  
35 the agenda, review the agenda and adopt the agenda. Are there  
36 any changes or revisions that need to be made to the agenda?  
37 Helga.

38  
39 MS. EAKON: I have an addition, Mr. Chair. If you will  
40 kindly put under 9 New Business, L, any other new business,  
41 number one would be Nelchina Caribou Herd special action.

42  
43 MR. LOHSE: Under 9(L).

44  
45 MS. EAKON: 9(L), L as in Larry.

46  
47 MR. LOHSE: Nelchina Caribou Herd. And what was the

48 whole thing, Helga, Nelchina Caribou Herd, what?

49

50 MS. EAKON: Special action.

0005

1 MR. LOHSE: Special action, okay.

2

3 MS. EAKON: And you do have a copy of the request  
4 itself and the analysis in front of you under your book  
5 someplace.

6

7 MR. LOHSE: Right, over here.

8

9 MS. EAKON: Yes.

10

11 MR. LOHSE: Okay. Any other additions?

12

13 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I won't be able to be  
14 here tomorrow. I have to leave this evening with some  
15 conflicting business with my tribe and so if you would like my  
16 input on anything in particular, that is on the following day,  
17 I'd like to discuss it today for you because I will be gone  
18 tomorrow.

19

20 MR. LOHSE: Do you see anything particular that you  
21 would like to comment on that is on tomorrow's agenda, Gary?

22

23 MR. OSKOLKOFF: I think the revisit of the Kenai C&T  
24 recommendations. There is a note for action there.

25

26 MR. LOHSE: Could we switch that to sometime today with  
27 something on today? Would you like to suggest doing that Gary?

28

29 MR. OSKOLKOFF: That would work for me if the Chair  
30 would like to hear my opinion on that?

31

32 MR. LOHSE: Definitely. So let's take G, which is  
33 almost the second item tomorrow morning and let's look at  
34 something between lunch break and this evening that we can  
35 switch with that. Boy, it's hard because all we have is  
36 reports this afternoon that we might need, too.

37

38 MS. EAKON: If we could squeeze it in under old  
39 business C, because it would tie in nicely with the Unit 15(A)  
40 moose subsistence season. If we could put 9G right under  
41 there.

42

43 MR. LOHSE: Right under old business A?

44

45 MS. EAKON: Under old business C, C as in Charlie.

46

47 MR. LOHSE: Okay, let's put it there. So we'll stick G

48 right under C and that will give you an opportunity to get your  
49 information on that.  
50

0006

1 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2

3 MR. LOHSE: You're welcome. Does anybody see any other  
4 changes at this point in time?

5

6 MS. MASON: Mr. Chair.

7

8 MR. LOHSE: Yes, Rachel.

9

10 MS. MASON: Another item that we would like Mr.  
11 Oskolkoff's input on is the research possibilities under H,  
12 annual reports, 3. So maybe if we could add that in today  
13 somewhere.

14

15 MR. LOHSE: Why don't we stick that right after where  
16 we stuck to this and just stick to the 3 part of it.

17

18 MS. MASON: That'd be fine.

19

20 MR. LOHSE: Would that work okay?

21

22 MS. MASON: Sure.

23

24 MR. LOHSE: So let's stick H3 right after G today. Any  
25 other changes that anybody sees that are necessary? Then a  
26 motion to adopt the amended agenda is in order.

27

28 MR. KOMPKOFF: So moved to adopt the agenda and  
29 changes.

30

31 MR. LOHSE: It's been moved by Don, is there a second.

32

33 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Second.

34

35 MR. LOHSE: Second by Gary. Anybody want to call the  
36 question? Any discussion?

37

38 MR. JOHN: Question.

39

40 MR. LOHSE: Question's been called, all in favor of  
41 adopting the amended agenda signify by saying aye.

42

43 IN UNISON: Aye.

44

45 MR. LOHSE: Those opposed signify by saying nay.

46

47 (No opposing responses)

48  
49 MR. LOHSE: Motion carries unanimously. The next thing  
50 we have to look at is review and adoption of minutes of

0007

1 February 6th and 7th, a motion is in order to adopt them so we  
2 can have them for discussion.

3

4 MR. OSKOLKOFF: I'll move to adopt the minutes of  
5 February 6th and 7th, 1997.

6

7 MR. LOHSE: Moved by Gary, is there a second.

8

9 MR. DEMENTI: Second.

10

11 MR. LOHSE: Second. It's been moved and seconded.

12 Discussion. Comments.

13

14 MR. KOMPKOFF: Question.

15

16 MR. LOHSE: The question's been called. All in favor  
17 of adopting the minutes as written for February 6th and 7th,  
18 signify by saying aye.

19

20 IN UNISON: Aye.

21

22 MR. LOHSE: Opposed signify by saying nay.

23

24 (No opposing responses)

25

26 MR. LOHSE: Motion carries unanimously. At this point  
27 in time we have to turn the meeting back over to Helga for  
28 election of officers.

29

30 MS. EAKON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The office of the  
31 Chair serves a one year term. The Chair may serve more than  
32 one year. The Chair conducts the Regional Council meetings,  
33 attends and represents the Regional Council at meetings of the  
34 Federal Subsistence Board. The Chair is a voting member of the  
35 Council. The Chair signs reports, correspondence, meeting  
36 minutes and other documents for external distribution as well.

37

38 At this time I'm going to open the floor for  
39 nominations for the office of Chair.

40

41 MR. LOHSE: Move we elect Roy Ewan.

42

43 MS. EAKON: Ralph Lohse has moved that you elect Roy  
44 Ewan.

45

46 MR. KOMPKOFF: Second.

47

48 MS. EAKON: Seconded by Don Kompkoff, Sr. Are there  
49 any other nominations for the office of Chair?  
50

0008

1 MR. OSKOLKOFF: I move to close nominations.

2

3 MS. EAKON: Gary moves to close nominations. Is there  
4 a second?

5

6 MR. DEMENTI: Second.

7

8 MS. EAKON: Gilbert Dementi seconds the motion. All  
9 those in favor please signify by saying aye.

10

11 IN UNISON: Aye.

12

13 MS. EAKON: Those opposed same sign.

14

15 (No opposing responses)

16

17 MS. EAKON: Motion carries. Mr. Ewan has been elected  
18 for office of Chair of the Southcentral Regional Council. At  
19 this time I'm going to open the floor for the nominations for  
20 the office of vice chair. The vice chair serves a one year  
21 term, however, may serve more than one year. The vice chair  
22 helps the Chair and assumes all functions in his absence. The  
23 floor is now open for nominations of the office of vice chair.

24

25 MR. JOHN: I'd like to nominate Ralph for vice chair.

26

27 MS. EAKON: Fred John, Jr., has nominated Ralph Lohse  
28 for the office of vice chair. Is there a second?

29

30 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Second.

31

32 MS. EAKON: Gary Oskolkoff seconds the motion. Are  
33 there any other nominations for the office of vice chair?

34

35 MR. KOMPKOFF: I move to close nominations.

36

37 MS. EAKON: Don Kompkoff moves to close nominations. I  
38 guess by unanimous, Mr. Lohse, you are now vice chair again.  
39 Would you like to resume the election for the office of  
40 secretary?

41

42 MR. LOHSE: We now need nominations for the office of  
43 secretary. Would you read the duties of the secretaries?

44

45 MS. EAKON: Yes, Mr. Chair. The secretary serves a one  
46 year term, however, may serve more than one year. Takes roll  
47 call and decides if a quorum is present. Records the votes and

48 assumes all functions of the Chair in the absence of the Chair  
49 and at the discretion of the Regional Council records the  
50 minutes.

0009  
1 MR. LOHSE: And can delegate that authority to somebody  
2 else to do those things?  
3  
4 MS. EAKON: That is correct.  
5  
6 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman, who is our secretary at  
7 this moment?  
8  
9 MR. ROMIG: Fred John.  
10  
11 MR. LOHSE: Fred John, Jr.....  
12  
13 MS. EAKON: Fred John, Jr.  
14  
15 MR. LOHSE: .....is our current secretary.  
16  
17 MR. OSKOLKOFF: You didn't know that?  
18  
19 MR. JOHN: I did.  
20  
21 MR. LOHSE: The floor is open for nominations.  
22  
23 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to nominate Fred  
24 John, Jr.  
25  
26 MR. KOMPKOFF: Second.  
27  
28 MR. LOHSE: It's been seconded by Don Kompkoff. Any  
29 further nominations.  
30  
31 MR. ROMIG: I move to close nominations.  
32  
33 MR. LOHSE: It's been moved to close nominations by Ben  
34 Romig. Is there a second?  
35  
36 MR. DEMENTI: Second.  
37  
38 MR. LOHSE: Second. It's unanimous. Hearing no  
39 objections, it's unanimous, right?  
40  
41 MS. EAKON: (Ms. Eakon acknowledges affirmatively)  
42  
43 MR. LOHSE: Okay, Fred, you are now the secretary.  
44 Okay, at this point in time we're going to open the floor to  
45 public comment. We have in front of us two people who would  
46 like to speak at this point in time. John Crawford from  
47 Seldovia, would you like to come forward and state your name

48 and where you're from and offer us your testimony?

49

50 MR. CRAWFORD: I thought it was going to be when the

0010  
1 subject came up, but I guess.....  
2  
3 MR. LOHSE: We can call on you at that time, John?  
4  
5 MR. CRAWFORD: Would that be fine? I would prefer  
6 that.  
7  
8 MR. LOHSE: You prefer to be called when the subject  
9 comes up?  
10  
11 MR. CRAWFORD: Yes.  
12  
13 MR. LOHSE: If that's in agreement with the rest of the  
14 Board, we'll do it that way. Tom Carpenter.  
15  
16 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chair, I'd appreciate the same  
17 courtesy if the Board wouldn't mind?  
18  
19 MR. LOHSE: Is that agreeable to the Board when the  
20 subject comes up?  
21  
22 MR. JOHN: Sure.  
23  
24 MR. LOHSE: You'll be here for the meeting long enough  
25 to be there?  
26  
27 MR. CARPENTER: I'll be here to about 4:00.  
28  
29 MR. LOHSE: Okay. John, you're going to be speaking on  
30 the Nelchina.....  
31  
32 MR. CRAWFORD: 15(A) proposal that the State has.  
33  
34 MR. LOHSE: Okay, 15(A). And Tom.  
35  
36 MR. CARPENTER: I'll be speaking on Proposals 14, 15,  
37 16 and 19.  
38  
39 MR. LOHSE: Okay. With that, we can go on to old  
40 business. Rachel, would you like to give us an overview?  
41  
42 MS. MASON: Certainly, Mr. Chairman.  
43  
44 MR. LOHSE: Tab E in your book.  
45  
46 MS. MASON: I'm going to be discussing first Proposals  
47 14 and 16, and then Proposals 15 and 19, and they all fit

48 together in a way because they all deal with Units 5 and 6(A)  
49 and were deferred by the Board at the last spring Board  
50 meeting.

0011

1 Before I begin, I would like to mention that there is  
2 another proposal analysis that didn't get distributed in your  
3 books and that is the one for the ceremonial moose. I'm  
4 calling it 19(B), it's responding to the request from the  
5 Native village of Eyak for the harvest of one moose for  
6 ceremonial purposes. And I distributed one copy of it to each  
7 of the Council members and there are more of them for other  
8 members of the audience back on the table beside the coffee  
9 back there.

10

11 MR. LOHSE: Is it one page?

12

13 MS. MASON: Yes, yes, one page on both sides.

14

15 MR. LOHSE: Okay.

16

17 MS. MASON: Also distributed to the Council members and  
18 available on that back table are copies of testimony that was  
19 given by Yakutat residents at the meeting last week. They  
20 requested that they be brought verbatim to the Southcentral  
21 Council in order to best convey their views. And I'd like to  
22 thank Salena Hile for transcribing it so quickly so that we  
23 could have that available.

24

25 MR. LOHSE: Do we have that on our table here?

26

27 MS. MASON: Yes, I distributed copies to each of the  
28 Council members.

29

30 MR. LOHSE: Okay, now, what does that look like?

31

32 MS. MASON: It looks like the transcript, there are two  
33 of them. One is the testimony of Elaine Abraham and then the  
34 second one, the thicker one is testimony of several Yakutat  
35 residences. That, that's right.

36

37 MR. LOHSE: Okay.

38

39 MS. MASON: To start with the overview of Proposals 14  
40 and 16, these are under Tab E. These proposals originated with  
41 the Southeast Regional Council, but they deal in part with uses  
42 in the Southcentral region. As I mentioned, all of them  
43 concern Units 5 and 6(A). Proposal 14 is for goat, 15 is for  
44 moose, and that was also deferred, 16 for wolf. Last year, the  
45 Southcentral Council deferred action on the proposals and when  
46 they were brought before the Federal Subsistence Board, the  
47 portions of the proposals that deal with Unit 6(A) were

48 deferred in order to allow for more input from the Southcentral  
49 region.  
50

0012

1           Shall I go ahead and talk about the meeting in Cordova.

2

3           MR. LOHSE: Yes.

4

5           MS. MASON: Representatives of both the Southcentral  
6 and the Southeast Regional Councils met in Cordova on May 5th,  
7 1997 to discuss the three proposals. And present were Ralph  
8 Lohse from the Southcentral Council, John Vale from the  
9 Southeast Council, and he is from the community of Yakutat,  
10 Federal Staff, including Helga Eakon, Fred Clark, Rachel Mason  
11 and Robert Willis, and Dan Logan of the Cordova Forest Service  
12 and some interested Cordova residents, including George Koval  
13 of the local Fish and Game advisory committee and Mark Hoover,  
14 Don Graham, Bud Janson, and Glen Ujioka of the Eyak Tribe.

15

16           At that meeting there was general discussion of the  
17 uses of Unit 6(A) for goat, moose and wolf. And I told the  
18 attendees that Proposal 15, which deals with moose would be  
19 analyzed this fall, together with deferred Southcentral  
20 Proposal 19, which was a request for a ceremonial use of moose  
21 and a C&T for moose which would be necessary before the  
22 ceremonial moose could be approved. So Proposals 15 and 19  
23 were melded into one analysis and that's the next item on our  
24 agenda.

25

26           At the Cordova meeting, the idea was also developed  
27 that the Southcentral Council would submit proposals on the  
28 deferred portions of Proposals 14 and 16, which are on goat and  
29 wolf in Unit 6(A). So the analysis for the proposals which  
30 will be developed for the winter meetings will look at how the  
31 uses are distributed within Unit 6(A). And at that meeting,  
32 participants indicated that the residents of Cordova  
33 concentrate primarily on the western portion of Unit 6(A),  
34 which is the part of the unit that's closest to Cordova and  
35 Yakutat doesn't use Unit 6(A) west at all, they concentrate on  
36 the eastern portion of Unit 6(A).

37

38           MR. LOHSE: Can I point out something at this point in  
39 time?

40

41           MS. MASON: Sure.

42

43           MR. LOHSE: 6(A) actually is already divided by Fish  
44 and Game regulations into 6(A) east and 6(A) west.

45

46           MS. MASON: That is correct.

47

48           MR. LOHSE: So there is already a defining dividing  
49 line there in place.  
50

0013

1 MS. MASON: That's correct. And based primarily on the  
2 statements of people at that meeting in Cordova, in the  
3 recommendation for the C&T, I drew the line between 6(A) east  
4 and 6(A) west at Cape Suckling and with a point north of Cape  
5 Suckling.

6  
7 At the Southeast Regional Council meeting in Yakutat  
8 last week we heard testimony from Yakutat residents addressing  
9 all three of the deferred proposals and they testified to the  
10 effect that their ancestors come from throughout the Copper  
11 River Delta and Pacific Gulf Coast and that they have  
12 traditionally used all of Unit 6(A). So they objected to the  
13 division of 6(A) into Unit 6(A) east and west. And they asked  
14 -- because they felt that it was important to have their  
15 testimony be presented verbatim, they asked that it be  
16 transcribed and brought to you.

17  
18 Is it the wish of the Council that I present a summary  
19 of Proposals 14 and 16 at this time?

20  
21 MR. LOHSE: Yes.

22  
23 MS. MASON: Yes, okay. Because the Board has already  
24 acted on the portions of these proposals that have to do with  
25 Unit 5, I'm going to concentrate my summary on the portion of  
26 it that deals with Unit 6(A). To start with, Proposal 14, this  
27 request in its original form, it requested a positive customary  
28 and traditional use determination for mountain goat in Units 5  
29 and 6(A) for residents of Unit 5. So what remains is a  
30 proposal for uses of Unit 6(A) by residents of Unit 5.

31  
32 Currently, there is no C&T determination for goat in  
33 Unit 6(A). The harvest data for Unit 6(A) from 1986 to 1994  
34 show that residents of a variety of communities hunted and  
35 harvested goats in Unit 6(A). 106 of the total 104 (sic) goats  
36 taken there were harvested by non-residents. There were a  
37 couple of Unit 6 communities represented among those who  
38 harvested goats there and those were Cape Yakataga and Cordova,  
39 and each of those had harvested one goat each during those  
40 years. During that same time period, there was a recorded  
41 harvest of one goat by residents of Yakutat. So it was a  
42 similar record of harvest.

43  
44 Research done in the 1980s in Yakutat was interviews  
45 with the Yakutat residents who described that the cliffs in the  
46 vicinity of Icy Bay, which are located -- some of which are  
47 located in Unit 6(A) were the prime goat hunting areas. But in

48 1975 the State reduced the harvest limits, so Yakutat residents  
49 after that time thought that the cost associated with such a  
50 hunt were no longer justifiable. So they had pretty much

0014

1 stopped using that portion of Unit 6(A) after 1975.

2

3 The conclusion or recommendations were to reject the  
4 portion of the proposal dealing with Unit 6(A), and that was  
5 because at the time that this analysis was written there seemed  
6 to be little interest or contemporary harvest in that area by  
7 residents of Unit 5. At this time, what would be asked of the  
8 Southcentral Regional Council would be to present a proposal  
9 for residents of Unit 6 or for persons in your region for uses  
10 in Unit 6(A). That concludes Proposal 14.

11

12 MR. LOHSE: Do we want to take action on 14 or do we  
13 want to hear what she has to say on 16 first and then go and  
14 take both of them together; what's the wish of the Council? If  
15 there's no comment from anybody else, let's take 14 and just go  
16 through it.

17

18 Basically what we're looking at right here is a  
19 proposal by the Yakutat residents of Unit 5 for a C&T finding  
20 for 6(A) which is also a unit -- as information that's been  
21 presented here shows, is also used by residents of the Cordova  
22 area. It's kind of interesting to me and just going from my  
23 own background I'll make some comments on that. There's a lot  
24 of background information in here on how goats were used, how  
25 they were used by the Tlingits and the Yakutats and how they  
26 did go up in that area and hunt goats. The one thing we have  
27 to remember is that Cordova is also -- Cordova is kind of a  
28 mixed community. And most of the Tlingits who used to live in  
29 the Katalla area which is down in that direction now live in  
30 Cordova. And so consequently the same traditional uses of  
31 goats that apply to Yakutat apply to some of the Native  
32 population in Cordova itself. And so with that information as  
33 far as past usage transfers to both communities because we're  
34 looking at the same type of population. Cordova has a very  
35 historical Native population base. Tlingits, Eyaks and the  
36 Prince William Sound people and they all currently dwell in the  
37 community of Cordova. So the same information would apply  
38 there.

39

40 Therefore, for my own personal looking at it and the  
41 fact that we look at the information and we find that Cordova  
42 residents have been just as present in the harvest in 6(A) as  
43 Yakutat residents, I, personally would object to finding a C&T  
44 for Unit 5 without finding C&T for Unit 6. Because the same  
45 reasoning that applies to one applies to the other. And if  
46 they, you know, when we had our little meeting in Cordova or  
47 little get together in Cordova, we recognized that, you know,

48 6(A), the western section was used more by Cordova and the  
49 eastern section was used by Yakutat, however, we all know that  
50 nothing's ever exclusive. If it appears that the people from

0015

1 Yakutat would object to splitting 6(A), then I think the same  
2 applications would apply to the people from Cordova.

3

4 So at this point in time, Rachel, what we need is, is  
5 we either need a -- Tom, would you like to speak to this one?  
6 Tom's from Cordova. If you don't mind, Rachel, we'll call on  
7 Tom Carpenter.

8

9 MS. MASON: No, fine.

10

11 MR. LOHSE: It's one of the proposals he had down to  
12 speak to.

13

14 MR. CARPENTER: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the  
15 Board. My name's Tom Carpenter, I reside in Cordova. I'm  
16 representing the Prince William Sound/Copper River Advisory  
17 Committee. In the handout that's in your pamphlet, they talk  
18 about the meeting as the Chairman noted that they held in  
19 Cordova last year, and I, personally, wasn't at that meeting.  
20 I wasn't Chairman of the advisory committee at that time,  
21 another gentleman from Cordova was in attendance. The main  
22 thing that the advisory committee wants to stress is as the  
23 Chairman just stated, the area at stake is kind of an unusual  
24 area as to where the Department of Fish and Game has already,  
25 in the past, separated it into two sections, east and west of  
26 Cape Suckling, and the area at stake also is, you know,  
27 extremely -- the cost of getting there is quite high. So I  
28 think that a lot of that must be taken into consideration. I  
29 think the big thing I want to stress is is that giving that a  
30 positive C&T is possible, that Cordova residents, along with  
31 the residents of Unit 5 or Yakutat, if you look at the  
32 percentages of harvest, I don't think that you can necessarily  
33 place more historical value on the land or historical harvest  
34 on the land for any of the one community. You know, the  
35 percentages speak pretty much for themselves, as was brought up  
36 earlier. I don't have the exact percentages on hand. I know  
37 that goats are much less of a hunted species in that area than  
38 say moose, for instance, or maybe even wolves or some trapping  
39 for that.

40

41 But we just want to stress that if there's going to be  
42 a positive C&T finding, that we really encourage that there  
43 shouldn't be a one side or the other. We feel that if there's  
44 going to be a C&T finding, that both Cordova and Yakutat, you  
45 know, you really look at the historical background there. And  
46 the people, you know, that lived on the Copper River Delta and  
47 the Yakutat foreland have -- they have moved and their

48 communities have changed in the last 100 years, and I think you  
49 really need to look at to where the people were living then and  
50 where they're living now. And you know, you got to almost

0016

1 transcribe to who's using it now and who was using it then and  
2 it's possible that the people could have lived, you know, 200  
3 miles down the coast then but they all live in Cordova now. So  
4 we just wanted to stress the fact that there shouldn't be a one  
5 sided finding for Unit 6, east or west.

6

7 That's basically all I have to say for goats.

8

9 MR. LOHSE: Thank you, Tom. Any questions for Tom. No  
10 questions, Tom, thank you. That was something else, it's not  
11 in our transcript right here on the meeting that we held in  
12 Cordova, but one of the things that John Vale stressed was they  
13 were not trying to -- they wanted to find a C&T for them  
14 because of the use in the past, they were not trying to exclude  
15 Cordova from it, that wasn't their original intentions. The  
16 nature of the proposal is, it does exclude Cordova. So our  
17 solution to that basically is to find a C&T for both or to  
18 leave it stand as it is. So it's up to the wishes of the Board  
19 as to what to do.

20

21 I was looking at some of the people who attended that  
22 meeting, and I'm looking at Bud Janson for one, it says that  
23 he's a member of the Eyak Tribe. Bud will tell you, very  
24 clearly, that he is a Tlingit from Katalla. I mean that's  
25 where he's from, that's where his family is from. He's a  
26 member of the Eyak Tribe in Cordova today, and the Eyak Tribe  
27 in Cordova is made up of Tlingits from Katalla along with  
28 Prince William Sound people, along with Eyaks.

29

30 So at this point in time, we can either move forward on  
31 this by putting in a proposal of our own or amending the  
32 current proposal, right Helga?

33

34 MS. EAKON: That is correct.

35

36 MR. LOHSE: What is the wish of the Board? We're  
37 dealing with just the part on 6(a), Proposal 14.

38

39 MR. JOHN: I got a question.

40

41 MR. LOHSE: Fred.

42

43 MR. JOHN: This proposal, Proposal 14, it's just for  
44 the people in Yakutat, Unit 5.....

45

46 MR. LOHSE: Um-hum.

47

48           MR. JOHN:   .....to have equal access to the goat  
49 hunting in Unit 6 as Cordova has?  
50

0017

1 MR. LOHSE: The proposal, the way it's written, Fred,  
2 cuts out the people in Cordova.

3  
4 MR. JOHN: Oh, okay.

5  
6 MR. LOHSE: The proposal, the way it's written gives a  
7 C&T to Unit 5, Yakutat and not a C&T to Cordova.

8  
9 MR. JOHN: Okay.

10  
11 MR. LOHSE: So.....

12  
13 MR. JOHN: I think we had this before where we  
14 discussed it and I kind of agreed with this proposal, that line  
15 that was drawn, usually doesn't effect subsistence hunters very  
16 much. It's a line drawn by the State and it does separate the  
17 community, but as far as I know -- what I heard so far is they  
18 both hunted the area and I believe that they -- it's their  
19 privilege and their right.

20  
21 MR. LOHSE: Yeah.

22  
23 MR. JOHN: And I would vote for that proposal.

24  
25 MR. LOHSE: Would you like to amend this proposal to  
26 find for -- let's see, the proposed regulation, currently it  
27 stands, as all rural residents -- the proposed regulation is  
28 rural residents of Unit 5 -- what we could have is rural  
29 residents of Unit 5 and Unit 6, and that would give Cordova and  
30 Yakutat access to 6(A).

31  
32 MR. JOHN: Is that how Bob wanted it?

33  
34 MR. LOHSE: Bob? Tom?

35  
36 MR. JOHN: Tom, yeah, I'm sorry.

37  
38 MR. LOHSE: Yeah, Tom was saying, you can't take that  
39 area and leave the people from Cordova out because the people  
40 from Cordova, a lot of them are from down in that area to start  
41 off with.

42  
43 MS. EAKON: Excuse me.

44  
45 MR. LOHSE: Yes.

46  
47 MS. EAKON: For all of Unit 6 or just 6(A)?

48  
49  
50

MR. LOHSE: Well, we're just dealing with 6(A).

0018

1 MS. EAKON: Okay.

2

3 MR. LOHSE: But you have to come up with the residents.  
4 So the rural residents of Unit 6 are basically the people of  
5 Chenega, the people of Tatitlek and people of Cordova.

6

7 MS. MASON: And Whittier.

8

9 MR. LOHSE: Is Whittier classed as rural?

10

11 MS. MASON: Unit 6. It's not rural?

12

13 MR. LOHSE: No, uh-huh.

14

15 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Ralph.

16

17 MR. LOHSE: Yes.

18

19 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman, could you restate your  
20 proposed solution was to this proposal, how it's different than  
21 the proposal?

22

23 MR. LOHSE: My proposed solution would be to find a C&T  
24 for both, the residents of Unit 5, which is Yakutat and  
25 Yakataga and some of those places down there, and the residents  
26 of Unit 6, which is Cordova, Tatitlek and Chenega, the rural  
27 residents. You'd have to use rural residents -- currently the  
28 proposal reads; rural residents of Unit 5. And if we would  
29 change it to rural residents of Unit 5 and Unit 6, that  
30 would.....

31

32 MR. JOHN: My question is, how big is that Unit 5? I'd  
33 like to see that map.

34

35 MR. LOHSE: How big is Unit 5, how far down does Unit 5  
36 go?

37

38 MS. MASON: It's on those maps that I handed out.

39

40 MR. LOHSE: Okay, you got it right there?

41

42 MR. JOHN: Yes.

43

44 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Yes.

45

46 MR. LOHSE: How far does Unit 5 go down?

47

48 MR. JOHN: Not very.....

49

50 MR. LOHSE: So it goes past Glacier Bay down here to

0019

1 Cape Fairweather, okay.

2

3 MS. MASON: Mr. Chair.

4

5 MR. LOHSE: Yes.

6

7 MS. MASON: I should mention that the proposals are  
8 only for Unit 5(A), they're not for all of Unit 5. And the  
9 Southeast Council has been specific about that saying that  
10 Yakutat is the only permanent community in Unit 5.

11

12 MR. LOHSE: Okay. So this shouldn't read then rural  
13 residents of Unit 5, it should read rural residents of Unit  
14 5(A)?

15

16 MS. MASON: That's correct.

17

18 MR. LOHSE: So what we could do is we could then make  
19 rural residents of Unit 6(C).....

20

21 MR. OSKOLKOFF: In the existing way it says just 6(A).

22

23 MR. LOHSE: Yeah, we're dealing with 6(A), nobody lives  
24 in 6(A), see. Unit 5 has got Yakutat, 5(A) has got Yakutat in  
25 it.

26

27 MR. OSKOLKOFF: And no one lives in 5(B).

28

29 MR. LOHSE: No one lives in -- well, I don't know about  
30 5(B), what.....

31

32 MS. MASON: The Southeast Council has repeatedly made  
33 the point that there are no permanent communities in 5(B) and  
34 that they don't wish for 5(B) to be part of any C&T  
35 determination that effects Unit 5(A).

36

37 MR. LOHSE: Okay, so they split it off into 5(A)?

38

39 MS. MASON: Yes.

40

41 MR. LOHSE: And what we're dealing with is we're  
42 dealing with 6(A), which is between 6(C) and -- let's see,  
43 nobody lives in 6(B), nobody lives in 6(A).

44

45 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Um-hum.

46

47 MR. LOHSE: 6(C) is the closest community, which is

48 Cordova, and Cordova traditionally has hunted 6(B) and the west  
49 half of 6(A) for moose and other things and there has been cari  
50 -- like Fred was saying, there's spillover. There's no

0020

1 question that people from here have gone farther down and  
2 people from here have gone farther up, you know. But this is  
3 the transition area between these two. There used to be a  
4 community -- if you take a look right here, you see Kayak  
5 Island and you see right where this little island that's inside  
6 of Kayak Island is, it's actually called Martin Island, right  
7 over here, in other words if you took where this line makes the  
8 tip right here and it's got a slant going into it between 6(B)  
9 and 6(A), that's where the community of Katalla used to be.  
10 And that's where we had -- you know, that's where the Jansons  
11 and a bunch of those people came from. They used to be a  
12 fairly good sized community at Katalla. Those people now  
13 currently reside in Cordova. Some of those people reside down  
14 in Yakutat.

15  
16 MR. OSKOLKOFF: So am I to understand between all the  
17 statements that I've heard, that no one is a permanent resident  
18 of 5(B), 6(A) and 6(B)?

19  
20 MR. LOHSE: Right.

21  
22 MR. OSKOLKOFF: So there's a large buffer zone there  
23 essentially of no residents?

24  
25 MR. LOHSE: Um-hum. There's no residents in 6(B) and  
26 6(A), and as far as Rachel was saying -- I don't know about  
27 5(B). 5(B) is on the other side.

28  
29 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Um-hum.

30  
31 MR. LOHSE: 5(B) is south, right?

32  
33 MS. MASON: No, actually 5(B) is the northern portion  
34 of 5.

35  
36 MR. LOHSE: Oh, the northern portion, okay.

37  
38 MS. MASON: Yeah.

39  
40 MR. LOHSE: So what we have is 5(B) here.

41  
42 MR. WILLIS: Mr. Chair.

43  
44 MR. LOHSE: Yes.

45  
46 MR. WILLIS: Mr. Chair, excuse me, a point of  
47 information. The reason 5(B) was specifically excluded is that

48 there is a logging camp at Icy Bay up in 5(B), which has been  
49 in place about two years. It's mostly peopled by residents of  
50 Washington and Oregon who came up to cut timber. And that

0021

1 Council did not feel that those people should be included in a  
2 customary and traditional use determination, so there is a  
3 transient community in 5(B).

4

5 MR. LOHSE: Okay. So this proposal as Southeast is  
6 going to change it is going to be for rural residents of 5(A)  
7 then?

8

9 MS. MASON: Correct.

10

11 MR. LOHSE: So we could change it to 5(A) and 6(C) if  
12 we so desired. Rural residents of 5(A) and 6(C), which would  
13 basically put the two communities that are on each side of that  
14 buffer zone into using that buffer zone.

15

16 MR. JOHN: Yeah, I like that.

17

18 MS. MASON: That's correct. The Board action has  
19 already changed it to Unit 5(A).

20

21 MR. LOHSE: The Board action has changed it to Unit  
22 5(A)?

23

24 MS. MASON: Yes.

25

26 MR. LOHSE: Don, what do you think about -- you know,  
27 if we go just the 6(C), that leaves out Tatitlek and Chenega;  
28 what's your feelings on that?

29

30 MR. KOMPKOFF: Well, we use that area, too, you know,  
31 just like anybody else.

32

33 MR. LOHSE: Yeah.

34

35 MR. KOMPKOFF: We have in the past.

36

37 MR. LOHSE: Did we find out whether Whittier was  
38 classed as rural?

39

40 MR. KNAUER: Whittier is rural.

41

42 MR. LOHSE: Whittier is rural. But there's no C&T for  
43 Whittier that I've found there.

44

45 MR. ROMIG: Right.

46

47 MR. LOHSE: Well, there's no C&T for anybody in Unit 6

48 for 6(A), and all we're dealing with is 6(A) at this point.

49

50 MR. DEMENTI: Can we just make it 6(C) and (D) to

0022

1 include Chenega Bay?

2

3 MR. LOHSE: Yeah.

4

5 MR. KOMPKOFF: You got Tatitlek, I think.

6

7 MR. LOHSE: Tatitlek would be in that, too. Again,  
8 we're dealing with communities that -- Tatitlek, Chenega and  
9 Cordova, we have a lot of migration between those three  
10 communities. People from Tatitlek live in Cordova, people who  
11 have lived in Cordova live back in Tatitlek. People from  
12 Chenega live in Cordova. People who have lived in Cordova live  
13 back in Chenega. So I mean they're basically almost thought of  
14 -- not as one community, but they have a lot of interrelations  
15 that way. And so what one group would have done, the other  
16 group would have done.

17

18 MR. ROMIG: Mr. Chairman, if we said all of residents  
19 of Unit 6, would that include Whittier in that? Are we making  
20 a big sweeping C&T if we include 6(D) without going from  
21 village to village?

22

23 MR. LOHSE: 6(D) does include Whittier. Unit 6  
24 includes Whittier, and we don't have any information on that.

25

26 MS. MASON: Mr. Chair, if I could just bring out that  
27 this amendment will be analyzed for the winter meeting.

28

29 MR. LOHSE: Um-hum.

30

31 MS. MASON: So that if there was some community or part  
32 of the unit that you're unclear of, that will be brought out  
33 again in the analysis for the winter meeting and then at the  
34 spring Board meeting.

35

36 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

37

38 MR. LOHSE: Yes.

39

40 MR. OSKOLKOFF: I'm in kind of a quandary. I'm looking  
41 for an easy way to state what I've heard is the general  
42 intention. I think most of us are in agreement, but I haven't  
43 heard it articulated in a way that, you know, I can easily  
44 grasp here. So I'm kind of reluctant to do anything until I  
45 have something concrete to work with.

46

47 MR. LOHSE: I'm having the same problem.

48  
49  
50

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Okay.

0023

1 MR. KNAUER: Mr. Chairman, maybe one way that you could  
2 state it; if I'm hearing what I think I am would be customary  
3 and traditional use for Unit 6(A) for goat would be for rural  
4 residents of Unit 5(A), Units 6(C) and residents of Chenega and  
5 Tatitlek. Are Chenega and Chenega Bay two different  
6 communities or is that one community?

7  
8 MR. KOMPKOFF: That's one community.

9  
10 MR. KNAUER: Okay. So you could say, residents of Unit  
11 6(C) and the residents of Chenega and Tatitlek if you're  
12 concerned that Whittier really doesn't use that area because  
13 they're so far away on other areas.

14  
15 MS. EAKON: Mr. Chair.

16  
17 MR. LOHSE: Yes.

18  
19 MS. EAKON: May I make it real clear for the record  
20 that this would be an amendment to an existing proposal, and as  
21 such, it would be analyzed by Staff and you would have a chance  
22 to consider it on the merits at the winter meeting.

23  
24 MR. JOHN: Can I make a motion?

25  
26 MR. LOHSE: Yes. I think you need to include the word,  
27 rural residents, if you'd like Fred.

28  
29 MR. JOHN: All residents of Tatitlek and.....

30  
31 MR. LOHSE: Rural residents of Unit 5(A), 6(C) and  
32 Tatitlek and Chenega. Because if I look right, Valdez is in  
33 6(C).

34  
35 MR. JOHN: Yeah. No, it's not it's in 6(D).

36  
37 MS. MASON: It's in 6(D), I think.

38  
39 MR. KNAUER: The aspect of rural is automatic. It does  
40 not need to be added, but it doesn't hurt to have it in there.

41  
42 MR. LOHSE: Okay. Fred.

43  
44 MR. JOHN: You got to help me with this. I'd like to  
45 make a motion that this is proposed we say, include 5(A), 6(C),  
46 Chenega and Tatitlek for C&T for goat in 6(A), that's about I  
47 think what I got.

48  
49  
50

MR. LOHSE: That's right. Is there a second?

0024

1 MR. OSKOLKOFF: I'll second it.

2

3 MR. DEMENTI: Second.

4

5 MR. LOHSE: Seconded by Gary or Gilbert, whoever you  
6 want to put down. Okay, what we have is a motion on the table  
7 to -- now, we can discuss it; we should have had a motion for  
8 it prior, but we have a motion on the table for a C&T finding  
9 for 6(A) for rural residents of 5(A), 6(C), Tatitlek and  
10 Chenega. And our reasoning behind that has to be the fact that  
11 the Staff analysis that was presented on 5(A), which documents  
12 customary and traditional uses, the records that come from the  
13 Board of Fish and Game that shows usage in that area and the  
14 fact that those records also show usage from the Cordova area  
15 and that the people of Cordova, Yakutat -- I mean Cordova,  
16 Tatitlek and Chenega also have traditional use of that area  
17 because of the makeup of the population, so the same customary  
18 and traditional uses would apply to them as would apply to the  
19 people from Yakutat, seeings how they have basically the same  
20 background.

21

22 Do we.....

23

24 MR. KOMPKOFF: Question.

25

26 MR. LOHSE: .....have any other discussion? Question's  
27 been called, okay, the question on the amended Proposal 14 to  
28 be presented to the Board, which reads, a C&T finding for Units  
29 6(A) goat, rural residents of 5(A), 6(C) and Tatitlek and  
30 Chenega. Question's been called, all in favor signify by  
31 saying aye.

32

33 IN UNISON: Aye.

34

35 MR. LOHSE: All opposed signify by saying nay.

36

37 (No opposing responses)

38

39 MR. LOHSE: Motion carries unanimously. Okay, at this  
40 point let's go on to Proposal 16. Is it 16 that we're going  
41 to?

42

43 MS. MASON: Sixteen, yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
44 Proposal 16 requested a positive customary and traditional use  
45 determination for wolf in Unit 5 and 6(A) for residents of Unit  
46 5. And again, the Board acted only on the portion of it  
47 dealing with the Unit 5 and it deferred action on the portion

48 of it dealing with uses in Unit 6(A). Under current  
49 regulation, there is a very broad C&T determination in Unit 6  
50 for wolf. And the rural residents of Unit 6, 9, 10, Unimak

0025

1 Island, 11 to 13, and Chickaloon, and 16 through 26 all have a  
2 positive customary and traditional determination for wolves in  
3 Unit 6(A).

4  
5 So there is already a positive C&T for all residents of  
6 Unit 6 there, however, there's also a positive C&T for all of  
7 -- a variety of other units as well. The Board action on Unit  
8 5 gave a positive C&T only to residents of Unit 5(A), and as  
9 for the harvest records, there is no record of any Yakutat  
10 community members using State lands to harvest wolves in Unit  
11 6(A) in the years between 1979 and 1995, however, there is a  
12 good record of use by Cordova residents. Unit 6(A) has been  
13 used periodically by Anchorage, Cape Yakataga, Elmendorf,  
14 Haines, Ketchikan, but more than any other community, by the  
15 Cordova residents. And that -- well, that means that six of  
16 the 29 wolves that were taken through those years were by  
17 Cordova residents.

18  
19 The analysis dealt mainly with uses by Tlingits of  
20 wolves. The conclusion in the original proposal analysis was  
21 to adopt the proposal for Unit 5, but to reject it for Unit  
22 6(A) because there was no ethnographic or harvest data on the  
23 uses of Unit 6(A) by Yakutat residents. However, there was no  
24 conclusion about the uses of 6(A) by Unit 6 residents. So the  
25 Board took no action on the proposal having to do with Unit 6.  
26 So that's where it was left after the Board meeting.

27  
28 MR. LOHSE: So Rachel, if I understand right then, the  
29 Board found for residents of Unit 5(A), they found a C&T for  
30 wolves in Unit 5?

31  
32 MS. MASON: Correct.

33  
34 MR. LOHSE: But they didn't find for wolves in Unit  
35 6(A)?

36  
37 MS. MASON: That's correct.

38  
39 MR. LOHSE: And currently what stands for 6(A) is this  
40 broad spectrum for C&T ?

41  
42 MS. MASON: That's right.

43  
44 MR. LOHSE: And this is based on Fish and Game records  
45 basically of wolves that have been taken there?

46  
47 MS. MASON: The broad spectrum of C&T is not based on

48 harvest records.

49

50 MR. LOHSE: Oh.

0026

1 MS. MASON: That was one that -- it's sort of  
2 mysterious how they were established in the first place, but  
3 it's similar to the ones for grouse and ptarmigan that we  
4 looked at last year. The Board of Game gave a very broad and  
5 sweeping C&T determination for these animals. Maybe it's worth  
6 pointing out that among the many units that currently do have a  
7 positive C&T for wolves in Unit 6(A), Unit 5 is not among them.

8  
9 MR. LOHSE: So we're dealing right now with only the  
10 6(A) portion, right?

11  
12 MS. MASON: That's right.

13  
14 MR. LOHSE: Because the Unit 5 portion has already been  
15 taken care of?

16  
17 MS. MASON: That's correct.

18  
19 MR. LOHSE: So again, we're looking back at 6(A) and  
20 there's a number of ways we could handle this. We could make a  
21 motion to include residents of Unit 5 in this list of -- or  
22 Unit 5(A) in this list of people who have C&T in 6(A) or we  
23 could make a complete new list for 6(A), but we'd have to have  
24 something to base that on. The one thing we do know is we do  
25 know that residents of Unit 6 have taken wolves in 6(A). And I  
26 think I saw in the thing from our meeting that we had in  
27 Cordova, that Unit 5(A) was going to have some written  
28 testimony of harvest records from 6(A) of people that took  
29 wolves in 6(A). Did they ever get that in or did they ever  
30 present anything to us on that?

31  
32 MS. MASON: They didn't give specific testimony on  
33 that. The testimony that the Yakutat residents gave was for  
34 all three of the proposals, 14, 15 and 16 concurrently. They  
35 did not specifically address that question.

36  
37 MR. LOHSE: They didn't specifically address wolves?

38  
39 MS. MASON: Right.

40  
41 MR. LOHSE: Well, I don't know about you guys, but it's  
42 my feeling that if they hunted in 6(A) at all and they had a  
43 chance at a wolf, they probably took it.

44  
45 MR. OSKOLKOFF: And you're talking about residents  
46 of.....

47

48 MR. LOHSE: Unit 5, 5(A).

49

50 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Five.

0027

1 MR. LOHSE: Or whatever. We deferred that part that  
2 pertained to Unit 6(A), and so we need to address 6(A) and  
3 decide whether or not there is enough evidence presented to  
4 allow Unit 5(A) to have a C&T for wolves in Unit 6(A) or  
5 whether we want to change it completely.

6  
7 Wishes of the Board, any comments?

8  
9 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman, maybe I'm misreading  
10 this, is there a specific proposal to do what we stated, which  
11 was Unit 5(A) being able to take wolves in 6(A)?

12  
13 MR. LOHSE: Originally the proposal included 6(A).

14  
15 MS. MASON: That's right.

16  
17 MR. LOHSE: Originally the request for the proposal  
18 from Unit 5(A).....

19  
20 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Okay.

21  
22 MR. LOHSE: .....was for Unit 5 and Unit 6(A), and that  
23 would have -- if they were to get a C&T and that would  
24 basically just add them to the C&T's that are already found.

25  
26 MS. MASON: That's right.

27  
28 MR. OSKOLKOFF: And all the information we gathered,  
29 testimony and what not, is from that original proposal then?

30  
31 MS. MASON: What we have before us is the original  
32 proposal. The only part that the Board acted on was dealing  
33 with use within Unit 5.

34  
35 MR. LOHSE: Yeah.

36  
37 MS. MASON: But the original proposal analysis did  
38 contain a recommendation concerning Unit 6(A). And that there  
39 were no documented uses by Yakutat residents in Unit 6(A).

40  
41 MR. LOHSE: The recommendation that stands in front of  
42 us is that there is no record of 5(A) using 6(A) for wolfe  
43 harvest, yet we've just said that they use it for goat harvest.  
44 We're going to deal with them using it for moose harvest. So  
45 basically we're saying that they do hunt in that area or have  
46 hunted in that area in the past, it's -- again, we have to  
47 decide whether or not that then shows evidence of them having

48 used wolf in 6(A) or whether -- or whether they have as much  
49 likelihood to have used wolf in 6(A) as people from Unit 9, 10,  
50 11 through 13, and 16 through 26.

0028

1 MS. MASON: Right.

2

3 MR. LOHSE: Since they live right along side of it.

4

5 MR. OSKOLKOFF: And what I was getting at is there  
6 hasn't been -- has there been subsequent testimony or  
7 information arise between the original proposal and that  
8 information?

9

10 MS. MASON: If I may, Mr. Chairman. Yakutat residents  
11 adamantly affirm that they use Unit 6(A) for hunting. I don't  
12 recall any specific testimony to the effect that they took  
13 wolves there. But I would tend to agree with Mr. Lohse, that  
14 they -- if they saw a wolf they probably took it because they  
15 were very clear that they use that area.

16

17 MR. LOHSE: If we go back to E1, the meeting that we  
18 held in Cordova with John Vale from the Southeast Regional  
19 Council, and we look at the last couple of paragraphs in that  
20 one right there. It says, Proposal 16, the wolf proposal may  
21 be approached in either of at least two ways. First, would be  
22 to narrowly focus on Yakutat's use of wolf in 6(A) and propose  
23 to add them to the existing broad list of units and communities  
24 that have a positive C&T finding. The second would be a more  
25 expansive look at the use of wolves in 6(A) in order to  
26 evaluate who does have actual C&T there including Yakutat, the  
27 latter would likely result in the elimination of C&T findings  
28 for communities such as Unimak Island. John Vale was confident  
29 that there was several people in the Yakutat area who had taken  
30 wolves in Unit 6(A) in the past and could be documented prior  
31 to the Southcentral Council's fall meeting. And that's what I  
32 was wondering, if we had any of that documentation. It goes on  
33 and it says, on the plane flight back between Cordova and  
34 Yakutat, John Vale and Fred Clark and Fred Clark was the  
35 Federal Staff that was in attendance?

36

37 MS. MASON: Um-hum.

38

39 MR. LOHSE: And he said, conversely Yakutat residents,  
40 both he and another Yakutat resident had taken wolves from Unit  
41 6(A). John will follow-up in getting a written statement of  
42 that harvest. And I'm just wondering if you'd ever gotten that  
43 written statement, Helga.

44

45 MS. EAKON: Mr. Chair, Fred Clark, who is the  
46 coordinator for the Southeast Regional Council wrote up this  
47 trip report. And he was very aware that this was to have been

48 a follow-up, but I have not seen any such.

49

50 MR. LOHSE: You haven't seen the follow-up on that?

0029

1 MS. EAKON: No.

2

3 MR. LOHSE: Okay, well, that gives us what we have for  
4 information to this point and time then.

5

6 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Okay.

7

8 MR. LOHSE: So acting on that information, we haven't  
9 received any follow-up reports on it. And we have the record  
10 here that -- and yet we have common sense that says that if  
11 somebody's hunting moose and goats in an area they probably  
12 would take a wolf if they had the opportunity to, but we're  
13 going to have to go from there. Like it says, there's two ways  
14 we can go. We can either try to analyze who all actually uses  
15 them in there or we could add Unit 5 or we can leave it as it  
16 is.

17

18 What's the wish of the Council?

19

20 MR. JOHN: Leave it as is.

21

22 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I'm in quite a quandary.  
23 On one hand, I like to be as inclusive as possible given that  
24 the game doesn't need to be restricted for management or safety  
25 concerns or something like that. On the other hand, I'm  
26 concerned with the level of information that we have regarding  
27 this, given how deep we've delved into some topics and how  
28 we've fractured and analyzed every nut and bolt in some cases.  
29 So I'm kind of inbevelent and unsure of really what to do.

30

31 MR. LOHSE: That's where I am.

32

33 MR. JOHN: Me too.

34

35 MR. LOHSE: I'm kind of disappointed that we didn't get  
36 the written statements that were promised. I mean that would  
37 -- I mean at least we would have something in front of us with  
38 the information we have. We have no information to deal with  
39 it.

40

41 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman, that's exactly my  
42 concern, is that, I don't want to act to exclude. Given that,  
43 I'm certain of your logic that wolves were taken and I'm  
44 certain that the statements are true that wolves were taken.  
45 But it seems like we're getting into very thin information here  
46 and I would really like to have that information before making  
47 a decision.

48  
49 MR. LOHSE: Rachel, in these two papers that you gave  
50 us that we haven't had time to look -- are there any specific

0030

1 referrals to wolves in Unit 6(A)?

2

3 MS. MASON: I was just paging through there trying to  
4 see and I didn't see any. I don't believe there were. Maybe  
5 somebody else who was there can recall. But I'm afraid that  
6 there is not -- that I know of, there is nothing directly  
7 concerning wolves in 6(A).

8

9 MR. LOHSE: Can I make a suggestion to the Council,  
10 that over lunch hour we look at these and if we find any  
11 information to the contrary, we can come back to this proposal.  
12 But at this point in time because we don't have any information  
13 other than what we've had before that we -- I don't like to use  
14 the word, defer action, on it because we're not really  
15 deferring action, but I guess take no action.

16

17 MS. EAKON: You can postpone your action on this until  
18 after lunch if you wish, Mr. Chair.

19

20 MR. LOHSE: Does that sound.....

21

22 MR. JOHN: That sounds good.

23

24 MR. LOHSE: .....good to the rest of the Council?  
25 Okay. So over lunch, everybody pursue this testimony that we  
26 didn't have a chance to see before and at that point in time if  
27 we find nothing to the contrary, we'll just take -- or we'll  
28 just leave things stand as they are or take no action, whatever  
29 the wish of the Council is.

30

31 Okay, at this point in time let's go on to Proposal,  
32 Rachel, I think it's Proposal 15?

33

34 MS. MASON: Fifteen and 19.

35

36 MR. LOHSE: Fifteen and 19.

37

38 MS. MASON: Right.

39

40 MR. LOHSE: Okay.

41

42 MS. MASON: And as I mentioned before, I distributed a  
43 second part of this referred to as Proposal 19(B). And this is  
44 the proposal by the Native village of Eyak to take one bull  
45 moose from Unit 6(C) for a memorial potlatch. Proposal 15 and  
46 19(A) is under Tab F in your book. And as mentioned  
47 previously, this is a combination of deferred Proposal 15,

48 which was a proposal for moose in Units 5 and 6(A), and a C&T  
49 proposal pursuant to the deferred Proposal 19, which was the  
50 proposal for ceremonial moose. So we're calling the C&T

0031

1 portion of deferred Proposal 19, 19(A). And in order to  
2 expedite analysis and in order to fracturing the analysis, we  
3 also through in a C&T consideration of moose in Unit 6(D) to  
4 make it an analysis of moose in all of Unit 6 together.

5  
6 This proposal is being considered by the Federal  
7 Subsistence Board on October 21st, and that is in order to  
8 accommodate the proponent of Proposal 19's request to harvest  
9 the ceremonial moose for a potlatch to be held in December or  
10 January. I also distributed maps that accompany the combined  
11 Proposal 15 and 19(A). Proposal 15 was deferred because  
12 although it originated with the Southeast Regional Council it  
13 also effects the Southcentral region, but like Proposals 14 and  
14 16, the portion of Proposal 15 which deals with Unit 5 has  
15 already been dealt with by the Board. And in regard to uses of  
16 Unit 6(A), the Board wanted to allow further comment from the  
17 Southcentral Council on Proposal 15.

18  
19 There's presently no subsistence priority throughout  
20 Unit 6 for taking moose on Federal lands. As we've heard in  
21 discussion of the other proposals in prehistoric and historic  
22 times, a number of different Alaska Native groups inhabited the  
23 area that's effected by this proposal. Tlingits lived here,  
24 Eyaks, also Chugach Alutiiqs and for centuries there have been  
25 migrations. There have been territorial expansions. There's  
26 also been trade and intermarriage among these cultural groups.  
27 And Athabascans are also part of the mix because the way that  
28 moose was familiar to the residents of this area was through  
29 trade with Athabascans living inland.

30  
31 Many of the indigenous residents of this area were  
32 Tlingits who had major settlements at Icy Bay, Cape Yakataga  
33 and the Kaliakh River, and some of the decedents of these  
34 Tlingits now live in Cordova, as Mr. Lohse was just pointing  
35 out and many of them live in Yakutat or other communities in  
36 Southeast Alaska. The Copper River Delta was primarily the  
37 homeland of the Eyaks, but also in the 18th Century, Controller  
38 Bay was claimed by Chugach Alutiiqs from Prince William Sound  
39 and they were driven back to Prince William Sound by  
40 Tlingitized Eyaks. The Tlingits were very culturally  
41 aggressive during this period and a group of Eyaks living along  
42 the coast were subject to what de Laguna has called,  
43 Tlingitization, of their culture, meaning they adopted a  
44 number of Tlingit customs. The Eyaks who were once a thriving  
45 and powerful group have been on the brink of dying out since  
46 early in the century and today there are only a handful of  
47 Eyaks left, mainly living in Cordova. The memorial potlatch

48 and through other means are ways that the Eyaks living in  
49 Cordova are attempting to revitalize their culture.  
50

0032

1           As for the availability of moose, in Unit 5 until the  
2 1920s and '30s, moose were only available in the Dry Bay area  
3 and they began to move toward Yakutat sometime in the 1930s.  
4 And it wasn't until the 1950s that moose were available for  
5 harvest in Yakutat. However, long before that, the hides of  
6 moose were a highly desirable trade item to Yakutat residents  
7 and they had obtained these hides in trade with Athabascan  
8 groups living in the Interior. In the Copper River Delta area,  
9 moose are an introduced species and in 1949 a few calves were  
10 introduced in Unit 6(C). A total of 24 moose calves were  
11 brought to the Cordova area over nine years and some Cordova  
12 residents still remember those calves and the stake they had in  
13 raising those calves. The first harvest in Unit 6(C) took  
14 place in 1960, the moose expanded into Unit 6(B) within a few  
15 years and by the late 1960s their population had extended into  
16 Unit 6(A). But until the hunting seasons were open in 1960,  
17 there was very little use of moose by residents of Unit 6,  
18 except through trade with other groups before that. But the  
19 trade was extensive and as I mentioned, there was extensive  
20 trade for moose hides and perhaps moose meat as well, between  
21 groups living in the Interior and those living on the Coast.

22  
23           And following the introduction of moose in their area,  
24 Native and non-Native residents of the Cordova area quickly  
25 adopted moose harvesting and began to use moose in ways  
26 comparable to their harvest, processing, distribution and  
27 consumption of other animals. As for the harvest records, the  
28 ADF&G harvest tickets indicate that Cordova residents were  
29 better represented in Unit 6(A), moose harvest than the Yakutat  
30 residents. During the 13 year period between 1984 and 1996,  
31 Cordova residents took about 39 percent of the 1,000 or so  
32 moose harvested in Unit 6(A) and Yakutat residents took about  
33 three percent of the moose harvested. Harvest in Unit 6(B) and  
34 6(C) are dominated by Cordova residents and of the very few  
35 moose that have been harvested in Unit 6(D), most of them were  
36 taken by non-rural residents of that subunit who live in  
37 Valdez. And I should mention that there is an error on Table 6  
38 in the proposal analysis that you have before you. It should  
39 say that the percent taken by Cordova residents on 6(B) -- was  
40 one moose was taken by Cordova residents which represents six  
41 percent of the harvest of the 18 that were harvested in that  
42 unit, and zero were taken by other residents of Unit 6.

43  
44           I've already mentioned in the context of Proposals 14  
45 and 16, that an information sharing meeting in Cordova took  
46 place between representatives of the Southcentral and Southeast  
47 Regional Councils, which included discussion of use areas

48 within Unit 6(A). And I would say that most of the discussion  
49 at that meeting concerned moose harvest. That that seemed to  
50 be of the greatest concern to the Cordova residents present and

0033

1 it appears that Cordova resident moose hunting is concentrated  
2 in the western portion of Unit 6(A) and Yakutat residents use  
3 the eastern portion of 6(A). And it was at that meeting that  
4 participants suggested that a line could be drawn north of Cape  
5 Suckling dividing Unit 6(A) and 6(B). But again, at the  
6 Yakutat Regional Council meeting last week, objections were  
7 raised to dividing Unit 6(A) in half. And many of those who  
8 testified at the meeting said that they were decedents of --  
9 inhabitants of Katalla, the place that Mr. Lohse said that many  
10 Tlingits now living in Cordova are also from. So some of them  
11 live in Yakutat, some in Cordova.

12  
13 The preliminary conclusion is to adopt the portion of  
14 the proposal regarding Unit 6(A) with modification. And this  
15 was on the basis of the discussions at the meeting in Cordova  
16 to divide Unit 6(A) into Unit 6(A) east and Unit 6(A) west, and  
17 this would give a positive customary and traditional  
18 determination to residents of Unit 5(A) in Unit 6(A) east and  
19 to residents of Unit 6(C), also Units 6(A) and 6(B), in this  
20 recommendation in Unit 6(A) west. Then in Unit 6(B) and 6(C),  
21 give a positive customary and traditional determination to all  
22 residents of Unit 6(A), 6(B) and 6(C) and in Unit 6(D), retain  
23 the no subsistence determination. The basis for this  
24 conclusion is that documented harvest and the testimony of  
25 residents of Yakutat and Cordova, again, this is before the  
26 Yakutat people objected to this indicate that Yakutat hunters  
27 have most consistently harvested moose in the portion of Unit  
28 6(A) east of Cape Suckling and at the same time -- and the  
29 residents of Cordova show a strong and consistent pattern of  
30 moose harvesting in the eastern portion of Unit 6(A), Unit 6(B)  
31 and Unit 6(C). The reasoning for including Unit 6(A) and 6(B)  
32 there is, while there are no permanent communities there, the  
33 remote rural residents living in those units should have the  
34 same positive C&T determination for moose hunting there as the  
35 residents of 6(C). In Unit 6(D) there has been little, if any,  
36 moose population and no tradition of moose hunting has been  
37 established, and that was the reason for retaining the no  
38 subsistence determination there.

39  
40 But generally, prior to the introduction of moose in  
41 the late 1940s to '50s in Cordova and the first hunting season  
42 for moose in 1960, the residents of Unit 6 didn't have any  
43 opportunity to develop customary and traditional hunting  
44 practices. But since they have been introduced and since there  
45 has been a trade established there, they have -- they were  
46 familiar with moose and following the arrival of moose in their  
47 areas, these residents have followed the patterns of harvest

48 and processing, distribution and consumption along traditional  
49 lines.  
50

0034

1 So that concludes the analysis.

2

3 MR. LOHSE: Rachel, I just have one thing that came  
4 across in your testimony. You said that residents of Unit 6(D)  
5 have no customary and traditional taking of moose and while  
6 that may be true for 6(A), 6(B), and 6(C), we just found a  
7 customary and traditional last year for Dry -- was it King's  
8 Bay?

9

10 MS. MASON: That was in Unit 7.

11

12 MR. LOHSE: That was Unit 7?

13

14 MS. MASON: Yeah.

15

16 MR. LOHSE: Well, that's in Unit 7, but that Unit 6(D)  
17 people had a customary and traditional use in Unit 7?

18

19 MS. MASON: Correct.

20

21 MR. LOHSE: Okay.

22

23 MS. MASON: Correct. They don't have any customary and  
24 traditional use within their unit.

25

26 MR. LOHSE: Okay. So basically what we're saying is  
27 there are no moose herds in 6(D)?

28

29 MS. MASON: Right.

30

31 MR. KOMPKOFF: Can I say something?

32

33 MS. MASON: Sure.

34

35 MR. KOMPKOFF: The boundary line in 6 and 7, there's  
36 parts of 6(D) that you could hunt moose in in Kings Bay.

37

38 MR. LOHSE: That's what I was under the impression,  
39 that part of the moose hunt takes place in 6(D).

40

41 MR. KOMPKOFF: 6(D). And 6(C) is just on the other  
42 side of the 6(D) line there.

43

44 MR. LOHSE: Yeah. So again, we're looking at the same  
45 -- at this point in time we're looking at the same thing. This  
46 proposal that we're dealing with is dealing with 6(A), and a  
47 customary and traditional finding for 6(A) at which point we

48 have 5(A) wishing a customary and traditional finding in 6(A)  
49 and we have to decide whether they have it or whether other  
50 people have it also. At this point in time, Rachel, I think

0035

1 that Tom is here to testify on this one.

2

3 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

4

5 MR. LOHSE: Yes.

6

7 MR. OSKOLKOFF: And then we'll take a break.

8

9 MR. LOHSE: After this testimony, yes, we'll take a  
10 break after this testimony.

11

12 MR. CARPENTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the  
13 Board once again. I'd kind of like to split up my testimony to  
14 where I think that Proposal 19, which it's 19(B) now or which  
15 was originally 19 and Proposal 15 have somewhat different  
16 circumstances. What I'd first like to do and with the Staff  
17 report you just heard is kind of bring into light how the moose  
18 were originally established on the Copper River Delta. In the  
19 early '50s, late '40s/early '50s, a group of people from  
20 Cordova which included many different groups got together with  
21 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife which finally ended up funding the  
22 project and basically what happened is they brought orphaned  
23 calves from the Mat-Su Valley and basically brought them to  
24 Cordova and raised them in pens, bottle fed them until they  
25 were old enough to be released into the wild.

26

27 Cordova and Unit 6 is extremely unique in this  
28 situation with the development of this moose herd. If you  
29 start off, you know, within a 10 year span with 24 calves and  
30 you look at what the population is today, some 2,500 animals,  
31 there's pretty profound likeness of these animals for the  
32 people that first got together to start the herd. I think that  
33 that's the big thing that I would like to stress the most, is  
34 that, it wasn't any one group of people that put the moose  
35 there, it was pretty much a community effort and that's the one  
36 thing that I'd like to stress foremost is that it was a  
37 community effort. And the people today that harvest the moose  
38 still look at it as a community type event.

39

40 Many of the people that first helped raise the moose,  
41 they were a lot younger then, of course, but actually there  
42 were two of them this year, one was in her 70s and I think  
43 another one was close to her 80s, they both received a drawing  
44 permit through the State lottery system and even to this day,  
45 still reap the benefits of their work that they did in the mid-  
46 '50s. In the past four or five years, the advisory committee  
47 from Cordova, which is made up of people from all different

48 walks of life has done a lot of work with the State Board of  
49 Game to help manage and make the opportunities for moose  
50 harvest because the demand is so high a lot better. And in

0036

1 1995, with the urging of the advisory committee and the  
2 Department of Fish and Game, we came up with a management plan  
3 that the State Board of Game adopted to basically enhance the  
4 opportunity in 6(C), which 6(C) is the closest subunit to  
5 Cordova and is accessible mainly by road and other forms of  
6 motorized or walk-in. And basically have come up with a 10  
7 year plan to hopefully, if it all works out right, will give  
8 more opportunity and more harvest availability for moose to the  
9 people who do live and reside in Cordova.

10  
11 In some areas, such as in Martin River, which is across  
12 the Copper River, which is not very accessible by road, mainly  
13 by boat or airplane or walk-in, they've had some problems with  
14 the moose/calf survival the last few years. As a result of  
15 that, the State Board of Game, last year, enacted some  
16 different type of programs to try and enhance the moose  
17 production in that area. The town of Cordova, this year, was  
18 really hard pressed because you take, you know, 20 bulls in  
19 6(C) and five cows and all of a sudden in Martin River, which  
20 is the next most accessible area for moose harvest for the  
21 local residents, you just don't have it anymore, that kind of  
22 hurts. So the main thing that I'm trying to get to you is I  
23 think that Proposal 19, which, if you found for this proposal,  
24 would basically be dividing the community, which once together,  
25 initiated and put this herd into existence, if you may. Like I  
26 said, there's people from all groups of life, lots of different  
27 organizations, you know, we had funding. The town gathered  
28 around these animals in the middle of town in these pens and  
29 raised them to what is now quite a healthy community besides  
30 for the one area that I mentioned in Martin River.

31  
32 I just think that, you know, in the world we live in  
33 today, there's really no reason to alienate or give special  
34 privileges to one group when that group was involved -- in the  
35 community at the time that the moose were first placed on to  
36 the Delta. And in my opinion and in the board's opinion -- or  
37 the advisory committee's opinion, we feel that there's got to  
38 be a better solution than Proposal 19 and we feel that if  
39 Proposal 19(B) is adopted that there will be a lot of division  
40 in a small town like Cordova, which nobody wants to see. And  
41 especially no one wants to see it over such a thing as an  
42 animal. There's a lot more important things that could happen  
43 there.

44  
45 Regarding Proposal 15, dealing with subunit 6(A). I  
46 was just reviewing some data that, I believe this is in your --  
47 the handout that you all have in front of you, it's on Page 7,

48 it's actually Table 6 which was referred to you earlier --  
49 excuse me, actually Table 5. The one thing that we want to  
50 stress here as I did testify earlier in dealing with the goat

0037

1 issue, 6(A) is not broken up into (A) east and (A) west in this  
2 table. There is another table in a different packet that does  
3 break it into two sections. Now, I believe that both of those  
4 pieces of information should be brought, you know, before you  
5 so you can really look at the data. Now, in 6(A) west, Cordova  
6 residents' percentage of harvest annually is much higher --  
7 much higher than the residents of say, 5(A), which is where the  
8 community of Yakutat resides. And on the other hand, in 6(A)  
9 east, which in the goat part of the testimony that I made last  
10 time, there was an equal boundaries. But still in 6(A) east  
11 with the moose, the percentage of moose harvest is still in the  
12 favor of Cordova residents, although it may be a little closer  
13 than in 6(A) west. So I think that that, Proposal 15, must be  
14 taken into consideration if the data shows and the facts are in  
15 front of you that the percentages are higher for Cordova  
16 residents versus the people, say in 5(A), in Yakutat. That's  
17 kind of hard to argue with those kind of numbers.

18  
19 The main thing that we want to stress is that 6(A)  
20 definitely, whatever the final document needs to be broken into  
21 east and west. Now, whichever the Council may find for a  
22 positive on one side or not or the whole thing as a whole, I  
23 think the data really shows that west is definitely -- the  
24 percentages are definitely in the favor of Cordova residents  
25 and in east, although the percentages are close, they are still  
26 in the favor of Cordova residents as well.

27  
28 I just would like to also stress once again, in regards  
29 to Proposal 19, Cordova's a small town, winter type people,  
30 probably somewhere in the neighborhood of 1,000 to 1,200, those  
31 are the people that really use and need the moose. The moose  
32 is definitely a shared type of harvest. The meet is spread  
33 around to different families and groups and different types of  
34 organizations that have different types of events in the  
35 community. We just want to stress that a special permit for a  
36 special harvest to a individual group of people in a town  
37 that's as small as Cordova, the division of the town, it could  
38 be drastic, it could be horrible. And I think there's some  
39 other way that this needs to be handled.

40  
41 Thank you.

42  
43 MR. LOHSE: Any questions for Tom? Okay, I've got one  
44 question Tom. You said you had a different chart there that  
45 told what was in east and west?

46  
47 MR. CARPENTER: I don't have it in front of me. I

48 believe it's in another packet that's.....

49

50 MS. MASON: Maps 2 and 3 on the maps that you have.

0038

1 MR. LOHSE: Um-hum.

2

3 MS. MASON: That illustrates the division between  
4 the.....

5

6 MR. LOHSE: No, I was wondering if -- my impression had  
7 been that there hadn't been any take for residents of 5(A) in  
8 6(A) west, that was my impression from something previously  
9 that we'd read. And that all of their harvest had taken place  
10 in 6(A) east. And that some Cordova harvest had taken place in  
11 6(A) east.

12

13 MR. CARPENTER: Right.

14

15 MR. LOHSE: And that's why they were fairly close in  
16 6(A) east, but there had been none in 6(A) west. Am I correct  
17 in that?

18

19 MS. MASON: Yes, you're correct in that.

20

21 MR. CARPENTER: Right.

22

23 MR. LOHSE: Okay. I just wondered if you had that  
24 table though.

25

26 MR. CARPENTER: Right.

27

28 MR. LOHSE: Any other questions for Tom? Hearing none,  
29 let's take ourselves a 10 minute break so everybody can get a  
30 cup of coffee. And when we come back, we have some other Staff  
31 that's shown up that I'd like to introduce and we'll go from  
32 there.

33

34 (Off record)

35 (On record)

36

37 MR. LOHSE: We'll call this back to order after our  
38 break. We're discussing Proposal 15, which deals with the  
39 customary and traditional finding for moose in Unit 6(A).  
40 We've had information presented showing that Cordova residents  
41 also use 6(A) and that residents of 5(A) use 6(A), the majority  
42 of the use by residents of 5(A) in Unit 6(A) east and Cordova  
43 residents using 6(A) west and 6(A) east. A piece of  
44 information that was brought to me on the 6(A) east and 6(A)  
45 west is that 6(A) east and 6(A) west is managed with two  
46 different set of regulations also. So there is a Fish and Game  
47 borderline through there and there are two different sets of

48 seasons and bag limits on 6(A) east and 6(A) west. I didn't  
49 realize that myself.  
50

0039

1           Okay. So at this point in time we need, if we're going  
2 to go on with Proposal 15, we need to come up with either  
3 different definition or a different way of including 6(A), the  
4 splitting 6(A) or including residents of 6(C), (B) and (A) in  
5 6(A), it's up to the wishes of this Council with the  
6 information that you received. Anybody have a proposal or a  
7 suggestion as how to do this? And you did check into that  
8 Rachel, that residents of 5(A) haven't -- don't have a record  
9 of moose take in 6(A) west, right?

10

11           MS. MASON: I didn't check into that, but that is my  
12 impression that they don't.

13

14           MR. LOHSE: Yeah. The other thing is -- and this is  
15 something I know that wasn't brought up. Yakutat has moose in  
16 the Yakutat area that has come up from the Elsak River in the  
17 other direction. The moose in 6(A) have come down from  
18 Cordova. There's basically -- because of Icy Bay, there's no  
19 way that the moose get back and forth between those two places,  
20 so they are -- they're distinct herds, they're distinct  
21 separate groups of animals. Am I right on that, Robert?

22

23           MR. WILLIS: Correct.

24

25           MR. LOHSE: Okay.

26

27           MR. ROMIG: Was Icy Bay in there?

28

29           MR. LOHSE: Icy Bay, I think is right here.

30

31           MR. KNAUER: Right on the boundary of 6(A) and 5(B).

32

33           MR. LOHSE: And with the ice field there and  
34 everything, there's no transfer of moose from one side to the  
35 other, so we're actually talking about two different groups.  
36 We have the -- the Board has already found a customary and  
37 traditional for moose in Unit 5 by residents of 5(A), right?

38

39           MS. MASON: That's right.

40

41           MR. LOHSE: Okay. So we're only dealing with 6(A) at  
42 this point?

43

44           MS. MASON: Right. And Mr. Chair, looking at Map 3  
45 here, this shows the recorded harvest by UCU and it shows no  
46 harvest by Yakutat residents in Unit 6(A) west.

47

48  
49  
50

MR. LOHSE: Okay.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

0040

1 MR. LOHSE: Yes.

2

3 MR. OSKOLKOFF: I don't have a proposal, but I do have  
4 a suggestion. Given the complexity of the issues, I think that  
5 we are sometimes loading up our plate a little too much on  
6 these proposals by -- especially when we put proposals  
7 together, although, they deal with one area to a certain  
8 extent, in this case we're dealing with multiple villages,  
9 multiple units. We've never dealt with multiple species before  
10 and I'm glad of that, I guess. But I would suggest -- since  
11 I'm not all that familiar with this particular area and this  
12 particular problem, I guess I'm a little behind the curve on  
13 this, but I would suggest that we try and go back to a  
14 situation where we deal with one specific town or village, one  
15 specific species in one unit or subunit, ideally by subunit.  
16 And here we have a lot of conflicting information. And  
17 although you can get through the information to what the  
18 proposal means, which is, believe me, it's been difficult in  
19 this particular case, the argument with regard to each facet of  
20 that proposal, I think gets lost in the overwhelming complexity  
21 of looking at all the different parts. And I also think we  
22 lose a bit of the opportunity for the public to comment on  
23 specific portions and we also lose some of the objectivity on  
24 various facets as we go along. It's just a suggestion.

25

26 I know we're kind of in a cleanup mode here with regard  
27 to some of these and sometimes you have to string proposals  
28 together in order to make some heads or tails of it, but -- but  
29 I'm finding myself significantly confused at various points and  
30 having to get information or clarification.

31

32 MR. LOHSE: I agree with you, Gary. I was looking at  
33 the original proposal, which basically was to find a customary  
34 and traditional C&T determination for residents of Unit 5,  
35 which has been changed to residents of Unit 5(A), for area 5  
36 and 6(A). And the one thing that we have come up with is we  
37 have come up with information that shows that we've -- they've  
38 already gotten a C&T for area 5 and we've shown that they do  
39 have C&T for area 6(A) east. If we would stick with the  
40 original proposal we could just amend this proposal to say that  
41 we agree that residents of Unit 5(A) have a customary and  
42 traditional finding for area 6(A) east for moose and that would  
43 simplify the whole thing.

44

45 MR. OSKOLKOFF: I would agree with that, Mr. Chairman.

46

47 MR. LOHSE: Is there a motion to that effect?

48  
49  
50

MR. ROMIG: So moved.

0041

1 MR. LOHSE: It's been moved by Ben Romig that we agree  
2 that residents of Unit 5(A) have a C&T finding for moose in  
3 Unit 6(A) east. Is there a second?

4  
5 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I'll second that.

6  
7 MR. LOHSE: It's been moved and seconded. Moved by  
8 Ben, seconded by Gary. Discussion. By doing this, Gary, it  
9 looks like what we're doing is we're just going back to the  
10 simplest proposal.....

11  
12 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Um-hum.

13  
14 MR. LOHSE: .....that we can go to, which is their  
15 original proposal.

16  
17 MR. OSKOLKOFF: I appreciate that Mr. Chairman.

18  
19 MR. JOHN: This is the original proposal?

20  
21 MR. LOHSE: Their original proposal was that residents  
22 of Unit 5 have a C&T determination for moose.....

23  
24 MR. JOHN: 5(A).

25  
26 MR. LOHSE: .....well, they've changed it to 5(A) now.

27  
28 MR. JOHN: Oh, okay.

29  
30 MR. LOHSE: And that's already been a finding.

31  
32 MR. JOHN: Um-hum.

33  
34 MR. LOHSE: Have a C&T determination for moose in Unit  
35 5 and Unit 6(A). Our information shows that they have never  
36 taken moose in 6(A) west, but the people of Cordova have taken  
37 moose in 6(A) west, but they have taken moose in 6(A) east.  
38 And so what we'll do is find a C&T determination for 6(A) east.  
39 Since those are subunits that are managed in different ways  
40 also. Any other discussion on it?

41  
42 MR. KOMPCKOFF: Question.

43  
44 MR. LOHSE: Question's been called, all in favor  
45 signify by saying aye.

46  
47 IN UNISON: Aye.

48  
49  
50

MR. LOHSE: All opposed signify by saying nay.

0042

1 (No opposing responses)

2

3 MR. LOHSE: Motion carries. So we agree that residents  
4 of Unit 5(A) have a C&T determination for moose in 6(A) east.  
5 Okay. Then at this point in time we go on to Proposal 19,  
6 right?

7

8 MS. MASON: Right.

9

10 MR. LOHSE: Okay, Rachel, can you give us some  
11 background on that.

12

13 MS. MASON: Okay. I have a separate analysis for the  
14 ceremonial harvest. Proposal 19 was included in the C&T one  
15 because in order to have a -- to honor a request for a  
16 ceremonial moose, you still have to have a C&T previously. So  
17 there has to first be a C&T determination for moose in Unit  
18 6(C), and.....

19

20 MR. LOHSE: And there has been no C&T determination for  
21 moose in 6(C) then?

22

23 MS. MASON: That's right. That's right. And that --  
24 the request for the C&T determination was combined with  
25 Proposal 15 in the analysis which I already read to you.

26

27 MR. LOHSE: Now, is there a proposal with a request for  
28 C&T determination for Unit 6(C)?

29

30 MS. MASON: Yes, there is.

31

32 MR. LOHSE: Okay.

33

34 MS. MASON: That came in.....

35

36 MR. LOHSE: That's Proposal 19?

37

38 MS. MASON: That's right. And I called them Proposals  
39 19(A) and (B), because there are separate analysis.

40

41 MR. LOHSE: Okay.

42

43 MS. MASON: But after the Board deferred the Proposal  
44 19 on the basis that you needed to have a C&T determination  
45 first, the Eyak Tribal Council submitted another proposal which  
46 was a proposal for a C&T determination for moose in addition to  
47 another request for a ceremonial harvest of one bull moose.

48  
49 MR. LOHSE: Okay. So there is a proposal on the board  
50 for a request for C&T finding.....

0043  
1 MS. MASON: That's correct.  
2  
3 MR. LOHSE: .....for moose in Unit 6(C)?  
4  
5 MS. MASON: That's correct.  
6  
7 MR. LOHSE: Okay. And that's Proposal 19?  
8  
9 MS. MASON: Right. So it's my understanding that the  
10 Council would first have to make a recommendation on the C&T  
11 request before making a recommendation on the ceremonial moose  
12 request.  
13  
14 MR. LOHSE: Okay. I've been kind of looking for that  
15 proposal and I haven't come across it, that's what I'm looking  
16 for.  
17  
18 MS. MASON: The proposal is not included in your  
19 materials.  
20  
21 MR. LOHSE: The proposal's not included in our  
22 materials?  
23  
24 MS. EAKON: No.  
25  
26 MR. LOHSE: Okay, wishes of the Council, how should we  
27 proceed? We don't have a proposal sitting in front of us, do  
28 we have a copy of it any place?  
29  
30 MS. EAKON: We have one in the office.  
31  
32 MR. LOHSE: Do you think you have one in the office?  
33  
34 MS. MASON: Actually I have one in the office, but not  
35 here, I don't think.  
36  
37 MR. LOHSE: Suggestions from other members of the  
38 Council to how to proceed from this point in time?  
39  
40 MR. KOMPKOFF: Can I say something?  
41  
42 MR. LOHSE: Yes, Don.  
43  
44 MR. KOMPKOFF: On the potlatch deal down here, the Eyak  
45 ceremony life, at least, 200 years they had -- they been doing  
46 that. And I think that should be enough right there for a  
47 proposal or something. I know that in the past they always had

48 potlatches like that.

49

50 MR. LOHSE: I think what the problem is, Don, is first

0044

1 we have to have a C&T finding for moose in Unit 6.

2

3 MR. KOMPKOFF: Right.

4

5 MR. LOHSE: And decide who has C&T for moose in Unit 6  
6 before we proceed with, you know, the merits of whether or not  
7 a moose can be taken for ceremonial purposes.

8

9 MS. EAKON: Michelle Chivers went to go make copies for  
10 you of the fax that was sent by Robert on this proposal.

11

12 MR. LOHSE: Okay.

13

14 MS. EAKON: Which you received on July 15th this  
15 summer.

16

17 MR. LOHSE: So this is on the agenda, I mean this is  
18 for public comment, this is on the agenda for a proposal on C&T  
19 for moose. I mean we have an agenda item for C&T for moose in  
20 Unit 6 at this point in time.

21

22 MS. MASON: Yes, we do.

23

24 MR. LOHSE: That's been public information and out for  
25 public comment -- not public comment, I mean the public knows  
26 that we're dealing with?

27

28 MS. MASON: Yes. Yes, it is. I should mention the fax  
29 that we received, he had not checked C&T determination. And so  
30 I confirmed that by a call to the tribal -- the Eyak Tribe,  
31 that their request was intended to be a C&T request because it  
32 appeared to be simply a request for a ceremonial moose again.  
33 But their understanding was from the Board, the Board's  
34 deferral of the proposal was on the basis that it had to have a  
35 C&T determination first before it could be considered.

36

37 MR. LOHSE: Okay.

38

39 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

40

41 MR. LOHSE: Yes.

42

43 MR. OSKOLKOFF: And the C&T determination would be for  
44 who, residents of Cordova, residents of 6(C)?

45

46 MS. MASON: The request was for the moose to be  
47 harvested in Unit 6(C), so that for that to take place there

48 would, minimally, have to be a C&T for Unit 6(C), for residents  
49 of 6(C).  
50

0045

1 MR. LOHSE: I think what Gary's asking is, was the  
2 proposal specific in asking for a C&T finding for a group of  
3 people for an area?

4  
5 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Yes.

6  
7 MS. MASON: No, it wasn't.

8  
9 MR. LOHSE: So there was no communities or anything  
10 specifically mentioned or -- you know, we know it's for Unit  
11 6(C).

12  
13 MS. MASON: That was the only specific mention of an  
14 area.

15  
16 MR. LOHSE: That was the only specific mention for Unit  
17 6(C).

18  
19 MR. JOHN: That memorial moose taken, one moose, could  
20 that go straight to the Park there or whoever runs the area  
21 there and the request go straight to them or do we have to have  
22 a C&T determination? Usually a request for a memorial moose  
23 seems like it just goes to the -- ours usually go straight to  
24 the Board, the Federal Board.

25  
26 MS. MASON: That -- it's my understanding that those  
27 requests always presume a positive C&T before there can be a  
28 request for a ceremonial moose.

29  
30 MS. EAKON: What he's saying is, you're referring to  
31 the Batzulnetas.....

32  
33 MR. JOHN: Yes.

34  
35 MS. EAKON: .....request?

36  
37 MR. JOHN: Yes.

38  
39 MS. EAKON: They go through the National Park Service  
40 and then the Board, is that specific to the Park Service, is  
41 that -- Sandy.

42  
43 MR. JOHN: We go through the Park Service and they just  
44 request the Board.

45  
46 MS. EAKON: Sandy Rabinowitch, who is the Staff  
47 Committee member from National Park Service.

48

49 MR. RABINOWITCH: I believe what Fred's referring to is  
50 that Fred or someone else from the tribal consortium comes to

0046

1 the Park Service and we help get the paperwork into the Federal  
2 Board and then it runs through the Federal Board on a normal  
3 process. So we just try to help out with the paperwork to make  
4 it all go smooth.

5

6 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

7

8 MR. LOHSE: Yes.

9

10 MR. OSKOLKOFF: I'm still unclear of exactly what we  
11 would have to find with regard to C&T in order to accomplish  
12 what the end result of the proposal is, and what would be -- if  
13 we are to find that residents of 6(C) have a C&T for moose in  
14 6(C), that's a pretty wide open statement as opposed to if you  
15 were to narrow it down to a specific proposal with reference to  
16 a proposal that had to do with ceremonial moose. These kinds  
17 of things like that. And I need some clarification as to where  
18 we're going with this or where we can go, I guess, with it.

19

20 MR. LOHSE: That's where I'm at, too, is the -- oh,  
21 Bill.

22

23 MR. KNAUER: Maybe I could help out a little bit.  
24 Normally what happens is the first step in a process is to have  
25 the Board make a positive customary and traditional use  
26 determination for a species in an area for a group of users.  
27 For example, moose in Unit 6(C), customary and traditional  
28 users use determination is, we'll say, residents of 6(C). Then  
29 the next step that could occur is the establishment of a season  
30 or a harvest limit under the Federal program. That may or may  
31 not occur. There are places in the State where there is a  
32 positive C&T, but no season or harvest limit for whatever  
33 reason. An adjacent occurrence could be a request by a group  
34 or community for the harvest of an animal or a number of  
35 animals for ceremonial or educational purposes. We regularly  
36 have a request annually from the community of Kake to harvest a  
37 deer for a cultural camp, it's not in regulation, but it's a  
38 special annual request. In Unit 21, there is a -- it is in  
39 regulation there, it's an annual occurrence for the harvest of  
40 a -- I'm not sure, three moose, I think, for Nuchalawoyya and  
41 their stick dance, which is -- there are two events up in that  
42 area. So those are things that can happen.

43

44 And what's happening in your case here is, Rachel is  
45 saying, okay, right now the -- it's no subsistence under the  
46 Federal regulations. So for the Board to grant a request for  
47 the harvest of a ceremonial moose, there would first need to be

48 the establishment of a customary and traditional use  
49 determination. You can do that and you can -- I should say,  
50 you can make the recommendation that the Board do it, and then

0047

1 you can make a recommendation whether or not you believe it's  
2 appropriate for the Board to grant the request for a ceremonial  
3 moose for an organization or a community.

4

5 MR. LOHSE: Question, Bill, on that. Now, if we're  
6 going to -- you answered one of my questions. I was going to  
7 ask you, those other places, there's already a C&T  
8 determination, right?

9

10 MR. KNAUER: That's correct.

11

12 MR. LOHSE: So that's what we're lacking here is the  
13 C&T determination. Now, if we're going to make a C&T  
14 determination, then the big problem, I think that's what Gary's  
15 coming up with, is who are we making it for? Are we doing like  
16 what happened with 5(A) where we're making a C&T determination  
17 for people in Unit 6(C) for moose in 6(C) and leaving other  
18 people out that have -- because we don't have any data on it,  
19 leaving other people out that also should have a C&T in 6(C)?  
20 There's no directive proposal in front of us that says,  
21 residents of Unit 6(C) have a C&T determination for moose in  
22 6(C), 6(C), 6(A) or something like that. You know, so we would  
23 have to come up with a proposal ourselves. I mean that's  
24 basically where we're at isn't it?

25

26 MR. KNAUER: Yes.

27

28 MR. LOHSE: And we'd have to have something to base  
29 that proposal on and I'm kind of like Gary, I don't know where  
30 to start on something like that.

31

32 MR. KNAUER: One thing to always remember is that the  
33 determinations that are made can be changed at later dates by  
34 the Board, additions or subtractions based upon more  
35 information. So if in this case, this Council were to  
36 recommend and the Board adopt a recommendation for residents of  
37 6(C) having C&T for moose in Unit 6(C) and then at a later  
38 point in time we'll say the residents of 12 or 11 came down and  
39 said, well, you know, here's all sorts of data that show our  
40 traditional oral history that shows that we have harvested in  
41 that area also and we think we should be included there, the  
42 Board could revise the C&T determination at a later time. So  
43 it's not a cast in stone type thing.

44

45 MS. DETWILER: Can I make an additional comment on  
46 that. If you wanted to stick to the specifics of what the  
47 proposal is asking for, what you could do is just focus your

48 recommendation on C&T just on the community of Cordova which is  
49 where the Eyak Tribe is based. And then, you know, if you  
50 wanted to in your rationale for recommending whatever you

0048

1 recommend on a C&T determination, you could also say that this  
2 doesn't mean that the Council believes that other communities  
3 don't have C&T, we were just -- the Council was just focusing  
4 on Cordova for the purposes of this proposal. So it's not  
5 foreclosing future opportunities, as Bill suggested, for other  
6 communities to be recognized as having C&T.

7  
8 MR. LOHSE: See that's where I kind of got lost because  
9 I know that we -- that was one of our big concerns with 5(A)  
10 getting a C&T for Unit 6(A), and not having a C&T for Unit 6 in  
11 Unit 6(A), because that would have foreclosed -- that would  
12 have given, you know, that basically would have cutout the  
13 people in 6.

14  
15 If you don't mind for a second, I just realized I'm  
16 talking to people I haven't introduced to the rest of you. I'd  
17 like to take just a short break right now to introduce some  
18 people that we have here that weren't here for the  
19 introduction. And I see another person that came in, too,  
20 since that time. So Tom Boyd working for.....

21  
22 MR. BOYD: Fish and Wildlife Service.

23  
24 MR. LOHSE: .....Fish and Wildlife Service. Rosa  
25 Meehan.

26  
27 MS. MEEHAN: Fish and Wildlife Service.

28  
29 MR. LOHSE: Fish and Wildlife Service. Sue Detwiler.

30  
31 MS. DETWILER: Fish and Wildlife Service.

32  
33 MR. LOHSE: Fish and Wildlife Service. Hollis  
34 Twitchell.

35  
36 MR. TWITCHELL: With Denali National Park.

37  
38 MR. LOHSE: Tony Booth.

39  
40 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: He had to leave.

41  
42 MR. LOHSE: He had to leave, okay. Bob Gerhard.

43  
44 MR. GERHARD: With the National Park Service.

45  
46 MR. LOHSE: The National Park Service. Is Gloria here?  
47 No, I don't see Gloria Stickwan, she's evidently gone right

48 now. And.....

49

50 MR. SUMMERS: Clarence Summers, National Park Service.

0049

1 MR. LOHSE: .....Clarence Summers. I'm sorry, I didn't  
2 take the time when we first came back but I realized I was just  
3 talking to somebody and the rest of you didn't know who they  
4 were. Thank you, Sue. Okay, back to the Council.

5  
6 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

7  
8 MR. LOHSE: Yes, Gary.

9  
10 MR. OSKOLKOFF: I need my memory refreshed. Did we  
11 have a discussion, perhaps even a number of years ago with  
12 regard to C&T determination for moose in 6(C)? Have we gone  
13 through this issue at one point? I thought we had. Because I  
14 know I had heard the discussion that you had given with regard  
15 to the transplanting of moose and what not. And I don't know  
16 if that was in view of a different situation or if we had  
17 actually discussed 6(C) at one point.

18  
19 MS. EAKON: No. Your past C&T determinations which  
20 you're going to talk about later on today focus on the Kenai  
21 Peninsula. This particular request did appear in the proposal  
22 book from last year and you -- that's probably how come you  
23 remember it.

24  
25 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Okay, thank you Helga. Mr. Chairman,  
26 with regard to the Staff work that was done and there was a  
27 conclusion -- preliminary conclusion, I guess to support the  
28 harvest of one bull.....

29  
30 MS. MASON: That analysis has not yet been presented.  
31 That's in response to request for the harvest of the ceremonial  
32 moose.

33  
34 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Um-hum.

35  
36 MS. MASON: But prior to that then there has to be a  
37 C&T determination.

38  
39 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Well, my question was, was there work,  
40 Staff analysis, done and is there preliminary conclusion with  
41 regard to the C&T determination?

42  
43 MS. MASON: Yes, there was. That was included in the  
44 draft Staff analysis that combined Proposals 15 and 19. And  
45 that was the one that, it had a broad analysis of all of Unit  
46 6, and it's my understanding that now the Council is separating  
47 this issue from the one that was in Proposal 15.

48

49 MR. LOHSE: Yeah, this is -- Proposal 15 dealt with  
50 6(A) Yakutat and Cordova in 6(A).

0050

1 MS. MASON: Um-hum.

2

3 MR. LOHSE: And we dealt with the Yakutat portion.  
4 What we haven't dealt with up to this point in time is C&T for  
5 anything in 6 other than 6(A).....

6

7 MS. MASON: Yeah.

8

9 MR. LOHSE: .....east which dealt with Yakutat.

10

11 MS. MASON: Right.

12

13 MR. LOHSE: I guess part of my hesitation in dealing  
14 with it is number one, there's not something directly sitting  
15 in front of me to address directly. And the other is just the  
16 fact that again, like we've talked about in the past, we're  
17 dealing with a community species that was imported and has only  
18 been there for basically 45 years now and how to deal with that  
19 on a C&T determination. One of the things that's been done in  
20 the past it's been managed so much for local use, it's  
21 basically a local, you know, a local type thing that it's hard  
22 to think of it like a C&T type thing because it has been  
23 managed, for Cordova, I hate to say it, but that's a fact.  
24 We've managed the moose in 6(A), (B) and (C) for Cordova, you  
25 know.

26

27 And so that's -- without a direct proposal in front of  
28 us to, you know, what I'd like to see is I'd like to see a  
29 proposal that says, you know, a C&T finding for residents of  
30 such and such such and such in such and such, you know. Then  
31 we could analyze it and we could deal with it on the basis of  
32 the merits of that proposal. Basically what we're asked to do  
33 right now is to decide whether there's a C&T in Unit 6 and  
34 who's in that C&T for Unit 6 and who's not in that C&T for Unit  
35 6. I saw a hand raised back there, was there.....

36

37 MR. CARPENTER: I'll pass until after your decision on  
38 C&T.

39

40 MR. LOHSE: You know, there was -- Helga.

41

42 MS. EAKON: Mr. Chair, except that at your February  
43 meeting speaking directly to Proposal 19, Unit 6(C) moose  
44 permit for ceremonial harvest, in light of the explanation that  
45 a positive C&T determination would be required in order for the  
46 Federal Subsistence Board to provide the requested hunt. The  
47 Regional Council concurred in the Staff recommendation that

48 actinon this proposal and on the appropriate C&T determination  
49 be deferred until August 1997. The Regional Council took note  
50 that the proponents had been contacted and agreed to this

0051

1 delay.

2

3 I bring this out only because the proponent has the  
4 expectation that the Federal Subsistence Board is going to act  
5 on this at a meeting later on this month. And that follows  
6 Regional Council recommendation, please note, Page 3 of your  
7 minutes under Tab C.

8

9 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

10

11 MR. LOHSE: Yes, Gary.

12

13 MR. OSKOLKOFF: In going back on the Staff analysis is,  
14 we have essentially the last -- second to the last sentence, I  
15 guess, it says the preliminary conclusions in Unit 6(A), Unit  
16 6(B), Unit 6(C) give a positive customary and traditional  
17 determination to all residents of 6(A), 6(B), 6(C). So the  
18 analysis or the justification for doing what we need to do with  
19 regard to customary and traditional use has been laid out.....

20

21 MR. LOHSE: Would you like to make a motion to that  
22 effect.

23

24 MR. OSKOLKOFF: .....by the Staff to get us to that  
25 point. Let me go ahead and make a motion to adopt that portion  
26 of the conclusion of the Staff, which says, Unit 6(A) west,  
27 Unit 6(B) and Unit 6(C) give a positive customary and  
28 traditional determination to all residents of Unit 6(A), 6(B)  
29 and 6(C).

30

31 MR. LOHSE: Okay, there's a motion on the floor to give  
32 in Unit 6(A), (B) and (C) to give a positive C&T finding to  
33 residents of Units 6(A), (B) and (C), right?

34

35 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Yes.

36

37 MR. LOHSE: Is that a pretty good summary?

38

39 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Yes.

40

41 MR. LOHSE: Okay. There's a motion on the floor, is  
42 there a second?

43

44 MR. JOHN: Second.

45

46 MR. LOHSE: It's been seconded by Fred John, Jr.  
47 Discussion.

48  
49  
50

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

0052

1 MR. LOHSE: Yes, Gary.

2

3 MR. OSKOLKOFF: I'm still unclear as to the  
4 justification, given the transplant population and the criteria  
5 that we had applied in the past with regard to C&T is -- maybe  
6 you could enlighten me a little bit more. I know you've gone  
7 over it and maybe I've just not quite grasped it yet, but.....

8

9 MS. MASON: Well, basically moose are not native to any  
10 of these areas. But the basis of the justification is that the  
11 indigenous residents of the area had been familiar since  
12 prehistoric times and had traded with moose with people of the  
13 Interior so that as -- and Native and non-Native residents  
14 alike have -- as they have learned to use moose, they've used  
15 it in ways that are similar to other species that were already  
16 present in the area.

17

18 MR. LOHSE: Robert, can I ask you a question?

19

20 MR. WILLIS: Sure.

21

22 MR. LOHSE: If we find for a C&T determination for  
23 moose in Unit 6, will that mean that the Federal government  
24 will have to take over management of moose on Federal property  
25 in Unit 6(C), 6(B) and 6(A) and come up with separate seasons  
26 than the ones that we've worked out so that it works out for  
27 the local population?

28

29 MR. WILLIS: Only if there's a request for them to  
30 establish a special season and harvest limit. As Bill stated  
31 earlier, the fact that you have a C&T doesn't require the  
32 establishment of a season and a harvest limit. In areas where  
33 that's the case, people who have requested the C&T will usually  
34 come forward with a requested regulation if they feel that  
35 there's a need for one. It isn't automatic.

36

37 MR. LOHSE: It's just a possibility?

38

39 MR. WILLIS: Correct.

40

41 MR. JOHN: This is just a request for C&T  
42 determination, right?

43

44 MR. LOHSE: Right.

45

46 MR. JOHN: Okay.

47

48 MR. LOHSE: Any other discussion?

49

50 MR. ROMIG: Mr. Chairman, I'd probably be not inclined

0053

1 to vote for C&T for an animal that was introduced like that  
2 only 45 years ago. I'd be voting against the motion.

3

4 MR. LOHSE: Fred, did you have a comment?

5

6 MR. JOHN: There have been a lot of arguments about  
7 what, to me, is C&T, how long it is, you know, is it 10,000  
8 years. Non-Native to Natives, it's one generation or you know,  
9 on down. And I really don't know. What I got is that they're  
10 -- what I got is that it's traditional and customary, you know,  
11 for the people in Cordova right now, that area, is moose a  
12 traditiona -- customary, I think for the Native people, is it?

13

14 MR. LOHSE: Well, in answer to your question on that,  
15 Fred, I would say for the community of Cordova, Native and non-  
16 Native, moose is very much a part of our community's makeup  
17 right now. I was going to tell you guys a little story of how  
18 it works in Cordova. The permits are very much desired, but  
19 they're also very much shared. If I get a permit and you're  
20 driving out the road and you see a moose, you head for the  
21 nearest telephone to call somebody that you know that's got a  
22 permit to go get the moose. And this gives rise to funny  
23 things that happen. Because I know the last time we had a  
24 permit, we had people cross a moose out the road, they were  
25 calling all over to find somebody with a permit to go get that  
26 moose and they happened to get us. Well, this fall, some  
27 friends of ours had guests out the road, actually non-meating  
28 guests from a different country and they were out the road and  
29 they spotted this nice big bull moose and they were all  
30 standing there with the binoculars looking at this big bull  
31 moose and up pulls a car from Cordova and out jumps the people  
32 and they said, do any of you people have a permit and they  
33 said, no, no, we don't have a permit, and so instantly out come  
34 a rifle and bang, the moose goes down right in front of -- this  
35 is how it's done in Cordova.

36

37 I mean it's very much a part of the community and  
38 that's, I guess, the part that's -- that's the part that, to  
39 me, as I hesitate, like Ben, because I see we've worked out a  
40 method in our community to keep the majority of those moose for  
41 local consumption through use with the Fish and Game, and I  
42 kind of hate to put the opportunity for another set of  
43 regulations on top of it which may jeopardize this community  
44 sharing that we currently have. Moose in Cordova is a very  
45 shared thing. It's -- the only moose that aren't shared are  
46 moose that are taken by somebody outside of Cordova that takes  
47 them out of town. I mean a moose that's taken in Cordova is

48 normally -- when you got a permit, you've got other people  
49 helping you and you got other people to give it to. So that's  
50 my hesitation on finding a C&T because we could add one more

0054

1 level of regulations to it that I'm kind of afraid of because  
2 we've worked so hard to get where we're at. But, yes, moose is  
3 very much a part of the community and it's very much a part of  
4 the community, Native and non-Native in Cordova. In fact,  
5 there's very little distinction between it, I mean it's a  
6 shared type thing right across those boundaries.

7  
8 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

9  
10 MR. LOHSE: Gary.

11  
12 MR. OSKOLKOFF: In light of what you just said, I'm  
13 actually considering voting for the proposal, given the fact  
14 that it is such a part of the community. I agree with you. It  
15 seems as though Cordova, perhaps, is one of those ideal places  
16 where things have worked out that there's enough of a balance  
17 between the resource and the people and the people have  
18 cooperated in a way to allow this to happen and I like to see  
19 those kind of things continue because I grew up in a world that  
20 was like that. Unfortunately, my world has changed quite a bit  
21 and there's quite a bit more competition.

22  
23 On the other hand, I'm inclined to vote for it because  
24 of a couple of factors. One is that the introduction was a  
25 number of years ago which is similar to the number of years  
26 that we described would be enough time for generation to pass  
27 to generation, information and custom and tradition, if you  
28 will, albeit not, perhaps, 10,000 year old tradition, it has  
29 become part of family life. And the other reason is, is that  
30 I'm always looking for concrete evidence as to why I shouldn't.  
31 And lacking that evidence, I'm more inclined to be inclusive.  
32 And therefore, I kind of find myself right on the cusp here,  
33 and when I end up in that situation, I always try and fall on  
34 the side of the people. What would be most advantageous to  
35 those people. This is possibly one of those scenarios, but my  
36 thinking hadn't been completed on this, but I wanted to share  
37 my logic so far.

38  
39 MR. LOHSE: Thank you, Gary. And I can understand your  
40 position because there's no guarantee life in Cordova will  
41 always stay the way it is either. I mean there's -- you have  
42 the possibility of roads and influxes of people and things like  
43 that, too. And I can see a change in your area. Any other  
44 discussion? Shall we call for the question if there's no  
45 further discussion?

46  
47 MR. JOHN: Question.

48  
49 MR. LOHSE: Okay. We're on Proposal 19, I guess we'll  
50 call it 19(A) because it's the first part. It's on finding a

0055

1 C&T determination for Units 6(A), (B) and (C) for residents of  
2 Units 6(A), (B) and (C). Question's been called, all in favor  
3 signify by saying aye.

4

5 IN UNISON: Aye.

6

7 MR. LOHSE: All opposed signify by saying nay.

8

9 MR. ROMIG: Nay.

10

11 MR. LOHSE: And I'm going to abstain on this one  
12 because I have mixed feelings on it. I just -- I hate to see  
13 it happen and at the same time I can recognize the changes that  
14 Gary is talking about.

15

16 MS. EAKON: For the record, may I take a roll call, Mr.  
17 Chair?

18

19 MS. EAKON: Gary O.

20

21 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Aye.

22

23 MS. EAKON: Fred.

24

25 MR. JOHN: Aye.

26

27 MS. EAKON: Ralph.

28

29 MR. LOHSE: I'll abstain.

30

31 MS. EAKON: Ben.

32

33 MR. ROMIG: Nay.

34

35 MS. EAKON: Don.

36

37 MR. KOMPKOFF: Abstain.

38

39 MS. EAKON: Abstain?

40

41 MR. KOMPKOFF: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

42

43 MS. EAKON: Gilbert.

44

45 MR. DEMENTI: Aye.

46

47 MS. EAKON: Yes. Three yes's, two abstains and one

48 nay.

49

50 MR. LOHSE: Motion carries.

0056

1 MS. EAKON: I do have a message that Roy's going to be  
2 here shortly, Mr. Chair.

3

4 MR. LOHSE: Wonderful. Now, we go on to Proposal  
5 19(B), which is a request for a potlatch moose for ceremonial  
6 moose.

7

8 MS. EAKON: Correction. You did not have a majority.

9

10 MR. LOHSE: Oh, we did not have a majority.

11

12 MS. EAKON: Three yes's does not make a majority out of  
13 six present because two abstained and there was one nay.

14

15 MR. LOHSE: Okay, then we have no C&T.

16

17 MS. EAKON: There is no C&T.

18

19 MR. LOHSE: Okay.

20

21 MR. KOMPKOFF: I didn't understand the vote, could I --  
22 my -- I wanted to vote for -- for the C&T.

23

24 MS. EAKON: You wanted to vote for the.....

25

26 MR. KOMPKOFF: Yes.

27

28 MS. EAKON: This motion, Regional Council, is to find  
29 for positive C&T finding for moose in 6(A), (B), (C) for the  
30 rural residents of 6(A), (B), (C), correct?

31

32 MR. LOHSE: Correct.

33

34 MS. EAKON: That's what you're voting on?

35

36 MR. LOHSE: Right.

37

38 MR. KOMPKOFF: Right. And I want to vote on that. I  
39 was wanting to put (D) on there, too, because we -- I hunt  
40 moose over there, too.

41

42 MS. EAKON: So what do we do?

43

44 MR. LOHSE: We could make another motion. At this  
45 point in time Don can make another motion to do the same thing  
46 and we can vote on it again.

47

48 MS. EAKON: Okay.

49

50 MR. KOMPKOFF: Yeah, I would like to have Unit 6(D)

0057

1 included in that motion.

2

3 MR. LOHSE: Okay. So Don, if I understand right, what  
4 you would like is a positive C&T determination for moose in  
5 6(A), (B) and (C) for rural residents of 6(A), (B), (C) and  
6 (D)?

7

8 MR. KOMPKOFF: Right.

9

10 MR. LOHSE: Okay, is there a second to Don's motion?

11

12 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Could you clarify that again for me,  
13 Mr. Chairman?

14

15 MR. LOHSE: Don would like to make the motion to find a  
16 positive C&T determination for area 6(A), (B), and (C) for  
17 rural residents of Units 6(A), (B), (C) and (D).

18

19 MR. OSKOLKOFF: And (D), oh, I see.

20

21 MR. LOHSE: And (D). See we haven't been including (D)  
22 in there because we were looking at a different moose or --  
23 Rachel, correct me if I'm wrong, in Unit 6(D), there's a record  
24 of people from Unit 6(C) taking moose in Unit 6(D), too?

25

26 MS. MASON: As I understand it, there area very few, if  
27 any, moose in 6(D).

28

29 MR. LOHSE: Right.

30

31 MS. MASON: So I'm not aware of any record of people  
32 from 6(C) harvesting moose in Unit 6(D).

33

34 MR. LOHSE: Okay, I thought there had been, that that  
35 had taken place. Okay. Yeah, here it says, right here on Table  
36 7, 6(D) 1983 to 1996, number percent taken by Cordova  
37 residents, six percent.

38

39 MS. MASON: Oh, one moose.....

40

41 MR. LOHSE: Yeah, out of 18.

42

43 MS. MASON: .....was taken.

44

45 MR. LOHSE: And we have a C&T finding for 6(D); do we  
46 have a C&T finding for 6(D) at all?

47

48  
49  
50

MR. JOHN: No.

MS. MASON: No subsistence.

0058

1 MS. EAKON: It's a no subsistence.

2

3 MR. LOHSE: Okay, it's no subsistence in 6(D) period,  
4 okay. And yet that Kings Bay hunt is a subsistence hunt and  
5 part of that takes place in 6(D), doesn't it?

6

7 MS. MASON: The ruling of the Board was for Unit 7  
8 only.

9

10 MS. EAKON: That's in Unit 7.

11

12 MR. KNAUER: Unit 7 only, correct.

13

14 MR. LOHSE: It's a Unit 7 only hunt, okay. Okay, so  
15 what we're asking for is -- what the motion is then is to find  
16 a positive C&T for Unit 6(A), (B) and (C) by the rural  
17 residents of Unit 6(A), (B), (C) and (D). So that includes  
18 Chenega, Tatitlek, Whittier, Cordova, Valdez is not classed as  
19 a rural community. I wonder if we have any records of.....

20

21 MR. JOHN: That's what I want to find out.

22

23 MR. LOHSE: Yeah. Fred, you can ask the question  
24 because I think you were going to ask the same question I was  
25 going to ask.

26

27 MR. JOHN: Yeah. You got any documents or records from  
28 6(D), hunting local moose in Cordova?

29

30 MS. MASON: I don't know the answer to that right  
31 offhand. I believe that they're very low and if you give me a  
32 few minutes, I can look through my notes and see if I have any  
33 information on that.

34

35 MR. LOHSE: Personally, I'm pretty sure that we've got  
36 -- that we can find records of Chenega or Tatitlek.

37

38 MS. MASON: Harvest?

39

40 MR. LOHSE: But the question is Whittier, whether  
41 Whittier has taken moose in 6(B), (C) and (A), and whether we  
42 want to include -- if we make a broad stroke and we say 6(D),  
43 we're including the community of Whittier, you know.

44

45 MR. JOHN: Um-hum.

46

47 MR. LOHSE: I mean that's what happens when we start

48 making -- like Gary was saying, when we start making broader  
49 and broader proposals, we start.....  
50

0059

1 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman, and to speak on that  
2 issue, I was pretty comfortable with 6(A), (B) and (C) with my  
3 understanding of the -- you know, the fact that we're down to a  
4 minimal amount of communities with regard to that, 6(D). I  
5 would like to include the majority of communities involved  
6 there, but I am very concerned with the process that we're  
7 using at this point as opposed to the process that we started  
8 with, which was individual communities and we had to base  
9 everything on communities and we couldn't use areas in between  
10 communities which are far more rural by anybody's standard and  
11 now all of a sudden, we're back to where we're taking this wide  
12 sweeping areas all at the same time. And I know it's more  
13 work, certainly to deal with it on one after another, but on  
14 the other hand, we seem to be kind of mired down in trying to  
15 deal with all the many facets of a much larger question.

16  
17 MR. JOHN: Is there a proposal from Tatitlek or  
18 Chenega?

19  
20 MR. LOHSE: Not at this point in time, is there?

21  
22 MR. KOMPKOFF: No.

23  
24 MR. LOHSE: No, there's no proposal from Tatitlek or  
25 Chenega. They could always put a proposal in in the future,  
26 that's one thing that could happen.

27  
28 MR. JOHN: Like Gary said, I don't want to go -- on  
29 this, that's everybody in one group there until I see, you  
30 know, a proposal in front of me.

31  
32 MR. LOHSE: Then is there a second for Don's --  
33 otherwise it dies for lack of a second?

34  
35 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Well, I'll second it because I think we  
36 need to discuss this.....

37  
38 MR. LOHSE: Okay.

39  
40 MR. OSKOLKOFF: .....to get into the process again, to  
41 track that down. And perhaps what we need to do here is bust  
42 this overall proposal into smaller fractions and deal with them  
43 on an individual basis. I know maybe we're not prepared to do  
44 that right now, but I'm just wondering if that's a possibility,  
45 is that something we could do?

46  
47 MR. LOHSE: I'm sure it's something we could do. It's

48 just a matter of putting a proposal on the -- you know, put a  
49 proposal that answers this question on the table and voting on  
50 it. I just noticed what time it is, maybe it's something that

0060

1 we can think about over lunch break and do after lunch.

2

3 At that point in time Roy will be here.

4

5 MR. JOHN: You know.....

6

7 MR. LOHSE: Fred.

8

9 MR. JOHN: .....I kind of have an idea that Tatitlek,  
10 Chenega, you know, they do hunt in -- they -- I mean like in  
11 our area we go so far away to hunt, too. But I'd like to see  
12 -- I mean a proposal in front of me before I really say yes,  
13 you know, just something to bring it right up. I'd like to see  
14 a solid proposal in front of me.

15

16 MR. LOHSE: Okay. We have a motion on the table at  
17 this point in time. I don't know if we should leave with the  
18 motion on the table and come back to it after lunch or if we  
19 should handle it and then go to lunch.

20

21 MR. JOHN: I think we should have more discussion on  
22 this.

23

24 MR. LOHSE: Can we leave a motion on the table and  
25 recess for lunch?

26

27 MR. KNAUER: Yes.

28

29 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Certainly.

30

31 MR. LOHSE: Okay. In that case, that's exactly what  
32 we'll do. We will recess until 1:15, at which time we have a  
33 motion on the table. And then the next one after this is 19(B)  
34 and then we get on to the 15 area.

35

36 (Off record)

37 (On record)

38

39 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Are we ready? I want to apologize for  
40 not being here this morning, I completely forgot about this  
41 meeting and I was busy doing what I'm doing every day until I  
42 was told I was supposed to be at the meeting this morning.

43

44 We're on old business, Item B, Proposal 19. Rachel.

45

46 MS. MASON: When we broke for lunch, Mr. Chairman,  
47 there was a motion on the table.

48  
49  
50

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yes, Don.

0061

1 MR. KOMPKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to withdraw that  
2 motion that I made before lunch and bring it up at the later  
3 whenever the proposals are. But I'd like to do it whenever we  
4 get ready.

5  
6 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, the motion is withdrawn, if there  
7 is no objections? Hearing no objections, the motion is  
8 withdrawn. Then we are open to any other motions, is that  
9 what.....

10  
11 MR. KOMPKOFF: Do I have to make a motion to stick with  
12 the first.....

13  
14 CHAIRMAN EWAN: I don't know what happened before so I  
15 can't -- go ahead, Ralph.

16  
17 MR. LOHSE: We're trying to find a C&T determination  
18 for Unit 9 so that's what's 19(A).

19  
20 CHAIRMAN EWAN: He wants to know whether he can make a  
21 motion again?

22  
23 MR. LOHSE: Yeah, he can make a motion, yeah.

24  
25 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. It's proper for you to make  
26 another motion, yes. Do you want to make another?

27  
28 MR. DEMENTI: I make a motion we stick with our --  
29 well, how do you -- Unit 6(A), (B) and (C).

30  
31 MR. LOHSE: Okay, find a C&T determination for 6(A),  
32 (B) and (C).

33  
34 MR. DEMENTI: Right.

35  
36 MR. LOHSE: For 6(A), (B) and (C)?

37  
38 MR. DEMENTI: For 6(A), (B) and (C).

39  
40 MS. EAKON: The motion reads, Gilbert Dementi moves  
41 that the Regional Council make a positive C&T finding for moose  
42 in Unit 6(A), 6(B), 6(D) (sic) for rural residents of 6(A),  
43 6(B), 6(C), right?

44  
45 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Second.

46  
47 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Motion's seconded, further discussion

48 on the motion?

49

50 MR. JOHN: Question.

0062

1 MR. LOHSE: So we're revisiting the same motion, right?

2

3 MS. EAKON: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

4

5 MR. LOHSE: And that's legal, right?

6

7 MS. EAKON: You can, yeah.

8

9 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Take a vote on the motion. Any  
10 comments from anybody? I'm coming in kind of cold here, I  
11 don't know what discussions took place before but if you have  
12 already discussed this, sorry. Are you ready to vote?

13

14 MR. LOHSE: We discussed this and the motion failed  
15 before. We had a second motion on the floor that was  
16 withdrawn. And so this is the original motion that we had  
17 before. So essentially it's being brought up for  
18 reconsideration then, is that what you do?

19

20 MS. EAKON: Yes.

21

22 MR. LOHSE: I mean that's basically what it is, it's  
23 the same motion being brought up for reconsideration.

24

25 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Could we reword it to say that?

26

27 MS. EAKON: Okay. Gilbert Dementi moved to reconsider  
28 the original motion which would grant a positive -- the  
29 Regional Council recommendation for a positive C&T finding for  
30 moose in Unit 6(A), (B), (C) for rural residents of 6(A), (B)  
31 and (C).

32

33 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, I understand what it is now. If  
34 there's no further discussion on the motion, all in favor of  
35 this motion say aye.

36

37 IN UNISON: Aye.

38

39 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Opposed by the same sign.

40

41 MR. LOHSE: Aye.

42

43 MR. ROMIG: Aye.

44

45 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Could we have hands. All in favor of  
46 the motion raise your right hand.

47

48 MR. JOHN: (Complies)  
49 MR. OSKOLKOFF: (Complies)  
50

0063

1 CHAIRMAN EWAN: (Complies)

2  
3 MR. KOMPKOFF: (Complies)

4  
5 MR. DEMENTI: (Complies)

6  
7 CHAIRMAN EWAN: There's five. All opposed same sign.

8  
9 MR. ROMIG: (Complies)

10  
11 MR. LOHSE: (Complies)

12  
13 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Five to two, the motion carries. The  
14 proposal is back on the floor, I guess.

15  
16 MR. LOHSE: No, that was passed.

17  
18 MR. JOHN: That passed.

19  
20 CHAIRMAN EWAN: It's passed.

21  
22 MR. LOHSE: That one passed, yeah.

23  
24 CHAIRMAN EWAN: It passes this, I thought we  
25 reconsidered. Okay. Then we'll go to item.....

26  
27 MR. LOHSE: 19(B).

28  
29 MS. EAKON: 19(B).

30  
31 CHAIRMAN EWAN: .....19(B), Rachel.

32  
33 MS. MASON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Proposal 19(B)  
34 was submitted by the Eyak Tribal Council and it would allow the  
35 Native village of Eyak to take one bull moose from Unit 6(C)  
36 for a memorial potlatch to be held in December 1997 or January  
37 1998.

38  
39 I'm not sure if Mr. Ewan has a copy of this proposal.  
40 This was passed out at the last minute to the Council members.

41  
42 CHAIRMAN EWAN: I believe do have it, yes. Okay.

43  
44 MS. MASON: By the action that was just taken by the --  
45 well, the Regional Council, by the last action recommended a  
46 positive C&T for moose in Units 6(A), 6(B) and 6(C). And that  
47 permits a ceremonial moose to be harvested in Unit 6(C). Just

48 to review what we've already gone over, in the spring of '97,  
49 the Federal Subsistence Board deferred this proposal until a  
50 request for a C&T for moose in Unit 6(C) could be brought

0064

1 before the Board. So that's what we just did. And also as  
2 mentioned in the context of the C&T moose is not a species that  
3 was native to the Copper River Delta area. They were  
4 introduced to the area between 1949 and 1959, however, since  
5 the introduction of moose in their area, Eyaks and others  
6 living in Unit 6(C) have harvested and used moose in ways that  
7 are comparable to the harvest and use of other animals.

8  
9 The Eyaks were one of several groups of Alaska Natives  
10 living in the Copper River Delta area and the Pacific Gulf  
11 Coast in historic and prehistoric times. As I mentioned  
12 before, Tlingits, Chugach and Athabascans also inhabit this  
13 area. And prior to European contact, there was extensive  
14 contact between these groups including trade and intermarriage.  
15 Moose was not among the animals that were traditionally  
16 harvested by the Eyaks, but they were familiar with this highly  
17 desirable resource through trade and contacts with neighboring  
18 Athabascans. The potlatch as a ceremony was also adopted by  
19 the Eyaks as a result of contacts with other groups,  
20 particularly the Tlingits. There are only a handful of Eyaks  
21 left at this time, mostly living in Cordova. And the Native  
22 village of Eyak is making efforts to revitalize the culture  
23 through the memorial potlatch and other means. They are  
24 working to promote pride and identity among Eyaks, especially  
25 the young people. The harvest of one moose for ceremonial  
26 purposes is intended to be instruction to youth and to permit  
27 the continuation of the Tribe's cultural traditions.

28  
29 The moose population in Unit 6(C) is relatively staple.  
30 In 1996 an aerial census revealed a population of 259 animals  
31 and the management objective for this subunit is to increase  
32 the population to 400 animals. However, the taking of one  
33 additional bull moose for ceremonial purposes should not  
34 significantly impact moose habitat or population. So the  
35 preliminary conclusion was to support the harvest of one bull  
36 moose for the memorial potlatch. That concludes the summary.

37  
38 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, are there any questions or  
39 comments for Rachel? If not, is there somebody else -- Helga.

40  
41 MR. KOMPKOFF: Could the thing say yearly on there, on  
42 the proposal?

43  
44 MS. MASON: I don't know that we have done that. In  
45 other ceremonial requests, they have been submitted each year  
46 on a yearly basis. I'm looking toward Bill or Sue to.....

47

48           MR. KNAUER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Normally the requests  
49 are submitted annually. There are two, however, in the  
50 Interior that are very large, well established ceremonies that

0065

1 actually have been put in regulation. But the most common  
2 practice has been for the community or organization to submit  
3 their request annually.

4  
5 CHAIRMAN EWAN: I have a question about the ceremony.  
6 I support this proposal, but I think I'd like to be clear on  
7 what is memorial potlatch, I mean how is it -- I know that I'm  
8 familiar with one in our area, the Athabascan in the Copper  
9 River area, but I want to know if it's similar to what we have  
10 up in our area.

11  
12 MS. MASON: I can't speak for the proponent of this  
13 request. It mentioned a memorial potlatch, so I presume that  
14 it is a potlatch in memory of those who have died, but I don't  
15 know the specifics of that custom.

16  
17 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Fred.

18  
19 MR. JOHN: I talked to one of the persons on there  
20 about this and he said it's just something that was revitalized  
21 a few years back and that they want to continue with it. It's  
22 part of their -- they're going to have it yearly and it's part  
23 of their -- that they had it before and they never had it for a  
24 long time and they're going to call it a memorial potlatch, but  
25 it's a once a year deal where they get together to teach their  
26 children, you know, to have pride in their culture just like  
27 the other places that they have.

28  
29 MS. MASON: Um-hum.

30  
31 MR. JOHN: And that's what he told me, it's being  
32 revitalized and they want to have it yearly. It's -- I don't  
33 think it's a memorial potlatch, but it's something like that,  
34 something similar to culture pride and stuff like that.

35  
36 MS. MASON: Um-hum.

37  
38 MR. JOHN: That's what I kind of got.

39  
40 CHAIRMAN EWAN: If there's no other comments or  
41 questions. We'll go on to the public comments, is that the  
42 process right now?

43  
44 MS. EAKON: Yes.

45  
46 CHAIRMAN EWAN: I guess we have somebody in the  
47 audience then that wants to speak. Identify yourself for the

48 record.

49

50 MR. CARPENTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name's Tom

0066

1 Carpenter, I'm representing the Copper River/Prince William  
2 Sound Advisory Committee based in Cordova. I testified  
3 earlier. I just wanted to reiterate what I said earlier, you  
4 know, for your behalf. The main thing that we want to stress  
5 here is that this species, although you have now for a positive  
6 finding for C&T, that they aren't an indigenous species to this  
7 area. The species was introduced as you might be well aware as  
8 a community effort in the early '50s. And the main thing that  
9 we're trying to stress is that it was a community effort, it  
10 wasn't initiated by a sole entity or specific group of people  
11 within the community of Cordova.

12  
13 We feel that if a special permit is given to a specific  
14 group of people within the community of Cordova, that all this  
15 is going to do is divide the community. There's going to be --  
16 the working relationship between the different groups in the  
17 community will be diminished. And we feel this will have a  
18 negative impact on Cordova as a whole.

19  
20 The one other thing that I wanted to state is that the  
21 -- I believe the Native village of Eyak and the Eyak  
22 Corporation which are two different groups, they are both --  
23 they both have the opportunity to existing laws, if I'm not  
24 mistaken, to take traditionally used species such as goat,  
25 bear, seal, sea lion, and I'm sure there's a few other ones  
26 that were traditionally used at these potlatches. We are not  
27 opposed to the idea that, you know, that these potlatches go on  
28 or what have you, because we have represented on our advisory  
29 committee -- there are several representatives from both the  
30 Eyak village and the Eyak Corporation. And when we took a vote  
31 on this, it was about a year ago, it was a 15 to 1 vote opposed  
32 to this idea for the reason, not the fact that we would like to  
33 hurt one's potlatch, but that we felt, like I said before, the  
34 division that this could put in the community of Cordova would  
35 have a more adverse effect than if the special permit was  
36 given.

37  
38 And so I just basically wanted to bring that into light  
39 before you voted on this proposal, and I thank you for your  
40 time.

41  
42 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, thank you for your comments. Any  
43 questions from the Council? Thank you.

44  
45 MR. CARPENTER: Thank you very much.

46  
47 CHAIRMAN EWAN: This is not my area, you know, I don't

48 know how people feel about this down in that particular area so  
49 I welcome that comment. Anybody else that's familiar with that  
50 particular area there and the people, I would like to hear

0067

1 their comments. Ralph.

2

3 MR. LOHSE: I'll just have to say what I've said  
4 before. You know, Cordova has always looked at the moose as a  
5 community thing. It's always been operated as a community  
6 thing. We've worked our regulations in a way that we could,  
7 you know, try to keep as many of the moose in the community as  
8 possible. And I think I said once before that sometimes things  
9 aren't worth as much if you don't have to give up something to  
10 get it. And if I remember right, a number of the moose permits  
11 this year were held by people who are members of the Eyak  
12 Tribal Council or Eyak Village Council -- or Eyak village, and  
13 so there are -- they have had the opportunity to take moose.

14

15 The one thing that Tom brought up that's kind of  
16 interesting, you know, is the fact that in our community there  
17 are game animals that only the Native population can take, that  
18 the White population is not allowed to take and that's all of  
19 your sea mammals, which is what the traditional -- basically  
20 traditional food was in the area. We have access to seals and  
21 sea lions and sea otters, all of which the White population  
22 can't take. And then there's salmon and halibut and all of the  
23 seafood that's available, too. So I guess -- I know from  
24 talking to a few other people, that that's one of the main  
25 objections to including the moose as far as the potlatches  
26 because the traditional potlatch foods are available and moose  
27 is a very limited species that everybody kind of feels belongs  
28 to everybody. And so that's -- I know that that's why some  
29 people have objections to having a special permit for moose for  
30 a potlatch.

31

32 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, thank you for your comment. Any  
33 other comments? I guess, you know, after you're away from a  
34 meeting for several months you forget the process. I'll ask  
35 Helga, are we following the process?

36

37 MS. EAKON: Yes, you are following. You might ask if  
38 there's any agencies who wish to comment.

39

40 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, any agency comments? Federal or  
41 State. Any public comment? I think the process should be, we  
42 should have a motion here.

43

44 MR. LOHSE: We don't have a motion on the floor.

45

46 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yeah, we should have a motion to  
47 discuss this.

48  
49  
50

MR. LOHSE: Right.

0068

1 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Is there a motion to adopt Proposal 19?

2  
3 MR. JOHN: I make a motion.

4  
5 CHAIRMAN EWAN: There's a motion to adopt Proposal 19.  
6 Is there a second?

7  
8 MR. KOMPKOFF: Second.

9  
10 CHAIRMAN EWAN: There's a motion and a second. Any  
11 further discussion on the motion?

12  
13 MR. ROMIG: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to kind of agree  
14 with Ralph -- not kind of agree, I agree with him. You know,  
15 it's my impression that it seems like the moose are real  
16 important to everybody over there and especially if the  
17 traditional food isn't moose for them to have at these  
18 potlatches, I don't know why we should all of a sudden  
19 including it. I'd be in favor of voting against this motion.

20  
21 CHAIRMAN EWAN: So you're speaking opposed to the  
22 proposal?

23  
24 MR. ROMIG: Right.

25  
26 MR. LOHSE: Could we have a statement of exactly what  
27 the motion is right now?

28  
29 CHAIRMAN EWAN: The motion is to adopt Proposal 19.....

30  
31 MS. EAKON: Actually that should be 19(B).

32  
33 CHAIRMAN EWAN: 19(B).

34  
35 MR. LOHSE: 19(B).

36  
37 CHAIRMAN EWAN: B?

38  
39 MS. EAKON: B, as in boy.

40  
41 MS. MASON: It would allow the Native village of Eyak  
42 to take one bull moose from Unit 6(C) for a memorial potlatch  
43 to be held in December 1997 or January 1998.

44  
45 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay.

46  
47 MR. JOHN: I'd like to say something.

48  
49  
50

CHAIRMAN EWAN: Fred.

0069

1 MR. JOHN: Our potlatches and our memorial potlatches,  
2 we down in the Copper River area, we use moose for, you know,  
3 moose, sheep and caribou. But if we can't get those we could  
4 get -- at those time we could get anything to get -- we usually  
5 have turkey and ham, too, and those are not traditional, you  
6 know. But have a turkey and ham, it's pretty good sometimes.  
7 A lot of the non-Natives that come to our potlatches, which we  
8 invite quite a few of them, we do -- they don't like our boiled  
9 moose meat so we have our -- or our boiled fish, so we have  
10 usually have ham and moose for that.

11  
12 I don't think throughout the ages -- or throughout the  
13 last 20 years we got -- you know, in our Native culture we lost  
14 quite a bit. Will Mayo say, we're giving up about 90 percent  
15 of what we, as a Native, we already gave up about 90 percent  
16 and right now we're fighting for the last 10 percent, you know,  
17 and we're still compromising. I would vote for this because I  
18 think of who I talked to down there, they -- it's something  
19 they want to do with their culture. It's something that they  
20 want to revitalize. And the Eyak culture, to me, is like at  
21 their wit's end right now and I think they're last language --  
22 well, the speak the fully Eyak language, it's either gone or  
23 it's about to be gone, you know. They're struggling right now  
24 to maintain their culture and keep their culture. And with all  
25 my heart I can't go say no to them just because the moose is  
26 not there for a long time. Because we had a lot of argument  
27 about generations -- how long it takes for tradition and  
28 culture. And down on the Kenai, you know, everybody told me  
29 it's one generation, so like I say, I'm going to vote for this.

30  
31 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Any other comments? It's a very tough  
32 issue for me, like I say, I am not familiar with the people  
33 and, you know, what they do down in the Cordova area. I have  
34 been down there a lot and like Fred, I have talked to quite a  
35 few people down there. I, too, would like to see, you know,  
36 the people continue to the Native tradition as much as  
37 possible. But also I'm aware that the moose was introduced, I  
38 guess it was -- when was it introduced down there, in the '50s  
39 -- in the '50s. And I wish there wasn't any problem with this.  
40 I would -- I'm really in favor of this motion because I'd  
41 rather lean towards helping the Native tradition, as Fred said,  
42 we have lost a lot over the years, of their ways. And just on  
43 that ground, I would support that. I don't think one moose  
44 will hurt as the analysis said, it wouldn't hurt the  
45 population. I know that there's going to be a problem between  
46 the people, but you know, it's something you live with. It's a  
47 culture I don't want to see destroyed.

48  
49  
50

MR. JOHN: Can I have one more?

0070

1 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Fred.

2

3 MR. JOHN: I just heard that, you know, they all worked  
4 together to get the moose population going out there, everybody  
5 was part of it. The community, and I believe the Eyak is part  
6 of the community and I think that being part of the community,  
7 they will add their culture to the community. And I think  
8 that's important for Cordova.

9

10 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Any other comments? Gary.

11

12 MR. OSKOLKOFF: I just wanted to make one comment with  
13 regard to the issue of dividing people. As that's been highly  
14 touted on the Kenai Peninsula was a reason why we couldn't have  
15 subsistence hunts and customary and traditional use findings,  
16 were not supposed to be and a variety of other issues. And I  
17 take exception to that on the grounds that nearly everything we  
18 do in Western culture, including the political aspects of that  
19 culture divide people. You divide them on where you live, what  
20 your income is, where you send your children to school. There  
21 are just endless varieties of reasons to claim that we're  
22 causing division. When you formalize a city or annex an area  
23 of a city or a borough, when one group is paying taxes of a  
24 certain rate and the next group -- a house over is not,  
25 crossing the river means you have a septic system on the other  
26 side, you have city water and sewer, some people can hunt  
27 because they're across one boundary line that somehow runs  
28 somewhere between Clam Gulch and Ninilchik in my area, the  
29 dividing has already been done. This, I think, is something  
30 that is in people's minds and I think that the mind's eye  
31 simply has to reconcile this and deal with the fact that this  
32 shouldn't divide people. If it is dividing people, it's only  
33 because they believe it should divide them. And I think we  
34 have to get past that as a modern culture, in general, and say  
35 that we don't need to be divided over this one moose because it  
36 isn't about the moose, we're in a flawed process, it's about  
37 the ceremony. And the ceremony just happens to want to, in  
38 this case, including moose, and we don't have a process that  
39 really works effectively to deal with this type of issue and  
40 we're having to use this process that we have in place right  
41 now and work towards the end goal. But the end goal is that  
42 these people should have the ability to displace, whether it be  
43 a turkey or a ham with a moose or a seal or what have you, if  
44 it is not an affront to the development of the rest of the  
45 population. And certainly if it's not a problem with the  
46 resource. And in both cases it's not and it shouldn't be.  
47 Therefore, I'll vote in favor of this proposal.

48  
49           CHAIRMAN EWAN: I do have a question of Staff. Is this  
50 ongoing; was that the question asked earlier or this yearly

0071

1 thing, somebody already mentioned?

2

3 MS. MASON: This request was for this year only.

4

5 CHAIRMAN EWAN: This year only, okay, thanks. Any  
6 other comments or questions? You ready to vote on the motion?

7

8 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Question.

9

10 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Question's called for -- oh, did you  
11 have a comment?

12

13 MR. LOHSE: I was going to ask one question of the  
14 Staff.

15

16 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yeah.

17

18 MR. LOHSE: But I don't know if any of the Staff is  
19 here that could answer that.

20

21 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Go ahead.

22

23 MR. LOHSE: And that was -- I don't even see any  
24 Cordova Staff here. I was just wondering whether there was a  
25 moose -- you know, out of the quota that was supposed to come  
26 out of 6(C), whether there was moose that hadn't been taken,  
27 but I don't think the season doesn't end 'til the end of  
28 October so I guess we won't know. And does it just say moose  
29 or does it say bull moose or does it just say moose?

30

31 CHAIRMAN EWAN: It just says moose according to the  
32 proposal.

33

34 MS. EAKON: Bull moose.

35

36 MS. MASON: Bull moose is requested.

37

38 MR. LOHSE: Bull moose, okay.

39

40 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, the question's been called for,  
41 all in favor of the motion say aye.

42

43 IN UNISON: Aye.

44

45 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Opposed by the same sign.

46

47 MR. ROMIG: Aye.

48  
49  
50

MR. LOHSE: Abstain.

0072

1 CHAIRMAN EWAN: I believe the motion passes unless  
2 anybody wants to have a count of votes.

3  
4 MS. EAKON: Ralph you abstain.

5  
6 MR. LOHSE: I abstain.

7  
8 CHAIRMAN EWAN: I rule that the motion passed, the  
9 proposal is adopted. We'll move on then to the next item on  
10 the agenda.

11  
12 MS. EAKON: Which is Proposal 16. Ralph Lohse, when he  
13 was Chair, had asked the Regional Council members to read the  
14 transcripts from the Southeast Regional Council meeting that  
15 happened recently as regards to wolf taken by Yakutat, right?

16  
17 MR. LOHSE: Right.

18  
19 CHAIRMAN EWAN: This is wolf?

20  
21 MR. LOHSE: This is about wolf.

22  
23 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Since I missed the discussion, could I  
24 ask Ralph for a comment.

25  
26 MR. LOHSE: Okay, pretty much what we did was, we're  
27 dealing with Unit 16(A) (sic), which is a buffer unit between  
28 Unit 5(A) and Unit 6, and we found a customary and traditional  
29 for goat in Unit 6 and for Unit 5(A) in Unit 6(A). We found a  
30 customary and traditional for moose in 6(A) for Unit 6 and in  
31 Unit 6(A) east for Unit 5(A). And now what we're on is wolf.  
32 We were looking -- they had told us that they would have some  
33 written documentation to us, we haven't found anything written  
34 that documents people from 5(A) taking moose (sic) in Unit  
35 6(A). And it's a request for a customary and traditional  
36 determination for wolf in Unit 6(A) by Unit 5(A). And so far,  
37 we haven't come up with anything. We were going to read these.  
38 I didn't find -- I read them over lunch and I didn't find any  
39 direct reference to the taking of wolves in Unit 6(A) in here.

40  
41 We had a comment by them when they had the meeting at  
42 my house in Cordova this summer that they would -- Fred, let's  
43 see if I can find it real quick, that they were pretty sure  
44 that there were several people in the Yakutat area who had  
45 taken wolves in the past and that it would be documented prior  
46 to our fall meeting, it hasn't been documented. Nobody sent  
47 any written information. And that was the coordinator who was

48 going to document it down there. So we're basically -- we  
49 basically didn't feel we had enough information to act on this  
50 one so we put it off until after lunch to have a chance to read

0073

1 these.

2

3 CHAIRMAN EWAN: So do you have a comment on this then?

4

5 MS. MASON: No further information.

6

7 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Could you recap whatever it was that  
8 you gave earlier?

9

10 MS. MASON: Sure. What I did was I summarized Proposal  
11 16, that was a proposal for wolf in Units 5 and 6(A). And it  
12 had come forth from the Southeast Regional Council, but the  
13 Board deferred it because it effects the Southcentral region as  
14 well. And the reason that the Board deferred was to allow  
15 this Council to submit a proposal having to do with uses in  
16 Unit 6(A). So the issue in this case is that currently the C&T  
17 in Unit 6 is a very, very broad one. It includes the rural  
18 residents of Unit 6, 9, 10, part of 10, 11 to 13 and the  
19 residents of Chickaloon and 16 through 26. So all residents of  
20 Unit 6 currently have a positive C&T in Unit 6 for wolf.  
21 Residents of Unit 5 don't. They're not among that array of  
22 units that do have positive C&T. So the proposal had asked for  
23 residents of Unit 5(A), which are essentially Yakutat residents  
24 to have a positive C&T in Unit 6(A). And this was discussed  
25 along with the other two proposals, 14 and 15, at the meeting  
26 in Cordova that Mr. Lohse referred to and at that time it was  
27 my understanding that the participants of the meeting were  
28 agreeing to a division between 6(A) east and west for wolf as  
29 well as for the other species.

30

31 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Could you explain that to me; what that  
32 means?

33

34 MS. MASON: Sure. This came up, I think, essentially  
35 in regard to moose. At least it was most dramatically  
36 demonstrable in terms of the moose. But residents of Cordova  
37 appeared to mainly use the western portion of Unit 6(A) and  
38 residents of Yakutat appeared to exclusively, in the case of  
39 moose, use Unit -- the eastern portion of Unit 6(A). And at  
40 that meeting, participants indicated that the dividing line  
41 could be approximately at Cape Suckling and a line drawn north.  
42 In terms of moose, the State has, in their regulations, have  
43 divided 6(A) into 6(A) east and west as well. However, at the  
44 meeting in Yakutat last week, the residents of Yakutat objected  
45 to the division of 6(A) into 6(A) east and west, and indicated  
46 that their use areas included all of 6(A). And that's what the  
47 transcribed testimony that I distributed to the Council members

48 includes, at the request of those Yakutat residents, the  
49 verbatim transcripts of what they had said.  
50

0074

1 CHAIRMAN EWAN: So that's pretty much it?

2

3 MS. MASON: Yeah. But there is very scanty information  
4 about the uses of wolf.

5

6 CHAIRMAN EWAN: So the Staff is kind of looking to us  
7 for some kind of action on this one way or the other?

8

9 MS. MASON: Well, the proposal that comes forward will  
10 be analyzed and then looked at again in the winter meeting. So  
11 there is still time to discover new information before that  
12 period.

13

14 CHAIRMAN EWAN: I'm still not too clear on the  
15 division; it's a geographical division as I understand it. It  
16 would be the Cordova area people, do they kind of agree with  
17 this?

18

19 MR. LOHSE: Basically what we're talking about, and  
20 this is, you know, after reading the two transcripts from  
21 Yakutat, the one thing that the Yakutat people stress the most  
22 is their interrelationship with the people that were in Katalla  
23 and are in Cordova and their relationship with the people up  
24 the Copper River. Basically what we have is we're talking  
25 about people that live over here, that they have this area here  
26 and with moose we went here and with goat we went this whole  
27 area. So we have records of them hunting in this area right  
28 here. And as I've said before, it's awful hard for me to think  
29 of them hunting in this area without going along with what was  
30 said at the meeting that we had at our house, which was that  
31 they took wolf. I mean because if you're hunting in the area  
32 and you come across a wolf, you take a wolf.

33

34 They promised to have some written testimony on what  
35 they said. They didn't get it to us. But basically, we have a  
36 little report from the meeting that we had at our house that  
37 where they said that they knew of people having taken wolves in  
38 that area. Personally, I have no problem with the fact that  
39 they take wolves in this area and they probably have taken wolf  
40 in this area. And again, like I said before, a lot of the  
41 people in Cordova are from this area and a lot of people from  
42 Yakutat are from this area. So I don't see any problem with a  
43 customary and traditional determination for wolf in either 6(A)  
44 or 6(A) east or whatever, because -- but what we were lacking  
45 is like Gary said, we're lacking any.....

46

47 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Evidence.

48  
49 MR. LOHSE: .....evidence. And so you know, the  
50 question is, do we -- this is one of our deferred proposals, do

0075

1 we need to handle it, do we defer it further, do we defer it to  
2 the Board for further information. The one thing we do know is  
3 we have records from people from 6 taking moose in 6(A). So we  
4 have records of people from the Cordova area taking moose in 6  
5 -- I mean wolf in 6(A).

6  
7 So the thing is, if we're going to give a customary and  
8 traditional determination for wolf in 6(A) to 5(A), we should  
9 include residents of 6(A), (B) and (C) as having customary and  
10 traditional wolf in 6(A), too. Currently they already do  
11 because they're included -- there's a real broad group of  
12 people who have -- if I can find that real quick, that's  
13 under.....

14  
15 MS. MASON: It's on Page E-18.

16  
17 MR. LOHSE: .....E-18, if you take a look at that,  
18 you'll see that currently -- E-17, currently residents of Unit  
19 6, 9, 10, 11 to 13, and 16 to 26 have a customary and  
20 traditional for wolf here. It's only logical that residents of  
21 Unit 5 would also have customary and traditional in that one  
22 there. I mean they're one of the closest groups and they're  
23 left out. So we got three choices, Roy, we can either add them  
24 to it, we can define it down smaller, or we can leave it as it  
25 is, you know, I mean that's basically what it is.

26  
27 And I would make a motion just to get things moving  
28 that we take Unit 6(A) and we make a determination for  
29 customary and traditional for the residents of Unit 6, 9, 10,  
30 11 to 13, 16 to 26 and 5, and add 5 to it. I mean we have no  
31 information to exclude these other people at this point in  
32 time.

33  
34 CHAIRMAN EWAN: So that's the motion then now?

35  
36 MR. LOHSE: That's the motion.

37  
38 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, is there a second.

39  
40 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Second.

41  
42 CHAIRMAN EWAN: The motion is seconded. Further  
43 discussion on the motion.

44  
45 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

46  
47 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yes.

48  
49 MR. OSKOLKOFF: I was reading the transcripts from the  
50 October 1st meeting, in which a Mr. Valley is referencing the

076

1 taking of wolves. And I'm wondering if someone was there or  
2 someone could interpret the area in which he was discussing  
3 here.

4

5 MS. MASON: What page are you on Gary?

6

7 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Let's see, I've got the thin copy and  
8 I'm on the second page of the proceedings, which is actually  
9 the third written page from the cover and the second -- or the  
10 first full paragraph on Line 4.

11

12 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yes.

13

14 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Where he states that my grandfather's a  
15 Coho, and then he does make a reference to being up and down  
16 the Coast, but I don't know where Mr. Valley was from.

17

18 MR. LOHSE: There's something on where he was  
19 originally from.

20

21 MR. OSKOLKOFF: He's from Yakutat?

22

23 MR. LOHSE: Yeah, he's from Yakutat.

24

25 MS. MASON: He's from Yakutat and his mother and  
26 grandmother were born in Katalla.

27

28 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Does that answer your question?

29

30 MR. LOHSE: But see that's all the same people there as  
31 it is in, you know, part of the Tlingits went down in that  
32 direction and part of them went to Cordova, you know. That's  
33 why it would be hard for me to have a customary and traditional  
34 for one without the other.

35

36 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Thank you, that does answer my  
37 question.

38

39 CHAIRMAN EWAN: I'll support the motion just for your  
40 information. Not knowing too much again about the people and  
41 their past uses of wolf for subsistence and all that. I'll  
42 take the word of the people that they have done it in the past  
43 and that they want to continue doing that. Is there any  
44 comments about impacts on the wolf population at all, Bob or  
45 somebody?

46

47 MR. WILLIS: Mr. Chair, we don't have any real good

48 information on the wolf population in that area. A lot of it  
49 is heavily forested and wolves are difficult to census. No one  
50 lives in most of that area. I would defer to Mr. Lohse and

0077

1 also possibly to the U.S. Forest Service representative here if  
2 any of the National Forest land lies within this area.

3  
4 MR. LOHSE: I know Stan isn't here right now.

5  
6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, he's gone. What you were  
7 saying, there isn't much information.

8  
9 MR. LOHSE: There isn't much information, there isn't  
10 much impact on them, no.

11  
12 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Thank you. Are you ready to vote on  
13 the motion?

14  
15 MR. LOHSE: Question.

16  
17 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Question is called for, all in favor of  
18 adopting Proposal 16.....

19  
20 MR. LOHSE: Proposal 16 as amended.

21  
22 CHAIRMAN EWAN: .....as amended, say aye.

23  
24 IN UNISON: Aye.

25  
26 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Opposed by the same sign.

27  
28 (No opposing responses)

29  
30 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Motion is carried.

31  
32 MS. EAKON: Who seconded Mr. Lohse's motion?

33  
34 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Gary.

35  
36 MR. OSKOLKOFF: I did.

37  
38 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, where are we at now?

39  
40 MR. LOHSE: Well, we're on proposals. Item C.

41  
42 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, on Item C, Unit 15(A) moose  
43 subsistence season. We'll have an overview from Helga.

44  
45 MS. EAKON: Please turn to the material under Tab G, G  
46 as in Gary. And before we do that, Roy, I want to explain that  
47 Gary Oskolkoff said that he will not be here tomorrow and that

48 is why after Unit 15(A) moose, we're going to go to 9(G)  
49 revisiting the Kenai C&T determinations. And then 9H3 research  
50 possibilities.

0078

1 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay.

2

3 MS. EAKON: And I wanted to ask Sandy Rabinowitch, is  
4 it true you're just going to be here today only?

5

6 MR. RABINOWITCH: I'll be here tomorrow.

7

8 MS. EAKON: You'll be here tomorrow, okay, never mind.  
9 As you may recall, at their Board meeting July 16, 1996, the  
10 Federal Subsistence Board determined that the residents of four  
11 Kenai Peninsula communities have customarily and traditionally  
12 used moose in Unit 15(A). And their action reversed their May  
13 3, 1996 decision on this matter. In addition to making that  
14 C&T determination, the Board established an August 18 to  
15 September 20 subsistence moose season on Federal public lands  
16 within the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge in Unit 15(A),  
17 excluding the Skilak Loop Wildlife Management area, which  
18 remains closed to all moose hunting. In particular, residents  
19 of Ninilchik, Nanwalek, Port Graham and Seldovia would be able  
20 to harvest one moose with spikefork or 50 inch antlers or  
21 antlers with three or more brow-tines on at least one side, and  
22 a Federal registration permit was required for the participants  
23 of this hunt.

24

25 I'm going to refer your attention to Page 33 of the  
26 transcript where the Chair Mitch Demientieff, at this meeting,  
27 at which Gary Oskolkoff and Ben Romig had testified at as well.  
28 Mitch, the Chair of the Board, said, it will go back to the  
29 Regional Council and give them an opportunity to work out,  
30 meaning the seasons and they were talking about the bull season  
31 as well. While this slipped by the cracks, this -- the  
32 discussion for the continuation of this hunt was to have been  
33 on your agenda a year ago. I take full responsibility, it  
34 slipped through my fingers and no one else caught it. But the  
35 Federal Subsistence Board was gracious enough to extend the  
36 season for this fall's hunt and the Chair said, please have the  
37 Regional Council discuss this season and that is why it's on  
38 your agenda today, Mr. Chair.

39

40 So essentially if you would like this subsistence hunt  
41 in Unit 15(A) to go forward, you will need to submit a proposal  
42 to that effect, but the action is up to you.

43

44 CHAIRMAN EWAN: I have a question. We're talking about  
45 next season, right?

46

47 MS. EAKON: Right.

48  
49 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. So any other comments from  
50 Staff?

0079

1 MR. LOHSE: Could we get a report on what's happened in  
2 that hunt?

3  
4 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Does anybody have any information about  
5 how the hunt went this year or last year?

6  
7 MR. WILLIS: Mr. Chair, Mark Chase, from the Kenai  
8 National Wildlife Refuge is here to present the Refuge report  
9 and he has that information. That's scheduled for later on,  
10 but I guess he could come forward and give that now if you'd  
11 like.

12  
13 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, go ahead.

14  
15 MR. CHASE: My name's Mark Chase with the Kenai  
16 National Wildlife Refuge. This season, I believe we had 38  
17 permits issued for the Federal subsistence hunting season, and  
18 the reports are still trickling in. It's been -- the season  
19 closed September 20, and the reports go to Anchorage office so  
20 Robert and I and others have kind of been talking trying to  
21 keep up on it. But at this point, I think there's been three  
22 reported moose harvested, one of those in 15(C) and two of  
23 those in 15(B). The last season, I'm not sure on the total  
24 number of moose, but I do recall that there weren't any  
25 harvested in 15(A) in the '96 season either or in the '97  
26 season. So that's kind of real quick where we're at on that.  
27 And as I said, the harvest reports are not all in, so that's  
28 certainly subject to change.

29  
30 MR. LOHSE: Were there any limit on the number of  
31 permits that could be given out?

32  
33 MR. CHASE: No, no.

34  
35 MR. LOHSE: You don't remember how many permits were  
36 given out in '96, do you?

37  
38 MR. CHASE: Well, as I recall it was somewhere around  
39 40, it might have been a little bit higher than that and this  
40 year there were 29 issued from our office in Soldotna, and then  
41 an additional nine issued from the Fish and Wildlife Service  
42 office in Homer.

43  
44 MR. LOHSE: And you don't know what percentage of them  
45 have been turned back in yet?

46  
47 MR. CHASE: What's the latest?

48  
49 MR. WILLIS: Still fairly low percentage. Probably we  
50 will not see anymore moose reported harvested from successful

0080

1 hunters. Typically we have to send out reminder letters to get  
2 all the permits back in. And we send out two reminder letters,  
3 one 30 days after the season, another one 30 days after that.  
4 And at this point I don't know exactly, Roy, how many -- what  
5 the percentage is, probably around half or a little over half.

6

7 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Do we have '96 harvest tickets also?

8

9 MR. WILLIS: I believe we had three harvested in '96  
10 also. Two in subunit 15(C) and one in subunit 15(B).

11

12 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Any other questions?

13

14 MS. EAKON: Public testimony.

15

16 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, thank you. We'll open it up for  
17 public testimony. I believe there was someone who wanted to  
18 speak on this proposal, and that's John Crawford.

19

20 MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman and  
21 Council. I'm John Crawford from Seldovia, Alaska and I'm here  
22 to testify on this area proposal for cutting off the  
23 communities of the Lower Inlet. And traditionally our hunting  
24 grounds, what we considered was from Cape Douglas to Seward and  
25 we've hunted beyond. We've hunted Montague Island and Prince  
26 William Sound also on certain occasions. And the coast lines  
27 being mostly a coastal people, we've always been water  
28 oriented, but also we do use the land animals. And when we  
29 neglected to come three or four years ago to one of these  
30 hearings, we came real close to losing our goat hunt down there  
31 because of the -- nobody -- there was a person who said they  
32 were from our community that said, nobody down there used them,  
33 but that -- when we read your minutes and stuff, no one in the  
34 community had ever heard of this person. He was not from  
35 Seldovia. But that's a different one. Having said that --  
36 what we consider our area traditionally, the boundaries keep  
37 getting smaller. They cut it -- and I don't know, are these  
38 Federal boundaries or are these just the Fish and Game boundary  
39 units that you use for regulations of your areas also.

40

41 MR. LOHSE: Federal.

42

43 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yeah, we can only, you know, regulate  
44 Federal -- make a recommendation -- we just make  
45 recommendations.

46

47 MR. CRAWFORD: Unit 15(A) is a Federal unit boundary

48 area.

49

50 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Maybe the Staff here can help us. Bob.

0081

1 MR. WILLIS: Mr. Chair, I think the units which he's  
2 referring are the State units such as 15(A), (B) and (C).  
3 Those are just the designations used by the State. The Federal  
4 regulations use the same subunits, except that the Federal  
5 regulations are limited to only Federal lands within those  
6 subunits.

7  
8 MR. CRAWFORD: Thank you. And that was basically my  
9 understanding, too. But our area is basically 15(A), we have  
10 hunted 7 and 9 also. But if you will look at Seldovia and  
11 where there is -- if there is to be a use in the area at all on  
12 Federal lands, it would be 15, not 15(A), 15(B), (C), it would  
13 be 15. If these aren't your boundaries of cutting off another  
14 section of the area that we hunt by using the A(), (B), (C)  
15 method, I would request that you don't because that is the  
16 closest and only Federal lands of moose hunting production of  
17 any -- well, there isn't any other Federal land close to our  
18 area.

19  
20 CHAIRMAN EWAN: So you're speaking in favor of the  
21 proposal?

22  
23 MR. CRAWFORD: I'm speaking in favor that we keep --  
24 no, the proposal, I believe, is to delete the 15(A) from our  
25 traditional C&T.

26  
27 MS. EAKON: The proposal is to have a subsistence moose  
28 hunt in 15(A) for the communities of Ninilchik, Seldovia, Port  
29 Graham and Nanwalek.

30  
31 MR. CRAWFORD: Okay, then I am in favor of the C&T. I  
32 must have read some of the information wrong where there was  
33 some -- the information was that 15(A), because of some reason  
34 of only one moose was got there or only one -- one was taken.  
35 I believe it was three years ago a hunter from our area went up  
36 there and asked the people there and he said, where's the open  
37 area and he says over there and so he went over there, shot a  
38 moose and they called Fish and Game and said he hunted the  
39 closed area. That was up in that same district. So that makes  
40 people kind of hesitate, well, if we don't know where we are  
41 and we're going to get that kind of information maybe we don't  
42 hunt. But I think one moose in our small community is really  
43 important to our economy. Fish and Game may say, well, they  
44 only got one moose or only one permit come in. One is just as  
45 important as many in our area.

46  
47 So with that, I would like to say that we do not lose

48 -- I'd like to ask that we don't lose our moose hunt in area  
49 15.  
50

0082

1 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Thank you. Any other comments from the  
2 public or agencies? We don't have a motion here or do we?

3  
4 MR. LOHSE: We don't have a motion.

5  
6 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Do I hear a motion to adopt Proposal --  
7 I guess it's not a proposal -- the proper action here would be,  
8 Helga, to recommend to the Federal Subsistence Board that we  
9 support moose hunting as proposed in 15(A)?

10  
11 MS. EAKON: Yes. However, you would need to do a  
12 Regional Council proposal. You would have to adopt.....

13  
14 CHAIRMAN EWAN: We have to go through a process yet?

15  
16 MS. EAKON: .....a motion to approve a Regional Council  
17 sponsored proposal to continue the subsistence moose season in  
18 Unit 15(A) for those four communities.

19  
20 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Do I hear a motion to that effect?

21  
22 MR. KOMPKOFF: I'd like to make the motion.

23  
24 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yes, go ahead. You'll make the motion?

25  
26 MR. KOMPKOFF: Yes.

27  
28 CHAIRMAN EWAN: To do as Helga outlined, is there a  
29 second?

30  
31 MR. JOHN: I second it.

32  
33 CHAIRMAN EWAN: The motion is seconded. Further  
34 discussion on the motion.

35  
36 MR. LOHSE: Mr. Chairman?

37  
38 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yes.

39  
40 MR. LOHSE: I'd like to ask Gary how you felt it's  
41 worked so far and what's your thoughts on continuation on it?

42  
43 MR. OSKOLKOFF: I think we're at the initial stages of  
44 an experiment with regard to how this is working. 15(A) is an  
45 unusual area as has been described before, giving it as a  
46 management area. And it is pretty heavily used recreationally.  
47 It -- the hunting effort, I think is somewhat stymied given

48 those kind of hurdles to overcome at this point.

49

50           And I would like to see it continue. It's certainly no

0083

1 detriment to the resource apparently with the lack of moose  
2 taken. I think the opportunity is necessary and I think, in  
3 short order, people will make accommodations necessary to fit  
4 their subsistence moose hunt into a -- a little more rigidly  
5 regulated area, if you will. I have heard comments back from  
6 individuals with regard to the Skilak Loop area and I've been  
7 through that area myself and found it difficult to know when  
8 you were on and when you were off. Most people take a little  
9 time to try and figure out exactly where the good spots are and  
10 when you are within the boundary -- if you had turned to your  
11 regulations at some point and read the definition of what the  
12 Skilak Look wildlife management area is under Unit 15, you'll  
13 see it has a lot of verbiage there to describe it and it's just  
14 as difficult to do so on the ground.

15  
16 With regard to some of the areas, they are much more  
17 difficult to access and I think that the economy of effort with  
18 regard to areas in 15(B) and (C), have meant that people have  
19 concentrated a little more effort down there. But my  
20 observation with this year's State hunt, at least in that area  
21 15(B) -- or 15(C), at least, was that there was -- there didn't  
22 seem to be as much or as many moose taken in some of the areas  
23 that are pretty easily accessible. Therefore, I think probably  
24 next year you'll have some displacement back up towards that  
25 area. But that's really speculation at this point. And I  
26 think that we really need to let the system work, you know, to  
27 get any real hard and fast figures on it.

28  
29 CHAIRMAN EWAN: We have a motion, I guess on the floor.  
30 Yes, Ralph.

31  
32 MR. LOHSE: I'd like a little clarification on this,  
33 are we only dealing with a subsistence moose hunt in 15(A)  
34 then, right?

35  
36 MS. EAKON: That is correct.

37  
38 MR. LOHSE: The 15(B) and 15(C) is established under  
39 different regulations?

40  
41 MS. EAKON: Yes.

42  
43 MR. LOHSE: Okay. And so in 15(A) so far we have  
44 basically had two moose in two years?

45  
46 MS. EAKON: One.

47

48 MR. LOHSE: Or one moose in two years.

49

50 MR. WILLIS: We haven't had a moose harvested in 15(A)

0084

1 in the two years that it's been opened.

2 MR. LOHSE: Okay, we haven't had moose harvested?

3

4 MR. WILLIS: No.

5

6 MR. LOHSE: Okay.

7

8 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. Further discussion on the  
9 motion. There's a motion on the floor, right?

10

11 MR. LOHSE: Um-hum.

12

13 MS. EAKON: Yes.

14

15 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Are you ready to vote on the motion?

16

17 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Question is called for, all in favor of  
18 the motion say aye.

19

20 IN UNISON: Aye.

21

22 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Opposed by the same sign.

23

24 (No opposing responses)

25

26 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Motion is carried. The next one I want  
27 to take up then is, Helga, was.....

28

29 MS. EAKON: Revisiting the Kenai C&T determination  
30 recommendations which is under Tab N, as in Nancy in your book.

31

32 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Are you going to comment on this?

33

34 MS. EAKON: Earlier this spring I had asked -- sent you  
35 a memo asking if you wanted this on your agenda, no one said,  
36 nay, I did ask your Chair and he said, well, I don't see any  
37 reason not to have it on the agenda. Also our anthropologist,  
38 Rachel Mason, has something to say.

39

40 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay.

41

42 MS. MASON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to  
43 give -- I guess bring up again, some of the events in 1995  
44 having to do with how many of the original questions of the C&T  
45 on the Kenai Peninsula were tabled. And I just want to  
46 summarize for you some of the Board -- actions of the Board and  
47 the Council. At the April '95 Federal Subsistence Board

48 meeting, the Board considered the Kenai C&T, that is the  
49 regional one and voted to support the recommendations of the  
50 Southcentral Council. And at that time, the proposed rule

0085

1 included both Unit 7 and 15, and species black bear, brown  
2 bear, caribou, goat, moose and sheep. In July of '95, the  
3 Regional Council passed C&T for moose only in Unit 15(A) for  
4 Ninilchik and Seldovia and then in Units 15(B) and (C) for the  
5 four rural communities, Ninilchik, Seldovia, Nanwalek and Port  
6 Graham. And at that time, the Council passed a motion to table  
7 any consideration of C&T use for any other species or any other  
8 communities on the Kenai Peninsula until a meeting to be  
9 determined. And that remained tabled.

10

11 At the Federal Subsistence Board meeting, also in July  
12 of '95, the Board also supported the action of the Council  
13 which was to table all consideration of species, other than  
14 moose and of communities other than the four rural communities  
15 in Unit 15. So as it stands now, all those other proposals --  
16 all proposals that remain in the backlog as well as the  
17 consideration that was there in the regional C&T remains  
18 tabled.

19

20 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. I know it's a little bit  
21 confusing even to me. I know we did discuss this in the past,  
22 but what is left to deal with, other species, animal species;  
23 is that correct and communities, too, C&T? Do we have C&T  
24 determinations for other communities and other species, both,  
25 right?

26

27 MS. MASON: Back in 1995, when the program was still  
28 considering C&T on a regional basis and it was expected that  
29 all of those species would be considered. However, by the  
30 action of the Council and Board, that consideration was tabled.

31

32 CHAIRMAN EWAN: I understand that.

33

34 MS. MASON: So instead....

35

36 CHAIRMAN EWAN: That's for species.

37

38 MS. MASON: Yeah, right.

39

40 CHAIRMAN EWAN: But then you also need communities, we  
41 only approved certain communities. There's more communities to  
42 approve yet, too?

43

44 MS. MASON: Right.

45

46 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yeah. So it's C&T determinations for  
47 communities as well as for species, yet, too. So it's kind of

48 a broad thing that we have to determine here yet.

49

50 MS. MASON: That's right. Everything in Unit 7 was

0086

1 tabled.

2 CHAIRMAN EWAN: I need direction on where to start on  
3 this then, that's what I need.

4

5 MS. MASON: If you want to keep them tabled, no action  
6 is required. The way it stands now, it's indefinite.

7

8 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Ralph, do you have a comment?

9

10 MR. LOHSE: Is it possible to keep these things tabled  
11 until such time as a proposal comes up that directly addresses  
12 and just like we just did with this Cordova one where there's a  
13 proposal on the table that deals with.....

14

15 MS. MASON: Yeah.

16

17 MR. LOHSE: .....a species and a community so that we  
18 can approach it on that basis? I mean originally what we  
19 started doing is we started doing C&T for everything, even if  
20 there was nothing that was on the table in front of us. And I  
21 think what I'm getting is that that's where we are on some of  
22 these.

23

24 MS. MASON: Yeah.

25

26 MR. LOHSE: Some of these communities and species  
27 haven't been issues and so they're still tabled.

28

29 MS. MASON: Um-hum.

30

31 MR. LOHSE: And we can either continue to have them  
32 tabled until such time as we need to address them directly for  
33 a specific proposal or we can go through with a broad brush  
34 take each community and each species and make a decision prior  
35 to a proposal being in front of us.

36

37 MS. MASON: Yeah.

38

39 MR. LOHSE: Am I correct in my.....

40

41 MS. MASON: There's no requirement to take them off the  
42 table or to take any ones of them off the table.

43

44 MR. LOHSE: Is there any need to make a C&T  
45 determination if there's no issue.....

46

47 MS. MASON: No.

48  
49 MR. LOHSE: .....about C&T with that community or that  
50 species at this point in time?

0087

1

2 MS. MASON: No, there isn't. This was only to give you  
3 the opportunity to bring it up again. We wanted to make sure  
4 it was clear that those issues had been tabled.

5

6 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Does any Council member want to take up  
7 any of the C&T determinations for species or communities at  
8 this time? Yes, Gary.

9

10 MR. OSKOLKOFF: I don't want to take them specifically  
11 at this time. I think that we were working on a backlog of  
12 proposals essentially. So there are proposals on the table,  
13 it's just that they haven't been -- or were being held  
14 essentially in reserve. It's just that those people who made  
15 the proposals haven't pressed the point or repropose again at  
16 this point simply because they had them in and they were under  
17 the understanding that essentially all sides were standing down  
18 until such time as we had an opportunity to deal with the rest  
19 of the world and essentially leave the Kenai Peninsula alone  
20 for a little while. Other wise, everyone else kind of got  
21 shortchanged. And I think that was one of the reasons that we  
22 tabled, indefinitely, those issues.

23

24 CHAIRMAN EWAN: So there's no action required today,  
25 just leave it as is. Is there any objection to leaving these --  
26 I guess, I don't know what to call it.

27

28 MS. MASON: Leave them tabled.

29

30 MR. OSKOLKOFF: I think there was one more issue that  
31 we needed to discuss, too, was with regard to getting back to  
32 the Kenai Peninsula and these issues. Is that there was some  
33 discussion as to whether we needed to revisit the rural/non-  
34 rural determinations before we got back into it simply because  
35 we found those tended to get in the way and caused our  
36 reasoning to get somewhat more convoluted than we intended to  
37 start. So I think there's no reason at all to take it up right  
38 now, but at some point we -- we have to address the proposals  
39 that people have sent in and I think we should do that in a  
40 reasonable time frame. But when we do it, it's going to be a  
41 serious long session again, no doubt.

42

43 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Gary, are you saying that maybe we  
44 ought to talk about it at this meeting here?

45

46 MR. OSKOLKOFF: No, I'm suggesting we ought to talk  
47 about the process, how we go about bringing them back up and

48 what kind of information is needed.

49

50           CHAIRMAN EWAN: I think that's a good idea.

0088

1

2 MR. LOHSE: Mr. Chair, I'd like to ask Gary a question.  
3 Can you think of any direct proposals that deal with any of  
4 these communities or species on the Kenai right now that we  
5 should be addressing?

6

7 MR. OSKOLKOFF: No. I think that we could hold back on  
8 these within reason, but I think it's unfair to the proposers  
9 to hold off on, you know, further, and take up new proposals  
10 and more new proposals as they come down the road. At one time  
11 it was unfair for us to keep working on the Kenai Peninsula  
12 because it was almost an unsolvable problem at that time and  
13 not take up the proposals from the other areas within our area  
14 of the State. I think that once we've taken up, you know,  
15 those, then we have to take the other ones in kind semi-  
16 chronological order again, we have to jump back to that at some  
17 point.

18

19 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Um-hum.

20

21 MR. OSKOLKOFF: And when we do, we should probably do  
22 it with both feet and address those issues in order. And I  
23 suggest the first issue we have to address on the Kenai  
24 Peninsula is the rural/non-rural determination that were made.  
25 Then once we've decided whether we're going to change anything  
26 or ask anything to be changed and once that's addressed, then  
27 we can take up the proposals at that time. Probably the C&T  
28 portion of it first and then back into the proposals again. So  
29 I see it as kind of a long process, one that I feel way to  
30 weary to start today, but one that we really have to think  
31 seriously on.

32

33 MR. LOHSE: Mr. Chairman.

34

35 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Let me make this comment. It looks  
36 like there's nothing really pressing right now. So if we leave  
37 the proposals tabled, is there any objection? That was my  
38 question earlier. Hearing no objection, we'll leave them  
39 tabled. But I'm not going to cut off comments. Go ahead,  
40 Ralph.

41

42 MR. LOHSE: Mr. Chairman, I was just wondering -- I'd  
43 like to ask the Staff, do we have a backlog of proposals for  
44 the Kenai Peninsula?

45

46 MS. MASON: I can respond to that, Mr. Chairman. Yes,  
47 we do. Let's see, I had put them all into the tabled category

48 thinking that they were tabled along with the.....

49

50 MR. LOHSE: Determinations.

0089

1

2 MS. MASON: .....the other C&T determinations for the  
3 Kenai Peninsula. But they can be revived if that is the wish  
4 of the Council.

5

6 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Speaking of reviving, you heard Gary's  
7 comments?

8

9 MS. MASON: Yes.

10

11 CHAIRMAN EWAN: I think I need some kind of direction  
12 from you people on how we go about this. He's recommending  
13 that we put the rural and non-rural on the agenda also before  
14 some of the C&T determinations are made.

15

16 MS. MASON: Um-hum.

17

18 CHAIRMAN EWAN: And then can we get some kind of  
19 process started here of how we -- which items we bring up first  
20 and so on.

21

22 MS. MASON: Yeah.

23

24 CHAIRMAN EWAN: I guess that the -- why your people are  
25 asking that we take up proposal number so and so.

26

27 MS. MASON: Um-hum.

28

29 CHAIRMAN EWAN: So a certain order so we have some  
30 process going.

31

32 MS. MASON: Yeah. I'm not qualified to address the  
33 question of rural/non-rural. I think Bill might be the best  
34 one to.

35

36 MR. KNAUER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The Board has  
37 indicated that the issue of rural/non-rural status for  
38 communities will be examined in the year 2000 when the new  
39 census data is in for all of the areas.

40

41 CHAIRMAN EWAN: So it's kind of off the table right now  
42 then. Yes, Ralph.

43

44 MR. LOHSE: Mr. Chair, I think another thing that Gary  
45 is getting at is that we need to setup a process whereby we  
46 visit these areas. Like Gary, I can't see us being able to  
47 handle everything at one time. We've dealt with it -- we've

48 dealt with the Copper River at our last meeting. We've dealt  
49 with the Cordova area in this meeting. Maybe what we should do  
50 is we should do, is maybe on a rotating basis, handle proposals

0090

1 from one area in our area every meeting so that we visit, at  
2 least, some of the proposals. And if I understand right, in  
3 dealing with the proposals that you have there in front of you,  
4 on the Kenai, Rachel, we'll end up having to make C&T  
5 determinations to take care of some of the proposals. And so  
6 if we request that a -- you know, like at the next meeting we  
7 have Kenai proposals -- I mean I'm not saying that we'll do  
8 that, but if we would request that you know, in the next  
9 meeting we'll deal with Kenai proposals and the next meeting  
10 we'll deal with Copper River proposals. At that time we could  
11 have the proposals and the backup information for C&T to make  
12 those kinds of determinations at that time. Do you think that  
13 work, Gary?

14  
15 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Yes. And I'm thinking in the case like  
16 the Kenai Peninsula, given that the issues and the intensity  
17 that we tend to look at the Kenai Peninsula comparably perhaps  
18 with other areas because of population or what have you. That  
19 we really need a very serious running start of information  
20 built up so that we can have our ducks truly in a row before we  
21 take it up before the Board. Because the reasoning that we  
22 used originally when we dealt with the Kenai Peninsula was very  
23 in-depth. We -- that was one of our first areas that we worked  
24 on and we spent a lot of time analyzing details and breaking  
25 everything down to it's smallest possible components and then  
26 reassembling it again. And I think that that may not be as  
27 intense because of the -- because we're not dealing  
28 specifically with moose right off and that was a very  
29 contentious issue on the Kenai Peninsula.

30  
31 But in dealing with, for instance, feelings that were  
32 expressed, let's say in Anchor Point when we were down there,  
33 people felt that there ought to be areas that -- that much more  
34 of the Kenai Peninsula ought to be rural or it all ought to be  
35 non-rural, that there were a lot of people who felt that it was  
36 one community. A lot of different statements were made and I  
37 think we have to delve into that issue to some extent.

38  
39 And then there were lines drawn that were -- that most  
40 people there testifying felt were somewhat arbitrary and there  
41 were -- between which was rural and which wasn't rural and then  
42 there was the problem we wrestled with which was community.  
43 Defining that it had to be a specific community that we were  
44 talking about and how as a community they had to have customary  
45 and traditional use where as when we're dealing with other  
46 parts of the State we tend to deal with things in subunits or  
47 units. And the issue of what that community makeup is and

48 specifically what they've done and how long they've been there  
49 and those kind of things aren't as important or aren't stressed  
50 as much as a general area. So I think if we go back in, what

0091

1 we want to have -- I just want to have a very clear idea of  
2 what our process is going to be because otherwise we're going  
3 to be -- we're going to be picked apart.

4  
5 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. I guess I already made my  
6 comment. I think we do need some direction on process, you  
7 know. What I heard is we ought to start dealing with certain  
8 proposals, maybe it's by different communities, different  
9 areas, different units, so on at each meeting. Those that were  
10 tabled I'm talking about. If we can do that, maybe we could  
11 get through some of the tabled proposals. The issue of  
12 rural/non-rural that Gary's talking about, maybe we could do  
13 that, too, maybe just have an open discussion on that. I don't  
14 see why we can't, is there a reason why we can't just talk  
15 about it at maybe the next meeting?

16  
17 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

18  
19 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yes.

20  
21 MR. OSKOLKOFF: I think perhaps what we're in need of  
22 is what we did more or less when we first formed this Council  
23 is more of a work session to discuss how things work. How the  
24 function, how the process actually is done and where we're  
25 going to emphasize priorities and those kind of things. So  
26 that once that process is developed, we can apply that in a  
27 similar fashion across the entire Southcentral region rather  
28 than, it seems that we amend the process and abbreviate it or  
29 intensify it, depending on what issue we're dealing with. And  
30 I don't think that's really appropriate. I think that we ought  
31 to deal with it in a very similar fashion.

32  
33 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. I think we kind of have an  
34 understanding of what direction we want to go, whether we get  
35 there or not, we'll wait and see. But I think everybody's  
36 clear, right, what we want to do. We want to get the proposals  
37 that are tabled back on the table eventually, maybe one by one  
38 or unit by unit or something like that. Bill.

39  
40 MR. KNAUER: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether Rachel  
41 was going to bring this up or not, but there are a number of  
42 backlog proposals that will be dealt with this year. In  
43 particular, there's C&T in Unit 16(B) and a number of them in  
44 Unit 13 that will be back on the table for this fall -- they'll  
45 be put on the table this fall and they will appear in your  
46 proposal booklet that you will see in November and then the  
47 Council will review and make recommendations on them in

48 February.

49

50 CHAIRMAN EWAN: So it's coming up.

0092

1

2 MS. MASON: Mr. Chairman, I was going to, on a later  
3 agenda item, go through the whole backlog. On the whole  
4 backlog, there are a number of proposals that I wanted to ask  
5 the Council to drop in order to submit more focused proposals  
6 if they addressed important issues. But there are some that  
7 have been on the books for years that have unknown proponents  
8 that are very general or broad or vague.

9

10 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Do you want to do that today?

11

12 MS. MASON: Yes, I do.

13

14 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Well, is there an objection to -- is it  
15 on the.....

16

17 MR. JOHN: It's on the agenda.

18

19 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Oh, it's on the agenda.

20

21 MS. MASON: It's the next thing on the agenda.

22

23 CHAIRMAN EWAN: All right. Could we take a break then  
24 here about five or 10 minutes.

25

26 MS. MASON: It doesn't matter.

27

28 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Good, break time.

29

30 (Off record)

31 (On record)

32

33 CHAIRMAN EWAN: All right, call the meeting back to  
34 order. We are on the backlog of proposals. I guess, Rachel,  
35 you're going to make comment at this point.

36

37 MS. MASON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Since the issue  
38 of the backlog proposals effecting the Kenai Peninsula came up,  
39 then we thought it would be good to address that issue right  
40 away, especially since it had been mentioned that we have to  
41 work through the backlog. I wanted to be able to tell this  
42 Council where we are with that.

43

44 For several years now, as you know, we've been trying  
45 to work our way through the C&T backlog. And we have been  
46 making considerable headway, but believe it or not, we  
47 dispensed with quite a few of them last year. And it's our

48 goal to dispense with this backlog altogether by the spring  
49 1998 meetings. And as part of that effort we divided the  
50 proposals that are remaining in the backlog into three

0093

1 different categories. Category one consists of those proposals  
2 that are live, that we need to go ahead with and have them  
3 analyzed, have them considered by the Council at the winter  
4 meetings and then acted on by the Board at the spring meeting.

5  
6 Category two consists of proposals that we want to  
7 consult with the Regional Councils about dropping. And these  
8 are those proposals that either have an unknown proponent or  
9 they are such broad requests that they would make analysis very  
10 difficult. So we want to suggest that the Regional Council  
11 drop those requests, and if there are important issues in the  
12 proposals, this would be an opportunity for the Regional  
13 Council or for other interested parties, like the proponents,  
14 to submit requests that are more focused on the important  
15 issues.

16  
17 And then category three, consists of proposals that  
18 have already been tabled by the Councils or else they're beyond  
19 the scope of the current Federal subsistence program. So  
20 bearing in mind that we have divided them into these three  
21 categories.

22  
23 If you look under Tab I, under the C&T backlog  
24 proposals for Region 2, you can see that there are two  
25 proposals in the first category and those are the proposals to  
26 be completed by spring 1998. The first of them, the moose in  
27 Unit 6(C), we have just dealt with and so that's -- that has  
28 been taken care of. The other one, the black bear in Unit  
29 16(B), that is still on the backlog. It was deferred by the  
30 Board at the spring 1997 meetings and so it will have to be  
31 dealt with this year and the analysis will be brought before  
32 you at the winter meeting.

33  
34 In the second category, are the ones that we want to  
35 consult with the Regional Councils about dropping. And there  
36 are seven in this category and most of them are from Unit 13,  
37 and all but one have an unknown proponent and they tend to  
38 come, not from formal C&T requests, but from comments at  
39 meetings. And the one proposal that's in this category that  
40 has a known requester is the one for all furbearers in Unit 13,  
41 and that was the one submitted by Mr. and Mrs. O'Conner and  
42 also the Middle Nenana Fish and Game Advisory Committee. And  
43 the reason that we put this one into this category is that it's  
44 for all furbearers and we were thinking that if this one were  
45 dropped, then a more focused proposal might be submitted for  
46 those species or that species that isn't the most important  
47 issue.

48

49           So I think I'll -- at this point I'll ask the Council,  
50 what is your wish, do you want to drop these or take other

0094

1 action in regard to these proposals?

2 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Any comments about that? I think we  
3 should just go ahead and take them one at a time. You  
4 mentioned the furbearers one. Give us a little background  
5 information on what the proposer is proposing and so on.

6

7 MS. MASON: Okay.

8

9 CHAIRMAN EWAN: If there's no objection, let's get.....

10

11 MS. MASON: Okay. I'll take the ones in this category  
12 one at a time.

13

14 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yeah.

15

16 MS. MASON: The first one in this category is for all  
17 species in Unit 6, and it comes from an unknown proponent in  
18 Whittier. We would like to ask that the Council drop this one  
19 because it's an unknown proponent for all species.

20

21 MR. LOHSE: You mean that's asking for a C&T  
22 determination on all species?

23

24 MS. MASON: Correct, in Unit 6.

25

26 MR. LOHSE: So that would be for all species for all  
27 communities then basically?

28

29 MS. MASON: I think it was asking -- it's hard to say  
30 because there is no original proposal form for this, but I  
31 think it was asking for Whittier to have positive C&T for all  
32 species in Unit 6.

33

34 MR. LOHSE: Okay. I got you now.

35

36 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Would it be possible to put these on a  
37 list of things that are going to be dropped, like a specific  
38 date, unless someone can come forward and explain what they  
39 area and put the nuts and bolts necessary to put the thing back  
40 together again?

41

42 MS. MASON: Sort of, if you don't claim this  
43 proposal.....

44

45 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Yeah.

46

47 MS. MASON: .....by a certain date, then it will be

48 dropped?

49

50 MR. OSKOLKOFF: There you go. Because you more about

0095

1 these proposals, probably by far, than I do since I've barely  
2 seen any of these. But we're only looking at a list and I'm  
3 just wondering if maybe one or two of them might have some  
4 substance to them or something that maybe we're missing.

5  
6 MS. MASON: It's really hard to say with these ones  
7 that have unknown proponents. And with those, you can't even  
8 contact the proponent except through the means that you were  
9 just discussing of putting it on a bulletin board or something.  
10 I would suggest instead they simply be dropped.

11  
12 CHAIRMAN EWAN: I would, too. Ralph, do you have a  
13 comment?

14  
15 MR. LOHSE: I would like to comment on that, too. If  
16 we don't know who put it in, I mean if they didn't put it in  
17 under any group or under their own name, it's just something  
18 that's there. It's no proposal, I would say. I would say drop  
19 it and leave it alone.

20  
21 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Is there any objection to dropping this  
22 particular proposal? Gary, do you?

23  
24 MR. OSKOLKOFF: No, I don't have a problem with that  
25 particular proposal. But I was just wondering, there was  
26 some.....

27  
28 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Let's get that one out of the way.

29  
30 MR. OSKOLKOFF: .....other ones.

31  
32 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Hearing no objection to dropping that  
33 one, the proposal for all species in Unit 6, is that the.....

34  
35 MS. MASON: Um-hum, for Whittier.

36  
37 CHAIRMAN EWAN: .....from Whittier is all we know. And  
38 hearing no objection, we'll drop that.

39  
40 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Yeah, I agree.

41  
42 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

43  
44 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yes.

45  
46 MR. OSKOLKOFF: After reviewing this, I could agree to  
47 the concept of handling these all at once, I think we'll

48 probably end up in the same phase and probably just dropping  
49 them.  
50

0096

1 CHAIRMAN EWAN: I just want to be sure we know what  
2 we're -- we talk a little bit about each proposal.

3  
4 MS. MASON: Yeah.

5  
6 MR. OSKOLKOFF: If you wish, yeah.

7  
8 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yeah, okay. If it doesn't take too  
9 long, let's see the next one.

10  
11 MS. MASON: The next one is the only one that we know  
12 of the proponent of the seven proposals. This is one for all  
13 furbearers in Unit 13 and it was submitted by Mr. and Mrs.  
14 O'Conner and by the Middle Nenana River Fish and Game Advisory  
15 Committee.

16  
17 So this one is one that we do know a little bit more  
18 about. Technically it would be possible to contact the  
19 proponents of this one to ask them.

20  
21 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Where's this person from?

22  
23 MS. MASON: It's -- I don't know where Mr. and Mrs.  
24 O'Conner live. This is -- you know, the Park Service is taking  
25 the lead on this proposal, so Hollis.

26  
27 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Hollis.

28  
29 MR. TWITCHELL: Hollis Twitchell with Denali National  
30 Park. Pat O'Conner was an individual who resided in the  
31 McKinley Village area, just east of the Park within that Mile  
32 Post 216 to 231 area. Several years ago he moved away into the  
33 Palmer area and no longer resides in the McKinley Village area.  
34 I think this was a proposal that he submitted that resulted  
35 from concerns, what happened to that community area with their  
36 use of moose and caribou, in which, they experienced a no  
37 subsistence use determination for that area. That concerned  
38 them and subsequently they submitted the proposal for all  
39 furbearers.

40  
41 Currently, in Unit 13, there is an rural resident  
42 determination for all of the furbearers, Page 75. So  
43 currently, people residing in this area are eligible to use all  
44 furbearers since there's been no determination made. They were  
45 concerned that there might be a determination made that would  
46 exclude them from using furbearers in subsequently submitted  
47 this proposal that would blanket all the furbearers to get an

48 affirmative positive determination.

49

50 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Isn't this proposal a little -- it

0097

1 sounds to me like it's a little broader, stating all of 13,  
2 right?

3

4 MS. MASON: That's why we're suggesting that it be  
5 dropped because it's so broad.

6

7 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Did you have further comment?

8

9 MR. TWITCHELL: That's all.

10

11 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, thank you.

12

13 MR. LOHSE: I make a motion to drop the proposal.....

14

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

16

17 MR. LOHSE: .....60476055.

18

19 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Is there a second to the motion?

20

21 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Second.

22

23 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, the motion's seconded. Further  
24 discussion on the motion.

25

26 MR. KOMPKOFF: Question.

27

28 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Question's called for, all those in  
29 favor say aye.

30

31 IN UNISON: Aye.

32

33 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Opposed by same sign.

34

35 (No opposing responses)

36

37 CHAIRMAN EWAN: We drop the proposal on the furbearers.

38

39 MS. MASON: Okay, the next proposal, like all the  
40 others, has an unknown proponent. This one is for Unit 13, all  
41 species and it came from comments at an EIS meeting.

42

43 MR. LOHSE: But who is it for, we don't even know that?

44

45 MS. MASON: It's for Unit 13. We don't know for whom.

46

47 MR. LOHSE: Okay. How about if we take.....

48  
49 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Bill has his hand up there, okay, go  
50 ahead, Bill.

0098

1

2 MR. KNAUER: Mr. Chairman, you'll notice that there are  
3 a number of these that say, from comments on EIS. At that time  
4 being very new in the program we hadn't yet established a  
5 proposal process and Staff members were just taking and  
6 transcribing comments that we had received. They were not  
7 formal proposals and they have remained in the backlog and so  
8 this is an attempt to -- we have faithfully carried, but where  
9 they are so broad or general or we're unable to determine now,  
10 just exactly what would be proposed, we're bringing it forward  
11 for your resolution.

12

13 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Ralph.

14

15 MR. LOHSE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion,  
16 after looking at these, that we drop 6050, 6051, 6052, 6053.  
17 For one thing, we don't know who they apply to, we just know  
18 the unit. And they were from comments on EIS, not a formal  
19 proposal. I'd like to include 6073, but I'm not sure if that  
20 was a formal proposal or not.

21

22 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Is there a second to that motion?

23

24 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Second.

25

26 CHAIRMAN EWAN: The motion is seconded. Further  
27 discussion on the motion. Comments. Rachel, do you have any  
28 general comments?

29

30 MS. MASON: No, I support what you're doing.

31

32 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Are you prepared to vote on the motion?

33

34 MR. JOHN: Yeah.

35

36 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, all in favor of the motion say  
37 aye.

38

39 IN UNISON: Aye.

40

41 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Opposed by the same sign.

42

43 (No opposing responses)

44

45 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Motion is carried. We took care of all  
46 of them except 073, okay.

47

48 MR. LOHSE: We even took care of that one.

49

50 MS. MASON: He took care of that one, too.

0099

1  
2 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay.

3  
4 MR. LOHSE: Yeah, I said I'd like to include that one.

5  
6 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Oh, you did include it?

7  
8 MR. LOHSE: Yeah.

9  
10 MS. MASON: Okay.

11  
12 MR. LOHSE: I said I don't know whether it was a formal  
13 proposal or not and I'd like to include that one.

14  
15 MS. MASON: It was not.

16  
17 CHAIRMAN EWAN: So we took care of that one, too, okay.

18  
19 MS. MASON: Great.

20  
21 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Does that take care of all the.....

22  
23 MS. MASON: That takes care of all the proposals in  
24 that category. Thank you very much to the Council. Now, we  
25 get to the third category and these are the ones that have  
26 already been tabled or else they are beyond the scope of the  
27 current program. So unless the Council revives them or  
28 untables them, then they remain tabled.

29  
30 There are 12 proposals in this category. one of them  
31 is from a Mr. Crouse and having to do with goat in Unit 6 and  
32 actually that one, we started looking at last year as -- in  
33 order to analyze it and then dropped it because it turned out  
34 not to be a C&T proposal. It was a comment at a meeting to the  
35 effect that Cordova residents should be removed from the  
36 Chenega goat hunt. The next three on your list here are all  
37 for non-rural areas and hence they are beyond the scope of the  
38 current Federal subsistence program. The remaining eight  
39 proposals in this category are all for C&T on the Kenai  
40 Peninsula. And these are all -- we considered -- when the  
41 Council tabled consideration of all C&T beyond moose in Unit  
42 15, that these were all tabled with them. So at this point,  
43 the Regional Council is not asked to take any action on the  
44 proposals in this third category because they've already been  
45 tabled. However, this would be the opportunity to revive them  
46 if there is interest in having a C&T for those issues.

47

48                   CHAIRMAN EWAN:  Could you give us the numbers on those  
49 ones you're talking about?  
50

0100

1 MS. MASON: Sure.

2 CHAIRMAN EWAN: C197 on down through.....

3

4 MS. MASON: C197, C198, I also should mention that for  
5 those first two, C197 and C198, those were not C&T proposals,  
6 they were subpart (D) proposals for a brown bear on the Kenai  
7 Peninsula. But in order for them to be done, a C&T would have  
8 been necessary so they were put in the backlog, not because the  
9 proponent had requested C&T, but just because C&T would be  
10 required in order to do them.

11

12 CHAIRMAN EWAN: So you're just opening it up to see if  
13 any of these want to be taken up at this time -- do we want to  
14 take up any of these proposals?

15

16 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Yeah, leave them tabled.

17

18 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Just leave them tabled?

19

20 MR. JOHN: Keep them tabled.

21

22 MR. LOHSE: Yeah, I would say so, just leave them  
23 tabled.

24

25 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Is there any objection to leaving these  
26 proposals that we're discussing right now tabled?

27

28 (No opposing responses)

29

30 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Hearing none, we'll continue with  
31 they'll be tabled. We'll just move on.

32

33 MS. MASON: Unless there's action by the Regional  
34 Council, these will remain tabled.

35

36 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Do we need a motion, does somebody want  
37 to make a motion -- do we need a motion?

38

39 MS. MASON: No.

40

41 MR. KNAUER: No.

42

43 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. Where are we now?

44

45 MR. LOHSE: But this is the backlog of our proposals  
46 then? These are the only proposals that are left on the table  
47 for our area?

48  
49  
50

MS. MASON: Right.

0101  
1 MR. LOHSE: Do I understand right?  
2 MS. MASON: Right.  
3  
4 MR. LOHSE: So that's not that many.  
5  
6 MS. MASON: Since they remain tabled, the only live  
7 proposal in the backlog for this Council is the black bear in  
8 Unit 16(B), which you can expect to act upon at the winter  
9 meetings.  
10  
11 MR. KNAUER: They'll have both those brown bear and  
12 black bear for Unit 13.  
13  
14 MS. MASON: There are some proposals for brown bear --  
15 one for brown bear and one for black bear. They're in Unit 13  
16 and 20(A), and so they will effect your region as well as  
17 Region 9, the Eastern Interior.  
18  
19 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, we'll move on then. These  
20 proposals we're talking about will continue being tabled. I  
21 guess we already commented about process earlier so you have an  
22 idea that we want to take them eventually, one by one. Where  
23 are we at now?  
24  
25 MR. LOHSE: 9H3. We were going to take that up so that  
26 we could have it while Gary was here.  
27  
28 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, do you want to take up Proposal  
29 9H3, okay. Who's going to take the lead on that?  
30  
31 MS. MASON: I am. But I'm looking for my notes here.  
32  
33 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay.  
34  
35 MS. MASON: Okay. This is research possibilities. And  
36 at previous Regional Council meetings, either I or somebody  
37 else has brought before the Council the need for more  
38 information on subsistence harvest patterns on the Kenai  
39 Peninsula. And particularly in the community of Ninilchik, but  
40 for several other communities as well. And it's also been  
41 brought up that the ADF&G harvest ticket data covers only a  
42 period since the 1980s, and doesn't cover the historical  
43 period, even the recent historical period from the 50s and 60s.  
44  
45 So we had originally proposed that ADF&G, Division of  
46 Subsistence conduct a harvest survey in Ninilchik, as well as,  
47 tentatively in Seldovia and the Homer rural area. And when the

48 Council discussed this possibility, some concerns were raised,  
49 notably, some of the other members of the Council as well as  
50 Gary, had suggested that more effort go into agreements with

0102

1 tribal entities. And so we have continued our efforts to find  
2 the best approach to getting the best data, getting the best  
3 information about the harvests in these communities and  
4 historical patterns. So Helga and I have begun discussions  
5 with the Ninilchik Traditional Council about a joint project in  
6 Ninilchik involving both, the gathering of oral history from  
7 knowledgeable people and also a harvest survey of randomly  
8 selected households. So the traditional council would direct  
9 the portion of the study concerning the oral history, whereas  
10 the ADF&G, Division of Subsistence, would direct the portion of  
11 the study dealing with the household survey. So this would  
12 allow both for the historical oral history data to be  
13 collected, as well as the harvest survey which would be  
14 comparable with other communities that the Division of  
15 Subsistence has worked in. And in order to discuss this  
16 possibility, Helga and I have been invited to go to Ninilchik  
17 on October 29th to discuss this, make a presentation at the  
18 Elders Conference that's being held by the NTC.

19  
20 So we haven't gotten too far in working out this plan  
21 or possibility for other communities, but it's hoped that a  
22 similar division of labor between a tribal entity and the  
23 Division of Subsistence could take place in Seldovia. The  
24 situation in the Homer rural area is a little different, and  
25 there it occurs to me, also since we -- it has been brought up,  
26 the rural and non-rural determination, that the need for that  
27 data in the Homer rural area is particularly linked to the  
28 question of the rural/non-rural determination.

29  
30 So this is presented as information to the Council, but  
31 we would like to have the support of the Council for this  
32 project, thank you.

33  
34 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Any questions or comments from the  
35 Council?

36  
37 MR. JOHN: No.

38  
39 CHAIRMAN EWAN: No action at this point, right.

40  
41 MS. MASON: Okay, thank you.

42  
43 CHAIRMAN EWAN: No action required?

44  
45 MS. MASON: No, none.

46  
47 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. Are we down to the -- we're

48 ahead of schedule, aren't we?

49

50 MS. EAKON: I would say right on because we took some

0103

1 new business items out of cycle. We are at old business Item  
2 8(D), request for reconsideration and I'm going to ask Sue  
3 Detwiler (sic) to kind of say a few words on this.

4

5 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Sure State the proposal again, which  
6 one?

7

8 MS. MASON: This is for RFR's, it's under Tab H in your  
9 book. This deals with the request for reconsideration that  
10 were sent in.

11

12 The State of Alaska sent four RFR's for your region and  
13 Safari Club sent one. Three of the RFR's, five altogether,  
14 represent new objections to proposals for which there have  
15 already been RFR's in past years. For one of them ADF&G  
16 requested another reconsideration of the C&T determination for  
17 black bear in Unit 6, and both ADF&G and the Safari Club  
18 renewed the objections to the C&T determination for moose in  
19 Unit 15(A).

20

21 In response to those renewed objections, the Federal  
22 Subsistence Board sent out letters both to ADF&G and to the  
23 Safari Club saying that there would be no further  
24 reconsideration of those issues, since the RFR's contained no  
25 new information.

26

27 Another of this years RFR's from ADF&G concerned --  
28 this one concerned sheep in Units 11 and 12, and it pointed to  
29 an error in recording the action in the Federal register. And  
30 that -- response to that has been corrected. The fourth RFR  
31 from ADF&G for your region and the only one still requiring  
32 action is one that asks for reevaluation for the C&T for goat  
33 in Unit 11. This was Proposal 22 last spring. And generally,  
34 the main focus of the RFR was that the eight C&T factors had  
35 not been adequately met in the determination, and particularly  
36 not the factor that's for a long-term consistent pattern of  
37 use. As you may recall, on that proposal, the Council and the  
38 Board recommendation was for a positive C&T for the seven Ahtna  
39 villages, plus Tonsina, Dot Lake, and the residents of Unit 11.  
40 And in the case of that RFR, the requester has agreed to wait  
41 until the spring for that to be brought before the Councils and  
42 the Board, so the Staff analysis for this RFR will be brought  
43 before you for consideration at the winter meetings.

44

45 Thank you.

46

47 CHAIRMAN EWAN: There's no action required here then?

48  
49  
50

MS. MASON: This is informational.

0104

1 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Ralph.

2 MR. LOHSE: Mr. Chair, could I ask, Rachel, I just need  
3 a clarification. So basically the Federal Subsistence Board  
4 has answered them on all except the one on goat in Unit 11?

5  
6 MS. MASON: That's right.

7  
8 MR. LOHSE: And do you have the specific objections  
9 that the ADF&G had to goat in Unit 11?

10  
11 MS. MASON: I do have that -- I do have their request  
12 for reconsideration, it's in your book here.

13  
14 MR. LOHSE: Can you synopsise what the.....

15  
16 MS. MASON: The only thing that I can tell you  
17 specifically is that there -- they -- the requester felt that  
18 the eight factors had not been met.....

19  
20 MR. LOHSE: For all the communities?

21  
22 MS. MASON: Right. For the communities that ended up  
23 with a positive recommendation for C&T that there was not  
24 evidence of a long-term pattern of use for those communities.

25  
26 MR. LOHSE: Okay, they didn't list specific communities  
27 that they objected to, they just said.....

28  
29 MS. MASON: I don't recall exactly what their  
30 objections were.

31  
32 MR. LOHSE: I don't think they did when I read through  
33 it.

34  
35 MS. MASON: There are detailed objections listed in the  
36 RFR.

37  
38 MR. LOHSE: Okay. You'll have that in the book that  
39 we'll be getting?

40  
41 MS. MASON: The analysis will cover those objections.

42  
43 MR. LOHSE: Okay.

44  
45 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, we'll move on then to the next  
46 item, and that is -- Helga, do we have others that we skipped  
47 over?

48

49 MS. EAKON: No. We have taken care of the ones that we  
50 moved up on the agenda, Mr. Chair.

0105

1

2 CHAIRMAN EWAN: So we are on new business then?

3

4 MS. EAKON: New business, that's correct, call for  
5 proposals.

6

7 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. Are there any proposals from the  
8 public? From agencies? From the Regional Council, I guess,  
9 right?

10

11 MS. EAKON: Um-hum.

12

13 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Do you want to discuss one at this  
14 time, Don?

15

16 MR. KOMPKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I have a proposal, two of  
17 them.

18

19 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay.

20

21 MR. KOMPKOFF: My proposal is to add residents of  
22 Chenega Bay and Tatitlek to those having a positive C&T for  
23 moose in Unit 6(A), (B) and 6(C). And the other proposal is  
24 brought to me by my board council, they asked me if I could  
25 send in a proposal for the residents of Chenega and Tatitlek to  
26 bring up a 30 day extension for a moose hunt in Kings Bay. And  
27 that's all I have.

28

29 CHAIRMAN EWAN: As I understand it, your first proposal  
30 is to have C&T determination for Chenega and Tatitlek for moose  
31 in 6(A) and (C); is that correct?

32

33 MR. KOMPKOFF: 6(A), 6(B) and 6(C).

34

35 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Oh, 6(B) and (C), okay. Do you want to  
36 make a motion, I don't know the process here or.....

37

38 MS. EAKON: No, Mr. Chair, this comes from a Regional  
39 Council member which is just informational only unless you  
40 wanted to endorse it, culture wide. But if you do not, he was  
41 just so informing you.

42

43 MR. LOHSE: This would be a proposal that would be on  
44 next year.

45

46 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Next year?

47

48 MS. EAKON: It's going to appear in the proposal book  
49 that's going to be published and it will be analyzed.  
50

0106

1 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay.

2 MS. EAKON: You're going to consider it at the winter  
3 meeting.

4  
5 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, should we discuss it at this time  
6 then?

7  
8 MS. EAKON: No, this is strictly informational.

9  
10 CHAIRMAN EWAN: All right. And the other, just so we  
11 understand, the other one was for.....

12  
13 MR. KOMPKOFF: Thirty day extension for a moose hunt in  
14 Kings Bay for the residents of Chenega and Tatitlek.

15  
16 CHAIRMAN EWAN: We were going to look at that again,  
17 anyway, weren't we? That was the recommendation, we'll look at  
18 that on a yearly basis, if I recall?

19  
20 MS. MASON: No.

21  
22 CHAIRMAN EWAN: No.

23  
24 MS. MASON: That was just for one year.

25  
26 CHAIRMAN EWAN: That was just for one year with no  
27 provisions for review, okay. Well, thank you. Any other  
28 proposals? Is that it?

29  
30 MS. EAKON: To kind of help you along, if you have any  
31 proposals that any of you would like to proffer, Rachel Mason  
32 has already given you the update on the C&T backlog. We do  
33 have on your agenda, a discussion of Unit 11, goat season.  
34 Last year you recommended a C&T, however, there is still no  
35 goat season in Unit 11. If you wanted to proffer a proposal to  
36 so establish a goat season, now would be the time for you, as a  
37 Regional Council, to do it.

38  
39 CHAIRMAN EWAN: So I don't know if anyone wants to make  
40 a proposal at this point? Do you know of anyone that has one?

41  
42 MS. EAKON: Unless CRNA has one. Is Gloria here? No.

43  
44 MR. JOHN: Gloria is working on one though. Yes, I  
45 think she's got one that she's going to send in.

46  
47 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, we'll skip over that one then.

48  
49 MS. EAKON: Okay. And then Item 9A3C, elders hunt for  
50 sheep in Unit 11. As you may recall, that was last year's

0107

1 Proposal 68 proffered by Robert Marshall. And Jay Wells, of  
2 the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park is here to give you  
3 information on that, Mr. Chair.

4

5 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yes, Jay, how are you doing?

6

7 MR. WELLS: Good Roy.

8

9 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Made her up, how's the road? You want  
10 to comment on this proposal, Jay.

11

12 MR. WELLS: Hi, my name's Jay Wells, and thanks for  
13 asking me up here, Roy. I don't have much to update you on  
14 with this except that last week we did meet with CRNA and talk  
15 about this proposal. Robert couldn't be there. And if you  
16 remember last meeting at our Subsistence Resource Commission  
17 meeting, we talked about this proposal and unfortunately Robert  
18 was not at that meeting and the Commission voted to endorse a  
19 designated hunter program, thinking that would satisfy the need  
20 that Robert had expressed through his proposal, and that did go  
21 through.

22

23 But since then, in talking with Robert, he would still  
24 like to see an elder hunt for that area. And we have a -- we  
25 tried to meet with Robert yesterday and we couldn't do that.  
26 But we have a meeting setup for Thursday with Robert to work  
27 through and try and develop a proposal. So we're not really  
28 ready at this time to put a proposal forward with Robert.  
29 We're hoping that we can do that together and we would like to  
30 run that through the Subsistence Resource Commission at the  
31 November -- the early November meeting, I think November 2nd --  
32 or the 3rd and 4th in Glennallen. So I doubt if we'll be ready  
33 for that October 24th deadline, but we've been unable to get  
34 together with Robert on that. And the Park Service doesn't  
35 want to put a proposal through without talking to Robert on  
36 that.

37

38 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, thank you, Jay for your comment.  
39 Just to refresh everyone's memory a little bit about this  
40 proposal. Robert Marshall proposed this. Robert Marshall is  
41 an elder from the Copper River region. He wanted to be able to  
42 hunt, I guess, a little later than the season is right now to  
43 allow, I guess the sheep to come down -- further down the  
44 mountain where some of the elders can have access to them. I  
45 think we recommended that we support this from the Wrangell-St.  
46 Elias Subsistence Resource Commission and also it went to the  
47 Federal Subsistence Board and I spoke at the Federal

48 Subsistence Board about this proposal. I supported the idea  
49 and the Federal Subsistence Board liked the idea and wants to  
50 do something along the lines that Robert Marshall proposed, but

0108

1 we need to find a way. And that's where it is right now, the  
2 Federal Subsistence Board said lets postpone it for this year  
3 and see if we could find a way to do that next year. To have a  
4 special hunt for elders for sheep that can't climb some of  
5 these mountains, and sheep do come down later in the season.  
6 And that's what Robert Marshall wanted to be able to do. How  
7 we do it is the problem.

8  
9 I think the regional solicitor that was at the Federal  
10 Subsistence Board meeting said that it can be done for elders.  
11 But he didn't say how we could do it. I mean maybe that's  
12 something we got to find out, how can we accommodate the  
13 elders. Any comments by anybody else?

14  
15 MR. WILLIS: Mr. Chair, if you look on Tab I, Page 24  
16 of your booklets, you'll find some information that was  
17 provided by Mr. Goltz, in which he stated, that it would be  
18 possible to establish an elders hunt providing that a rationale  
19 defined group such as persons over age 65, which is the  
20 recognized age break could be established. And that it would  
21 also be helpful if customary hunting practices for that age  
22 group that are different from other age groups could be  
23 provided. And that's one of the things that we have asked the  
24 Park Service and Gloria Stickwan to provide in the proposal  
25 that's forthcoming.

26  
27 MS. EAKON: I want to ask Mr. Bill Knauer as well, on  
28 behalf of Mr. Marshall and the Wrangell-SRC, if after their  
29 meeting, they go a little bit past their deadline, can they go  
30 ahead and still submit it as a courtesy or what?

31  
32 MR. KNAUER: It would actually be better to have a  
33 draft proposal submitted prior to the deadline and then follow-  
34 up with necessary comments and coordination. The deadline is  
35 in there so that the Staff have adequate time to thoroughly  
36 analyze the proposals to provide good information to the  
37 Regional Councils. If it's a day or so late, if at all  
38 possible, we do include it in the book, but we can't always  
39 guarantee whether or not a late proposal will be able to be  
40 placed in the proposal booklet.

41  
42 CHAIRMAN EWAN: I would add to my comment one more  
43 thing. I would discuss that the Federal Subsistence Board, and  
44 that is, the possibility of using the designated hunter to hunt  
45 for the elders. I had talked with Robert Marshall and he  
46 didn't think that that was a solution because it would be  
47 difficult to get a hunter, you know, to climb the mountain for

48 you to hunt for you, it's not that easy. There's still a  
49 problem. There's still a need to be filled. I support the  
50 concept of doing something for those that are not able to climb

0109

1 the mountain to get sheep meat. How we get there is the  
2 problem. Ralph.

3  
4 MR. LOHSE: I'd like to go along with Roy there. From  
5 reading what Robert Marshall is talking about and just from  
6 doing some thinking on it, the designated hunter idea satisfies  
7 the idea of producing meat, but that's not the idea. The idea  
8 is to allow those with historic background, you know, elders,  
9 who have lived and hunted in that area an opportunity to hunt.  
10 It would be done at the expense of the younger population,  
11 there's no question about that. But like it points out in this  
12 background, it could not be restricted to Native elders only,  
13 it would have to include all those that are in the C&T area  
14 that are over a certain age.

15  
16 It would actually -- some of the objections to that  
17 extended hunt that are written in here, would be satisfied by  
18 the fact that you limit it to -- and I'll use our older  
19 generation, because it says, an extended hunt season would be  
20 open to all subsistence users and would be most beneficial to  
21 younger hunters with ATVs or snowmachines, and that would have  
22 a serious impact on the sheep. However, I think if we limit it  
23 to those that are over 65 and you could limit it to foot  
24 access, basically, you know, up on the mountain itself, you're  
25 not going to have that big of an impact on the population of  
26 the sheep, and yet, you would do what's really the proposal is.  
27 The proposal's not about meat, the proposal's about giving  
28 those older people an opportunity to do what they did in the  
29 past.

30  
31 I'd like to see something worked out on this myself.

32  
33 CHAIRMAN EWAN: If we don't have a specific proposal  
34 today, we're delaying again right?

35  
36 MR. LOHSE: No, this is just telling us what's in the  
37 works right now.

38  
39 CHAIRMAN EWAN: All right. We don't need to be part of  
40 the process, it's beyond us already, correct?

41  
42 MR. LOHSE: It's not to us yet.

43  
44 CHAIRMAN EWAN: It's not too us yet? I thought Bill  
45 said something about having to have something specific.

46  
47 MR. KNAUER: The group that is working on it, Park

48 Service along with the Subsistence Resource Commission and Mr.  
49 Marshall, that's the group that will be coming forward with  
50 either a proposal or a draft proposal that they'll need further

0110

1 coordination on. So there is nothing that this Regional  
2 Council needs to do right now.

3

4 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. But the Board, the Federal  
5 Subsistence Board, you think will act on this this year?

6

7 MS. MASON: If a proposal comes in, yes, it will be for  
8 this year.

9

10 CHAIRMAN EWAN: I see.

11

12 MR. WELLS: Roy, that is on our agenda for the SRC  
13 meeting in early November, to come up with a proposal if the  
14 SRC can. We'll do some of the ground work on that beforehand  
15 with Robert. Robert sits on the Commission as does Roy and  
16 Fred.

17

18 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, thank you. We'll move on then.  
19 That took care of that. Review of regulations by units.

20

21 MS. EAKON: Yes, Mr. Chair, I had reproduced the  
22 Federal regulations as well as the State regulations beginning  
23 on Page I-40 for your Federal regulations and beginning on Page  
24 I-79 are the State regulations. These were to help you along  
25 in case you saw any Federal regulation that you would like  
26 changed and that's how come I put it on the agenda like that,  
27 Mr. Chair.

28

29 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Any questions or comments on this?  
30 Well, we'll move on if there are none, okay.

31

32 MS. EAKON: Okay.

33

34 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Go ahead.

35

36 MS. EAKON: Item 9B, Mr. Chair, Regional Council  
37 charter. If you will please look under Tab J you will see a  
38 copy of the Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory  
39 Council charter. As you may recall, the Federal Advisory  
40 Committee Act provides that these charters must be renewed on  
41 even number years. And the items that you can change in your  
42 Regional Council charter are, you can change the name of your  
43 Regional Council. You could recommend a boundary change. You  
44 could recommend a change in the size of your membership. And  
45 you could have a say so in the criteria for removing a member  
46 and you do also make Subsistence Resource Commission  
47 appointments. So if there are any items that you wish to offer

48 for change, now is the time to do it because it does take time  
49 to get these changes from the 10 State wide Regional Councils  
50 to the Federal Subsistence Board in time to have the charter

0111

1 renewed in '98.

2 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, any comments from the Council on  
3 this? Yes, Ralph.

4

5 MR. LOHSE: Mr. Chair, I think the only one that's in  
6 question at this time is the size of the Regional Council and  
7 we went through that at the last meeting. I don't see any  
8 parts of the charter that need changed at this point in time.

9

10 CHAIRMAN EWAN: I recall we discussed the criteria for  
11 removing a member, right, at one time?

12

13 MR. LOHSE: Yeah.

14

15 CHAIRMAN EWAN: A number of meetings missed or  
16 something like that.

17

18 MS. EAKON: If a member skipped two consecutive  
19 meetings, that you would ask questions of that member, however,  
20 there has not been any problems with your current makeup, Mr.  
21 Chair.

22

23 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, so I guess we're not recommending  
24 any changes; is that correct?

25

26 MR. JOHN: Right.

27

28 CHAIRMAN EWAN: No change.

29

30 MS. EAKON: If you like your present charter, a motion  
31 would be in order to approve it as it is.

32

33 MR. LOHSE: I make a motion we approved the charter as  
34 stands.

35

36 MR. JOHN: I second it.

37

38 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Motion and second that we keep the  
39 charter as it is. Any further discussion on the motion?

40

41 MR. DEMENTI: Question.

42

43 MR. JOHN: Question.

44

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

47

48           IN UNISON:   Aye.  
49  
50           CHAIRMAN EWAN:   Opposed by the same sign.

0112

1  
2 (No opposing responses)

3  
4 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Motion is carried. Okay, the next item  
5 is.....

6  
7 MS. EAKON: Update on Federal Subsistence Fisheries  
8 Management Implementation by Bill Knauer.

9  
10 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, Bill.

11  
12 MR. KNAUER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We had a large  
13 series of overheads to present to you, however, I think the  
14 Regional Council is aware that there have been some significant  
15 developments at the national level. There was, in fact, in  
16 place a moratorium that prohibited the implementation and the  
17 publication of final regulations for Federal expansion of  
18 jurisdiction for fisheries. That moratorium was attached to  
19 the budget bill last year and would have expired 30 September.  
20 As you're aware there was not a Budget Bill -- there has not  
21 been a Budget Bill passed for this coming year yet, however,  
22 there was what's called a continuing resolution passed by  
23 Congress. That's sort of a stop gap measure that says, you can  
24 keep spending money at the same level that you did last year  
25 until we have time to pass a budget for you. Attached to that  
26 continuing resolution were some amendments placed on it by  
27 Senator Stevens which did a number of things.

28  
29 One of which, essentially continued the moratorium  
30 until December 1st, 1998 and offered some amendments to Title  
31 VIII of ANILCA that would go into effect if the State passed  
32 either a Constitutional amendment or laws that provided for  
33 compliance with Title VIII. This was to give the State  
34 Legislature and so on, the Task Force, a chance to come to  
35 resolution to attempt to regain the subsistence management for  
36 Alaska. So as far as fisheries goes, from the Federal  
37 standpoint, we are now in the same position we were last year;  
38 we're on hold until either the State does something and comes  
39 into compliance or until December 1st of 1998.

40  
41 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Any questions or comments? Go ahead  
42 Ralph.

43  
44 MR. LOHSE: Just basically one question. Now,  
45 basically when you say you're on hold, all management decisions  
46 and working towards those decisions are just at status quo  
47 then, right? Or are you going ahead with plans and things like

48 that so that you'd be ready at that time?

49

50 MR. KNAUER: We have the documentation that would be

0113

1 needed to publish a proposed rule, an environmental assessment  
2 and so on that would be necessary if the leaders decided it  
3 would be appropriate to publish a proposed rule prior to  
4 December 1st or shortly thereafter.

5  
6 MR. KOMPKOFF: I have a question.

7  
8 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Go ahead, Don.

9  
10 MR. KOMPKOFF: What is this new deal on halibut IFQ's  
11 quota that just came out?

12  
13 MR. KNAUER: I'm sorry, but I'm unaware of anything.  
14 That's done through the North Pacific Fisheries Management  
15 Council and I'm unaware of that. I don't know whether there's  
16 anyone else here in the room that might be familiar with it.

17  
18 CHAIRMAN EWAN: What Bill reported on, I might add, the  
19 Secretary of Interior Babbitt is involved, so I believe that  
20 what you reported is what's going to be for this coming year,  
21 it's still pending though; isn't that correct?

22  
23 MR. KNAUER: It's still pending.

24  
25 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yeah.

26  
27 MR. KNAUER: It's my understanding that it has not been  
28 -- the continuing resolution has actually not been signed, but  
29 Secretary Babbitt is not going to recommend that the President  
30 veto it. Now, there may be other parties, it's my  
31 understanding that the Alaska Federation of Natives has sent a  
32 resolution to the President recommending he veto it. I don't  
33 know whether or not he will take them on that in conjunction  
34 with a number of other requests or not. We should know within  
35 the next few days.

36  
37 CHAIRMAN EWAN: It could go either way, I think,  
38 myself. I've been part of that process. I was on the  
39 teleconference with Secretary Babbitt and Senator Stevens, and  
40 one of the things that's involved here is I guess there was a  
41 meeting with the Native Task Force with the President some time  
42 ago. At which meeting, the President stated that nothing would  
43 happen on the subsistence one way or the other without Native  
44 involvement in the process. And that is the basis for AFN's  
45 objection, we were not involved in the process, not at all.  
46 Whether the President will backup his word or not, you know.

47

48           Okay, thanks, if that's it.

49

50           MR. KNAUER: Thank you.

0114

1

2 CHAIRMAN EWAN: We'll go on to Task Force report,  
3 Federal Subsistence Board, and I guess Sue does this.

4

5 MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the  
6 Council. This agenda item is essentially a status report on  
7 restructuring of the Federal Subsistence Board. And it's also  
8 an opportunity for the Regional Council to comment on Board  
9 restructuring. I do have some transparencies that I'm prepared  
10 to use as a tool if you want. I'm not quite sure how the setup  
11 would be. The information that I do have to present is in your  
12 books there behind Section L, I think, so you can work from  
13 that or I can use the transparencies if you want. It might be  
14 helpful to the people in the audience who don't have those  
15 books.

16

17 MR. LOHSE: Does everybody in the audience have access  
18 to what we have in L

19

20 MS. DETWILER: I think they do. I think the handouts  
21 are on the back table back there.

22

23 MR. LOHSE: Sue, do your transparencies have different  
24 information or more information?

25

26 MS. DETWILER: It's about the same. It's just ordered  
27 a little bit differently.

28

29 The issue of restructuring the Federal Subsistence  
30 Board has been suggested several times in the last two years.  
31 It started a couple of years ago with the annual reports of the  
32 Northwest Arctic and Seward Peninsula Regional Councils, in  
33 which, they made recommendations to the Secretary of the  
34 Interior to completely restructure the Board so that it  
35 includes only members of each of the 10 Regional Councils,  
36 rather than the existing Board, which is composed of the agency  
37 heads. The rationale for those recommendations was that the  
38 Council Chairs felt that -- or those Councils felt that the  
39 agency head were not sufficiently aware of subsistence user's  
40 needs and therefore couldn't be responsive to subsistence uses  
41 as a board composed of a subsistence users as Regional Council  
42 Chairs would be.

43

44 That request to totally revamp the Board was  
45 subsequently submitted again by the Seward Peninsula Regional  
46 Council in 1996, I believe, and was adopted collectively by all  
47 10 Regional Council Chairs at their joint meeting that was held

48 in November of 1996. At that time the 10 Regional Council  
49 Chairs met, jointly, with the Federal Subsistence Board and  
50 made their recommendation to restructure the Board to be

0115

1 composed of those 10 Chairs. After -- in April of this year,  
2 the Council Chairs met again and changed their recommendation  
3 so that they recommended to the Federal Subsistence Board that  
4 the existing Board restructure be retained, but one seat -- at  
5 least one seat be added to allow for one Regional Council  
6 representative nominated by the Chairs to be recognized as a  
7 voting member on the Board. The Regional Council Chairs  
8 presented that recommendation at the joint, Chair, Board  
9 Council meeting in April, and as a result of that discussion in  
10 that work session a task force was established to look into the  
11 issue. The task force is composed of Mitch Demientieff, who is  
12 the Chair of the Board. Bill Thomas, who is the Chair of  
13 Southeast Regional Council. And then Jim Caplan, who is the  
14 Board member representing Forest Service. And Dave Allen, who  
15 represents Fish and Wildlife Service. And the purpose of that  
16 task force was to explore different options for restructuring  
17 the Board. Prepare options for the Regional Councils to  
18 discuss at these fall meetings. And then report back to the  
19 Board after the Regional Councils had had an opportunity to  
20 comment and the task force had an opportunity to evaluate what  
21 the Council's had said.

22  
23 The task force met in June of this year, they were  
24 provided with background information that was useful to them in  
25 identifying options in restructuring the Board. In their  
26 discussion, they identified a couple of important constraints  
27 for Board restructuring. One constraint was that they wanted  
28 the Board to retain its regulatory authority. The way that  
29 Federal law is written now, regulatory authority has to be  
30 retained by Federal employees. So if the Board were to be  
31 restructured to be composed of -- to include people who aren't  
32 Federal employees, then it was lose its regulatory authority.  
33 The regulatory authority would likely go back to Washington,  
34 D.C.

35  
36 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Can I ask a question on that?

37  
38 MS. DETWILER: Sure.

39  
40 CHAIRMAN EWAN: How is Mitch Demientieff treated  
41 because.....

42  
43 MS. DETWILER: His was a special case and that leads  
44 me right into the next point that I was going to make. Which  
45 was, that during their discussion on retaining regulatory  
46 authority, it was pointed out that Mitch is specially appointed  
47 to serve as a Federal employee only for his service on the

48 Board. It's kind of an anomaly and it breaks new ground. And  
49 there was some concern that if the -- if the issue were raised  
50 back in Washington to be adding more non-Federal employees to

0116

1 the Board, it might also raise concern about how Mitch was  
2 appointed. It might cause people to reconsider whether or not  
3 he should have been appointed to Federal employee status solely  
4 for purposes of serving on the Board. So there was some  
5 concern raising the broader issue of appointing non-Federal  
6 employees to Federal status just for serving on the Board might  
7 put Mitch's position as a Federal employee for the purposes of  
8 the Board in jeopardy as well. So the regulatory authority was  
9 one constraint.

10

11 And then the other constraint was, if for some reason a  
12 decision was made that -- in fact, the Board would be  
13 restructured to include Regional Council Chairs then it would  
14 become advisory. But there's some difficulties to overcome in  
15 converting to advisory status. Probably the most important of  
16 which is that there are some pretty strong statutory and  
17 executive order prohibitions about creating advisory committees  
18 that duplicate the work of existing advisory committees. And  
19 so the concern would be that a Federal Subsistence Board that  
20 was advisory would seem to be duplicating the existing Regional  
21 Advisory Councils. So it's pretty unlikely that the Board  
22 could become another advisory committee.

23

24 So having identified those constraints, the Board came  
25 up with three, what they thought, might be viable alternative  
26 structures for the Council's to comment on. And they're  
27 specifically asking for Regional Council comments on these  
28 three alternatives. Although, you can certainly come up with  
29 additional alternatives if you want. The first one is just the  
30 existing Board which is composed of the five agency heads plus  
31 the Chair appointed by the Secretary. The second alternative  
32 would be the existing Board plus at least one Regional Council  
33 Chair nominated by the Council Chairs and that was the  
34 recommendation that was put forth by the collective Regional  
35 Council Chairs in April. And then a third option that the task  
36 force developed, was to have the existing Board plus one  
37 subsistence user and one representative nominated by the  
38 Governor.

39

40 So those are the options. And the background  
41 information that you have in your booklets there for you to  
42 review and comment on. And once all of the Regional Councils  
43 have had an opportunity to comment, and then after these  
44 meetings, the task force will reconvene and evaluate the  
45 comments and make their recommendation to the Federal  
46 Subsistence Board. And a particular point that the task force  
47 wanted to make sure got conveyed to the Councils was the task

48 force will not recommend any change in Board structure that  
49 would be detrimental to subsistence users. That's the end of  
50 my presentation.

0117

1

2 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Thank you. Any questions or comments.  
3 Ralph.

4

5 MR. LOHSE: I'd like to ask Sue a couple of questions  
6 the way I understand it. We've got this -- they've got three  
7 alternatives down here, but two of them run into the problem of  
8 delegation of authority, don't they?

9

10 MS. DETWILER: (Nods head affirmatively)

11

12 MR. LOHSE: So basically two of these alternatives turn  
13 the Federal Subsistence Board from a regulatory position to an  
14 advisory position unless some special laws are passed or some  
15 special compensation is made to make these people Federal  
16 employees?

17

18 MS. DETWILER: That's a grey area. We're not sure  
19 which -- how many non-Federal employees it would take to cause  
20 it to become an advisory committee. It's -- as I mentioned  
21 before, Mitch's appointment was plowing new ground back in  
22 Washington, D.C. We don't know that the tolerance level back  
23 in Washington would be for appointments. And the task force  
24 felt that these three were probably viable. But the more -- as  
25 you increase the number of appointees to Federal status, then  
26 that does increase the likelihood of having to revert to the  
27 advisory status.

28

29 So in other words, if you were going to add more non-  
30 Federal employees to the Board, it's best to have as few as  
31 possible in order to increase the likelihood the Board would  
32 retain its regulatory status.

33

34 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yes, Ralph.

35

36 MR. LOHSE: Mr. Chair, if what I'm understanding Sue to  
37 say is that basically the more changes that are made, the more  
38 possibility of review in Washington, which could then result in  
39 the Board going from a regulatory to an advisory status,  
40 depending on what the political climate is and things like  
41 that.

42

43 MS. DETWILER: That's precisely correct. That was the  
44 task force's feeling.

45

46 CHAIRMAN EWAN: I don't know, my feeling is that we  
47 made our recommendation and I'm going to stick with that until

48 I guess we're shot down or something for some reason or  
49 another.  
50

0118

1 MS. DETWILER: Pardon me, we, meaning the collective  
2 Council Chair's recommending.....

3  
4 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yeah.

5  
6 MS. DETWILER: .....number two?

7  
8 CHAIRMAN EWAN: I hope that the Council understands  
9 what we recommended as Council Chairs and that you support that  
10 recommendation. If there is a problem -- we know there is a  
11 problem for sure then maybe we can back off on our position,  
12 but we ought to stick to our guns. Ralph.

13  
14 MR. LOHSE: Mr. Chair, Roy, I think though that what  
15 you're dealing with is that you're actually dealing with two  
16 sets of -- in a way two sets of people making recommendations,  
17 the Council Chairs is not the same as the Council. And I think  
18 when the Council Chairs make recommendations, then they bring  
19 it back to their individual Councils to see whether or not  
20 their Councils agree with them or back them up. They can make  
21 recommendations as the Chairs, even if that doesn't agree with  
22 what their Council says.

23  
24 Basically what's being brought to us right here is that  
25 if -- well, if the Council Chair's recommendation was made that  
26 it would be basically all the heads of the Council Chairs, we  
27 would turn from a -- they would have no regulatory power at  
28 all, and then all regulations would be formatted in Washington,  
29 D.C.

30  
31 CHAIRMAN EWAN: No, the proposal is for only one; the  
32 latest proposal.

33  
34 MR. LOHSE: Oh, the latest proposal.

35  
36 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Just one person.

37  
38 MR. LOHSE: Okay, so that's the current option.

39  
40 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Right here, see proposal, at least one  
41 Regional Council.

42  
43 MR. LOHSE: Then I think we need to bring that to this  
44 Council to see if this Council wants to support that, right?

45  
46 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Um-hum.

47

48           MR. LOHSE: I make a motion that we support -- to me,  
49 that's option two, I make a motion that we support option two,  
50 which is the current Board, plus one Regional Council Chair.

0119

1  
2 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Is there a second?

3  
4 MR. JOHN: Second.

5  
6 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Motion and seconded. Further  
7 discussion on the motion. We talked about this a long time and  
8 I guess over the years the Councils I guess got frustrated that  
9 they are not part of the final action on any of the proposals,  
10 that we can't -- it kind of gets out of our hands once we make  
11 a recommendation.

12  
13 I think some of the Council Chairs and other Councils  
14 feel that there should be a voting member on the final  
15 proposals, on the final regulations and so on from the Council  
16 Chairs. I kind of support that idea. The reason is that at  
17 times we recommended something and we were voted down at  
18 Federal Subsistence Board level. I guess that's just to have a  
19 member there, it makes all the Regional Councils feel better to  
20 be able to vote on some of the proposals.

21  
22 MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

23  
24 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Um-hum.

25  
26 MR. OSKOLKOFF: I'd like to reflect upon that, too. In  
27 the few times that I've been able to witness the Board in  
28 action, there may be a Regional Council Chair there to put  
29 their comments in, but at some point the -- just like we do,  
30 you get to a point which it's just the Board itself having a  
31 discussion amongst itself, now that they've heard from the  
32 people that are there at the floor. And when that happens, you  
33 essentially shut out information that I believe is valuable,  
34 that someone could be there to advocate for or at least, bring  
35 up at that point. And although they've been fairly reasonable  
36 in trying to include as much information as possible, one can't  
37 always guess what changes in the discussion might take place  
38 once the Board gets a hold of it itself. And I think it's  
39 necessary for someone to be there to advocate.

40  
41 And I also think that there's another facet to this  
42 that hasn't been brought to play here. We're in a situation  
43 where we find ourselves often at odds with the Federal  
44 government and the State government. They have essentially  
45 come into what is Indian land, if you will, and in my  
46 particular area and assumed it, and now we are fighting to get  
47 that little increment back all the time as we go along.

48 However, our Council has found even that our resources are  
49 somewhat limited. We meet a couple of days at a time and then  
50 we're gone for months at a time at our various jobs and we come

0120

1 back and we hope that we have enough information presented in  
2 front of us to resolve the questions. But that's not always  
3 the case. What happens is that the Staff has to then guess, to  
4 some degree, what we had in mind, where we were going as a  
5 Council. They can call up individual people if it's an  
6 individual comment, perhaps, but as far as what the Council  
7 wants to do, we're not there working, we can't comment and talk  
8 to us. We have -- we don't have the ability to have a Staff  
9 person to back us up. It would be like going into court  
10 without an attorney. It is -- you don't end up in a very good  
11 situation. And I feel that, not only is it necessary to have  
12 someone on that Board advocating for the discussions and the  
13 decisions of the Advisory Councils, but I think it's necessary  
14 for them to have access to Staff in a manner similar to what  
15 all the other members of that Board have. They have a  
16 multitude of people who can draw up graphs and charges and do  
17 research and when they get there, they can throw up one nice  
18 argument just the way people like to hear them in the Western  
19 World, which is what we have to deal with. And then when I'm  
20 sitting there or Roy is sitting there talking about a specific  
21 issue from the point of view of the Ninilchik Tribe or  
22 something that has been advocated by this Council, we're not  
23 allowed that same resource. We haven't been able to work at it  
24 day in and day out, we haven't had contact with Staff, we don't  
25 have the budget for that, and of course, we're going to lose a  
26 lot of arguments. And I think that's patently unfair. It's  
27 unreasonable. We're going to lose ground over time and  
28 eventually we'll be overcome. And I think we have to start  
29 leveling that ground to some extent so at least that version of  
30 reality that we deal with on a day-to-day basis is placed  
31 before the Board is advocated for. And if there needs to be  
32 independent research or just simple collation of material, that  
33 can be done.

34  
35 MS. DETWILER: With the Chair's permission, I'd like to  
36 get a clarification then. With regard to your first comment,  
37 that you'd like to have a voting member representing the  
38 Regional Council's on the Board; should I take that to mean  
39 then that you feel that the existing configuration, when the  
40 Board has meetings, of having the Board members up front and  
41 sort of a U-shape with the Board members on one part of the U  
42 and then the Regional Council members on the other sides of the  
43 U and engaging in the discussions with the Board up until the  
44 moment that the Board is finally ready to take formal action --  
45 is it -- is it your opinion then that that structure of Board  
46 meeting is -- doesn't incorporate enough opportunity for  
47 Regional Council participation in the Board discussions?

48  
49 MR. OSKOLKOFF: That's correct. It allows you to  
50 comment, but it doesn't allow you to be a participant in the

0121

1 deliberations themselves.

2 MS. DETWILER: Um-hum.

3

4 MR. OSKOLKOFF: And often that's when you sway a vote  
5 or two and that may make all the difference in some cases.

6

7 MS. DETWILER: Um-hum.

8

9 CHAIRMAN EWAN: I guess to clarify what Gary's saying  
10 is, at some point in time in the Federal Subsistence Board,  
11 everybody's shut out except for the Board. Only the Board  
12 discusses and so on and that's where we're really left out.  
13 Council members come in from out of town, like myself, not up  
14 to speed on a lot of stuff and not thinking about subsistence  
15 all the time on a daily basis, if you're busy with something  
16 else, you know, you're kind of slow to get up to speed again,  
17 and all your -- you don't have everything in your mind to talk  
18 about the particular proposal or whatever is on the table, and  
19 you forget something, but it's too late to comment any further  
20 after it gets past the Regional Council Chair's comments. I  
21 guess Mitch has made an exception a couple of times, but yes,  
22 there's something missing there. The process is not working  
23 very well.

24

25 And if we know for sure we have some differences with  
26 the Federal Subsistence Board and the Regional Councils just  
27 sit there pretty mad and there's nothing we can do. It's out  
28 of our hands. We recommend something and we don't get to vote  
29 or anything on it and you watch all these Federal Subsistence  
30 Board members vote against it or a majority of them. That's  
31 very frustrating and I think we want to get a vote in for the  
32 subsistence users.

33

34 Ralph.

35

36 MR. LOHSE: Mr. Chair, I agree with you in one way that  
37 if you're not on the Board itself -- if you're on the Board you  
38 got a say so right up until the last minute, if you're not on  
39 the Board all you've got is a chance to comment if the Board  
40 gives you that opportunity.

41

42 Now, I could see that this person could actually be a  
43 member of -- a Regional Council Chair who has been nominated to  
44 -- would become a Federal employee for purposes of being on  
45 that Board, have the Staff to back him up and everything so  
46 that he could accomplish what needs to be accomplished. But  
47 the one thing -- one impression I'd like to counteract is the

48 fact, that just because you have somebody on the Board, the  
49 democratic process does not mean that you automatically get  
50 everything that you want to get. But it does mean that you, at

0122

1 least, have a say so right up until the last minute -- you can  
2 at least get a comment in right up until the last minute. I  
3 mean the fact that we're disappointed with something that's not  
4 passing, they may not pass even if you have a member on the  
5 Board.

6

7 CHAIRMAN EWAN: But you can get it on the record.

8

9 MR. LOHSE: But at least you can vote on it and show  
10 what your feelings on it were and have a chance to comment  
11 right up until the last minute. I think that's pretty  
12 important.

13

14 So I've got a motion on the table, was there a second?

15

16 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. There's a motion, and a second  
17 right?

18

19 MR. JOHN: Yeah.

20

21 MR. LOHSE: Okay, it's seconded.

22

23 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Further discussion on the motion.

24

25 MR. KOMPKOFF: Question.

26

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

29

30 IN UNISON: Aye.

31

32 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Opposed by the same sign.

33

34 (No opposing responses)

35

36 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Motion is carried. Thank you, Sue.

37

38 MS. DETWILER: Thank you.

39

40 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, how much longer do we want to go,  
41 another half hour?

42

43 MR. LOHSE: Yeah, let's go to 5:00.

44

45 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, the next item then is.....

46

47 MS. EAKON: Tab M, Task Force report, State Memorandum

48 of Agreement and Sandy Rabinowitch will present that.

49

50 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Tab M. Sandy, you're going to take

0123

1 care of this?

2 MR. RABINOWITCH: Yes.

3

4 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay.

5

6 MR. RABINOWITCH: Again, I'm Sandy Rabinowitch with the  
7 National Park Service and I'm Staff Committee to the Federal  
8 Subsistence Board. You can find this item in your book under  
9 Tab M, as in Mark. What I will try to do here is move this  
10 along quickly. I know it's late in the day. There's also some  
11 overheads that were prepared, but based on what you just did,  
12 I'll dispense with those and try to just summarize from these  
13 two pages.

14

15 The first comment is that the point of me being here is  
16 to both, provide you with information and solicit any comments  
17 you may have. And I can also say that probably in the winter  
18 meeting, this will be on your agenda again and we'll be back,  
19 whether myself or another member of the group, and we'll give  
20 you again, an update of how this progresses along.

21

22 What this is about is that about a year ago the State  
23 of Alaska approached the Federal Board through a couple of  
24 letters indicating an interest to pursue a memorandum of  
25 agreement between the Department of Fish and Game and the  
26 Federal Board, itself. There's some history in this, in that,  
27 apparently when the Federal program came into creation there  
28 were efforts made to have a memorandum of agreement; that was  
29 before I was involved with the program. But my understanding  
30 is that those efforts were fruitless and basically an agreement  
31 was not consummated. So this is sort of second attempt.

32

33 The Federal Board, after some deliberation, instructed  
34 the Staff Committee, again, which I'm a member of, to pursue  
35 discussions with the State, so that's what we've done. There  
36 have been four Federal employees and four State employees put  
37 together to pursue this. I'm one of those four. The others  
38 are Peggy Fox of the BLM. Ken Thompson, the Forest Service.  
39 And Greg Bos of the Fish and Wildlife Service. And we've met  
40 with four people from the State. Elizabeth Andrews. Steve  
41 Peterson. Paul Larson. And Gary Summers. Only once, so there  
42 has been one meeting. It was at the end of July this year.  
43 And to really to try to get an understanding of what the  
44 State's interests were and the four of us on the Federal side,  
45 you know, offered our reactions to what the State put forward.

46

47 The crux of this, sort of why are we talking, if you

48 will, is that it's believed that there's a chance to improve  
49 coordination and cooperation between the State and Federal  
50 programs. I think everybody realizes there's both strengths

0124

1 and weaknesses in both. And certainly there is confusion with  
2 both of them in operation at the same time for lots of people.  
3 So perhaps we can all do better, in the simplest of terms, if  
4 we talk and look for some ways to do better together. And it  
5 doesn't mean to take away from either program. It means to try  
6 to coordinate between the two.

7  
8 Specific benefits to the users in the program are hoped  
9 to be, again, reduce confusion between them. Hopefully  
10 improved presentations to groups like yours, okay, and to other  
11 groups on the State side, and ultimately improved analysis.  
12 Those documents that you typically get at your winter meetings,  
13 much of the information, sometimes -- I won't say all, but much  
14 of the information often comes from the State in one manner or  
15 another. And we think that the presentation of that can be  
16 improved if we have better communication and coordination  
17 between the two.

18  
19 I'm going to flip the page here and almost be done now.  
20 The things that we talked about are bulleted on the second page  
21 of the handout that you got in your booklet. We think that  
22 there's some potential to better coordinate the State and  
23 Federal regulatory cycles. Right now the State Board meets  
24 several times a year, they don't take up all the items every  
25 year as they used to. I'm sure all of you know that. Whereas,  
26 the Federal program, basically you do take up -- you can take  
27 up any season, any bag limit any given year. So we have two  
28 cycles that do things in a different time series, and that can  
29 be confusing and problematic, when you're sometimes trying to  
30 pursue a change on both the Federal and State programs at the  
31 same time. We think there's a chance to improve the resource  
32 surveys done at the ground level by the agencies, and improve  
33 information exchange. There's a strong interest in better  
34 integrating the Fish and Game advisory committees and their  
35 participation at meetings like yours today. Of course, I  
36 realize you have a member from Cordova here today, so that's a  
37 good example of the kind of thing that might be further  
38 improved. We've had some talk about jointly producing a  
39 regulation booklet. As you all know there's -- the blue  
40 covered Federal -- it's blue this year, blue covered Federal  
41 book and a separate State book, we talked a little bit about,  
42 could we combine the books and put them into one book. Now, we  
43 joke and say it might be twice as thick, but is there any value  
44 in putting it in, you know, one set of covers.

45  
46 The State also has interest in increasing its  
47 involvement at the Staff Committee level of things. I think in

48 simple terms, much of the work that you do often then goes to  
49 the Staff Committee and then to the Federal Board. The State  
50 has expressed a number of concerns about what the Staff

0125

1 Committee does, how it does it at various times. The Staff  
2 Committee, I think is open to hear more about those things and  
3 if we think we can improve things we'd like to.

4  
5 And then finally, and not least, as I think all of you  
6 know there's a number of State and Federal management plans.  
7 One that you're familiar with, probably the Mentasta Caribou  
8 Plan, the State's interested in seeing more plans like that  
9 done. I think I could say that many of the Federal agencies  
10 are also interested to see more plans like that done, where you  
11 have, you know, plans done at a more local level and then  
12 they're brought up through the Councils and ultimately to the  
13 Federal Board, and then the Federal Board tries to enact  
14 regulations that are consistent with those documents. So the  
15 interest there is to try to format those a little more  
16 consistently on a State wide basis and then see what we can do  
17 to promote more local planning.

18  
19 There are undoubtedly other things that we've talked  
20 about that I didn't mention and there will be other things that  
21 get added on to the list, but that's kind of the short and  
22 sweet of it. Again, as I say, I expect we'll be back at the  
23 winter meeting and give you another update. At some point out  
24 in time, it is possible that we'll come back with a draft MOA,  
25 again, that's where the State started their goal. And so when  
26 and if we get to that point, we'll bring that draft document to  
27 this Council and all the other Councils around the State. The  
28 idea here, I think, is for mutual gain and mutual improvement.  
29 And in terms of, if anything results from these discussions,  
30 that it needs to benefit both the Federal program and the State  
31 program, because ultimately I suggest the Federal Board nor the  
32 Department of Fish and Game would sign off on something that  
33 they didn't see mutual value to. Whether we'll be successful  
34 at that, I don't know. Again, this was tried some years ago  
35 and it was not successful.

36  
37 I'll stop at that point. If you have questions, I'll  
38 try to answer them and if I can't, I'll.....

39  
40 CHAIRMAN EWAN: I have no questions. I think it's a  
41 good idea. The only concern I have is process, you know. I  
42 hope the Federal process isn't delayed by all this coordination  
43 that has to take place to the detriment of the subsistence  
44 users. That's the only concern I have. I think it's all a  
45 good idea. Any other comments or questions? If not, thank  
46 you.

47

48 MR. RABINOWITCH: Okay, thank you.

49

50 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, we'll go on to the next one then.

0126

1 The State subsistence dilemma, information sharing.

2 MS. EAKON: Yes, our division staff -- we had an  
3 obligation to provide you with a matrix that shows everyone's  
4 position on the state of subsistence as it was before the big  
5 deal happened recently. But this was just or your information,  
6 we do have a copy of the Summit resolutions at the back table  
7 over there. This is just for your information, okay.

8  
9 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. We'll go on to the next item  
10 unless you want to quit for the day or just go on to the next  
11 item?

12  
13 MS. EAKON: It's up to you, we're right on -- we're  
14 ahead of schedule as a matter-of-fact.

15  
16 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Since we have the first item for the  
17 morning for public testimony, why don't we just skip that and  
18 go on to the next item. Okay.

19  
20 MR. McDONALD: Were we going to address the Unit 11  
21 goat season, I've got a staff person to talk about it?

22  
23 MS. EAKON: If you want to here?

24  
25 CHAIRMAN EWAN: What did we do, skip over that?

26  
27 MR. LOHSE: That's on the request for RFR, the request  
28 for reconsideration.

29  
30 MR. McDONALD: Roy, didn't you have a proposal that you  
31 were writing up for us for Unit 11 goat? No, so we're done  
32 with it.

33  
34 CHAIRMAN EWAN: We tabled it, we are leaving it tabled,  
35 right?

36  
37 MR. LOHSE: Well, that's going to be on the winter's  
38 meeting.....

39  
40 MS. EAKON: Yes.

41  
42 MR. LOHSE: .....if you have a proposal and we discuss  
43 it on the winter meeting.

44  
45 MR. McDONALD: Thank you.

46  
47 CHAIRMAN EWAN: What's the wish of the Council, do you

48 want to continue for a little while? We'll pass the public  
49 testimony part and leave it until the morning, if that's okay.  
50

0127

1 MR. JOHN: Yeah.

2 CHAIRMAN EWAN: And we'll go to -- we did G already?

3  
4 MS. MASON: Yes.

5  
6 CHAIRMAN EWAN: H.

7  
8 MS. EAKON: Okay, H, please look under Tab O, as in  
9 Oscar, in your book for annual report. On September 4, 1997,  
10 the Chair of the Federal Subsistence Board, Mitch Demientieff  
11 signed a letter addressed to your Chair responding to the  
12 Regional Council's 1996 annual report, which you do have a copy  
13 of right after Mr. Demientieff's letter of response. Do you  
14 want me to highlight what they said about each issue?

15  
16 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Um-hum.

17  
18 MS. EAKON: Okay.

19  
20 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay.

21  
22 MS. EAKON: Regarding the issue of the Council's  
23 requesting more time to hear Staff analysis on proposals, even  
24 if it was part of a special meeting, the Board does support  
25 that request. They suggest that you add additional days to  
26 your meetings if you think that necessary and that meeting  
27 agendas be carefully managed to give priority to the  
28 subsistence issues before you. And also, the Board said that  
29 it's good to have all sessions in public.

30  
31 With regard to the second issue, interaction with  
32 neighboring Regional Councils where both have mutual issues,  
33 the Board is supportive of your request and cite an example of  
34 a work session between representatives from the Eastern  
35 Interior and Southcentral Regional Councils earlier this spring  
36 as an example. And as is the one that was held in Cordova  
37 between Southcentral and Southeast Regional Council members.  
38 And once again, the Board urges that these meetings be open,  
39 with a report of what transpired.

40  
41 Thirdly, you had asked the Board -- you had asked that  
42 at least one Regional Council Chair sit as a voting member on  
43 the Federal Subsistence Board. And that was taken up at the  
44 Regional Council Chair's meeting in April of '97, and you just  
45 heard Ms. Detwiler's report on that.

46  
47 Fourthly, you had supported the idea of funding for

48 customary and traditional use studies for rural communities  
49 needing such studies in Southcentral region. Essentially,  
50 right now the budget program is fully allocated. Additional

0128

1 funding requests have been made to Congress, but are not likely  
2 given the trend of budgetary cutbacks government wide. The  
3 Board suggested that you make a list of ongoing subsistence  
4 related projects to identify existing data that could help you  
5 make more informed decisions. Also a consultation with the  
6 U.S. Geological Services biological resources division would be  
7 helpful. And he says, thank you.

8  
9 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Thank you. Is there comments? If not,  
10 we'll move on then.

11  
12 MS. EAKON: Also you should be thinking about the  
13 burning issues within the region. Do you have any issues that  
14 you would like to have included in the '97 report? You are  
15 going to take up this topic again in final at the winter  
16 meeting, but if you give us a heads up at this time, that would  
17 help Staff.

18  
19 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Maybe we'll have some after -- we have  
20 agency reports tomorrow, right?

21  
22 MS. EAKON: Yes. You have agency reports tomorrow.

23  
24 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Maybe we will have some after that.

25  
26 MS. EAKON: Would you like to revisit annual report '97  
27 after that?

28  
29 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yeah.

30  
31 MS. EAKON: Okay.

32  
33 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Are we done with that item then?

34  
35 MS. EAKON: Yes.

36  
37 CHAIRMAN EWAN: We took care of 1997 issues then or is  
38 that the one we're talking about?

39  
40 MR. LOHSE: Yes, we'll do that tomorrow.

41  
42 MS. EAKON: That's the one we're talking about.

43  
44 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. We'll go to Item I then.

45  
46 MS. EAKON: Okay. Item I, Regional Council new member  
47 training material. Please look under Tab P, as in Paul, which

48 is just a blank sheet of paper. You were mailed.....

49

50 MR. LOHSE: A packet.

0129

1

2 MS. EAKON: When you were mailed your Council booklet,  
3 you were mailed the manual -- you were mailed the manual which  
4 is the grey one. I don't know if you had time to look at it?

5

6 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Yes. I thought it was helpful. You  
7 know, it could be improved, I suppose, but if we had all that  
8 when we first started it would have been very good. I think  
9 it's a start, a very good start.

10

11 MS. EAKON: So you have this -- you were mailed this  
12 overview of the program and this is a more detailed manual,  
13 which is going to take the place of that original operations  
14 manual that has been approved by the Federal Subsistence Board.  
15 We do have evaluation forms, Michelle, do you have them, the  
16 evaluation forms? If you have any comments, suggestions for  
17 improvement regarding these, please give them to us and you  
18 will have the final versions at the winter meeting. And I want  
19 to say that your Chair attended the morning session of the  
20 focus group meeting, which was held on July 30, and provided  
21 helpful comments to our group, okay.

22

23 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. Then we go to Item J.

24

25 MS. EAKON: Regulatory year schedule and Mr. Bill  
26 Knauer will present that.

27

28 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, Bill.

29

30 MR. KNAUER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There is some  
31 material under Tab Q. One concern that has arisen on a regular  
32 basis put forward by the regional teams is the fact that  
33 frequently the analysis on proposals that are provided to the  
34 Regional Councils, not just your Regional Council, but all of  
35 the Regional Councils, sometimes suffers because personnel --  
36 field personnel, both State and Federal, are frequently  
37 unavailable over the holidays. Surveys that have been  
38 conducted of harvest data and various biological surveys are  
39 frequently incomplete or have not commenced yet or sometimes  
40 they have been completed, but the data has not been analyzed  
41 and therefore, the analysis that are provided to the Regional  
42 Councils on the proposals are sometimes lacking. Our Staff  
43 does an excellent job with what they have, but they don't do  
44 original research, that's done by the field folks. And they  
45 feel bad about that and they want to give you the best that  
46 they can. And one thing that has been suggested is possibly  
47 shifting the winter meetings one month later to allow both the

48 field staff to be available and the studies, the data from the  
49 studies to be analyzed and in other cases, the studies to be  
50 completed, so that they can provide a more complete analysis to

0130

1 you. And therefore, you will have better information from  
2 which to make a reasoned recommendation to the Board.

3  
4 This is something that the -- this issue is being  
5 presented to all of the Regional Councils based upon the  
6 Regional Council recommendations the Board made this winter go  
7 ahead and make a decision to take the winter meetings and place  
8 it about one month later -- it's not a full month, but about  
9 three weeks later. And that would also necessitate having the  
10 Board meeting a month later, right at the first of May. So  
11 later in the meeting, you'll be asked when you make your  
12 recommendation for your winter meeting to make it on two  
13 different calendars. But at this time what the Board would  
14 like is any feelings that you might have either no objection or  
15 support for that option or objection to it and any  
16 recommendation that this Council would have in that regard.

17  
18 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Ralph.

19  
20 MR. LOHSE: In that regard, Bill, you've got a section  
21 in here that says, please tell us whether this proposed  
22 schedule will conflict with any subsistence activities and to  
23 what extent whether weather would be more or less likely to  
24 cause meeting cancellations and whether there are other  
25 activities that might conflict with such a weather change.  
26 I'll speak just for myself, March is a lot better for not  
27 interfering with subsistence activities than February. Because  
28 February still has trapping season going on. Weather is  
29 generally milder, the days are longer, there's sunshine in  
30 March. For myself, it'd be a lot easier to travel in March  
31 than it would be to travel in February.

32  
33 And as far as it conflicting with any other activities,  
34 March is about as good a month as I could think of to do  
35 something like this for myself. It's before the activities of  
36 spring start and the activities of winter are winding down, so  
37 I'd be very much in favor of having our meetings in March  
38 instead of the first of February.

39  
40 CHAIRMAN EWAN: I don't have any problem with that  
41 either moving it from February to March. I'm just wondering  
42 about the proposals or whatever coming in, the same time, the  
43 previous meeting is on the same schedule?

44  
45 MR. KNAUER: Right. We're not contemplating changing  
46 the proposal period or the fall meeting schedules.

47

48                   CHAIRMAN EWAN: So you have more time as it says here  
49 to.....  
50

0131

1 MR. KNAUER: That's correct. There would be more time  
2 and it would be "better time" for the Staff analysis to occur.

3  
4 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. I'll go along with that. I  
5 think there's no objection. Does anybody else want to comment  
6 on this? I think it's a good idea.

7  
8 MR. KNAUER: Would you see any problem with recognizing  
9 that if you went to the later Council meeting that it would  
10 shift the Board meeting to the beginning of May? That -- I  
11 haven't heard any.....

12  
13 CHAIRMAN EWAN: I have no problem with that.

14  
15 MR. KNAUER: .....objection there -- comments there.

16  
17 MR. LOHSE: That would still give them a chance to get  
18 the regulations out in time for the fall season, wouldn't it?

19  
20 MR. KNAUER: That's correct.

21  
22 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, thank you, Bill.

23  
24 MR. KNAUER: Thank you very much.

25  
26 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay. Boy, we're moving right along  
27 here. I guess we'll want to stop here and call it a day?

28  
29 MR. JOHN: Yeah.

30  
31 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Ralph, did you have a comment?

32  
33 MR. LOHSE: Mr. Chair, I make a motion we adjourn for  
34 the day.

35  
36 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay.

37  
38 MR. LOHSE: It's been a long day and we've got a lot to  
39 do yet tomorrow.

40  
41 MR. JOHN: I second.

42  
43 CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay.

44  
45 MR. LOHSE: Unless there is some Staff member that is  
46 here that won't be here tomorrow?

47

48                   CHAIRMAN EWAN: Okay, if there's no objection to that  
49 -- hearing no objection, we'll recess until tomorrow. What  
50 time?

0132

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

MS. EAKON: 9:00.

CHAIRMAN EWAN: 9:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. Okay,  
thank you.

(Hearing recessed)

\* \* \* \* \*