

00159

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

SOUTHCENTRAL SUBSISTENCE
REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
PUBLIC MEETING

8

9

10

11

12

VOLUME II

13

14

March 11, 2004
Anchorage Hilton
Anchorage, Alaska

15

16

17

18

19 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

20

21 Ralph Lohse, Chair

22 Robert Churchill

23 Susan Wells

24 Douglas Blossom

25 R. Greg Encelewski

26 Gilbert Dementi

27 Fred Elvsaas

28 Gloria Stickwan

29 Dean L. Wilson, Jr.

30 James R. Showalter

31 Tom M. Carenter

32 Harley B. McMahan

33

34 Regional Council Coordinator, Donald Mike

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44 RECORDED AND TRANSCRIBED BY:

45

46 COMPUTER MATRIX COURT REPORTERS, LLC

47 3522 West 27th Avenue

48 Anchorage, Alaska 99517

49 907-243-0668

50 jpk@gci.net

00160

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Anchorage, Alaska - 3/11/2004)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'll call the spring meeting of the Southcentral Subsistence Regional Advisory Council back in session.

We are on Proposal 28, WP04-28. And you can find it on Page 107 in your book. Chuck.

MR. ARDIZZONE: Good morning, Mr. Chair, Council members. I guess I'll start out with WP04-28. It was submitted by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, and requests that Federal subsistence harvest limits for moose in 16(B) remainder be changed from one moose to one bull. The proponent requests the harvest limit for moose be changed to eliminate the cow harvest, which is an important step for promoting growth of the declining moose population.

The current Federal subsistence regulations for moose in 16(B) remainder were adopted in 1991, and have remained unchanged. The current State management objectives for moose in Unit 16(B) are to maintain a moose population of 6500 to 7500 moose with 20 to 25 bulls per 100 cows, and allow a harvest of 310 to 600 moose from the population.

Because of the Unit size, ADF&G has divided the unit into three zones, north, middle and south, for survey purposes. None of these zones directly correspond with the Federal unit 16 remainder. The Fish and Game estimate for 16(B) middle population is approximately 3,314 in the fall of 1999, and 1,836 in the fall of 2001. And the 16(B) north population was at approximately 909 in the fall of 2000, and 1,187 in the fall of 2001. Unit 16(B) fall population in 2000 was -- ranged between 3,700 and 4,000 moose total. Overall in 2001, the composition in the entire unit was approximately 33 bulls per 100 cows and 12 calves per 100 cows.

A little harvest history. There has been no Federal subsistence cow harvest reported since 1993. The portion of the season that allows antlerless harvest requires a permit. Since 1991 only 12 Federal permits were issued, and only five moose were harvested, one bull

00161

1 and four unknowns.

2

3

4 Until recently there's been a
5 misunderstanding about when a Federal subsistence permit
6 is needed. Many residents of Skwentna assume that all
7 moose harvested during the antlerless season needed to be
8 reported with the Federal registration permit. So the
9 four unknown sex animals reported may have been bulls.

9

10 Federal lands in 16(B) are very remote
11 and have limited access, which further limits harvest
12 opportunities.

13

14 Going to the effects of the proposal, if
15 this proposal is adopted, it would have little effect on
16 the moose population because few permits are issued, and
17 even fewer moose are harvested under Federal subsistence
18 regulations. If this proposal is adopted, it would
19 remove the current Federal subsistence opportunity which
20 allows Federally qualified subsistence users to harvest a
21 cow moose. If in the future an increase in the Federal
22 subsistence harvest of antlerless moose triggers a
23 conservation concern in regards to the moose population
24 in Unit 16(B) a regulation change could be addressed at
25 that time.

26

27 Our preliminary conclusion would be to
28 oppose this proposal.

29

30 Are there any questions.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Chuck.

33

34 (No comments)

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Chuck.

37

38 MR. ARDIZZONE: You're welcome.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Alaska Department
41 of Fish and Game.

42

43 MR. DELFRATE: Good morning, Mr. Chair.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Good morning.

46

47 MR. DELFRATE: As -- where we came about
48 getting to where I decided to draft this proposal, I had
49 an interesting conversation with a local resident in the
50 Tyonek area when I went out for my very first time to

00162

1 meet with that community, and they came to me and said,
2 we hear there's a cow hunt available. Where is this cow
3 hunt that we can go hunt in. And I said, well, gosh, I
4 looked at our regulations and I'm studying up on them. I
5 don't think there is one, but I'll have to look back into
6 it, and then I came up with the Federal regulations and
7 saw that, yes, in fact there still was a cow hunt on the
8 books as far as for 16(B).

9

10 I think Chuck put forth the information
11 that we worked on together showing that the population of
12 moose in 16(B) south and 16(B) where there is Federal
13 land has declined substantially. Since we worked on this
14 proposal, we completed the census in 16(B) north, and in
15 the last two years -- we finished this in December, and
16 our census in December of this year was 898 moose. So
17 the population has declined another 25 percent since
18 2001, in two years.

19

20 This moose herd -- the locals have been
21 pushing me pretty hard to do everything possible that we
22 can to get this herd turned around, to start productivity
23 back up. Just at this last -- well, in 2003 of March the
24 Board of Game authorized a predator control
25 implementation plan. They eased into it with just
26 allowing the pursuit of wolves with snow machines, but
27 the direction was we need to do as much as we can to get
28 this moose herd back on line. Just this last meeting
29 that finished up a couple days ago, the Board drafted
30 findings and are poised to be moving forward next winter
31 with aerial, airplane-based wolf control.

32

33 So I think that the cases can be made
34 that we have strong conservation concerns for this moose
35 herd. The southern part that's located around Lake Clark
36 National Park I don't believe has much in the way of
37 winter moose habitat, and so I've kind of focused my
38 efforts and my work on the northern portion, which is
39 Denali Preserve lands, specifically the preserve lands
40 that have moose habitat are the east and the west forks
41 of the Yentna River.

42

43 To find out just kind of how low the
44 moose populations is, I sent one of my technicians out
45 there a couple weeks ago, which is during the hunting
46 season to see what we had for a moose population. We
47 counted 27 total moose in this area, in the Preserve. He
48 was fairly confident that he saw every moose. He had
49 good conditions. And there were seven calves, which is
50 real encouraging, but that means there were only 20

00163

1 adults that were out in that area available for harvest
2 at the time.

3

4 I decided to propose this change to the
5 regulation strictly on the basis of the perception that
6 we're sending to the locals and everybody else, saying
7 that, yes, it still is okay to kill a cow moose, and even
8 if it is only one, it's okay. And my biggest concern is
9 the unreported harvest that may go one, and if we're
10 saying that, yes, it is okay to kill a cow moose in the
11 Federal portion, what's to say we can't just take one a
12 little bit lower down on the river.

13

14 This was the presentation I kind of
15 provided to the three local advisory committees. I gave
16 this information to the Tyonek Advisory Committee, the
17 Mount Yenlo Advisory Committee, which both -- they live
18 in the unit, and then the Mat Valley Advisory Committee.
19 Many of their hunters go into 16(B). And all three
20 committees voted to support this proposal. I saw in your
21 public -- in your packet that Mount Yenlo and Mat Valley
22 actually sent letters. Tyonek, it was my understanding
23 they were drafting a letter, but I don't know if it ever
24 did make it into the book or actually made it to the
25 Office of Subsistence Management.

26

27 So with that, I think I'll answer any
28 questions and let you act on this proposal.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

31

32 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you. Gino, thank
33 you for the information. Generally, you tend to look at
34 three factors limiting in ungulate populations: weather,
35 habitat, and a sense of food provided and predation. I
36 get the sense that the limiting factor in this moose
37 population is non-human predation; is that correct?

38

39 MR. DELFRATE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr.
40 Churchill, I believe that predation was probably very
41 responsible for the decline in the moose population, and
42 is probably responsible for the low productivity we have
43 now. Weather certainly played a part in the decline. We
44 had about 10 years where we had higher than average
45 snowfalls and snow accumulations in the area, but I think
46 predation -- during that time frame, wolf numbers
47 increased substantially. Bear numbers are assumed to be
48 stable or still slightly increasing, and so predators
49 have a good strong hold in the area. Human harvest does
50 play a part, but to what extent, we know what the

00164

1 reported harvest is, but we don't know what the
2 unreported harvest is.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

5

6 MR. CHURCHILL: Then do you consider the
7 human harvest having a significant impact on limiting the
8 population?

9

10 MR. DELFRATE: Mr. Chair, Mr. Churchill,
11 I don't think so. I think there is some unreported
12 harvest. I have -- I've had some discussions with folks
13 that have said, you know, they know it occurs. I think
14 it occurs statewide, but we don't have a good number on
15 it, but I don't think that that's limiting the
16 productivity of the herd. It's not limiting the size of
17 the herd.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: One more, Bob.

20

21 MR. CHURCHILL: Do you think eliminating
22 the cow hunt will stop the unreported, currently illegal
23 harvest of cows and/or bulls?

24

25 MR. DELFRATE: The short answer is no. I
26 think that we can send a message though that says it's
27 not -- it won't help if we continue to take cows.

28

29 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you. Thank you.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Gilbert.

32

33 MR. DEMENTI: Yeah. Do you have a record
34 of how many cow moose have been harvested in that area?

35

36 MR. DELFRATE: We do have records that go
37 back to the early 80s.

38

39 MR. DEMENTI: How many cows have been
40 harvest?

41

42 MR. DELFRATE: Yes.

43

44 MR. DEMENTI: Since 1980. So over these
45 years, there's no cow moose been harvested; is that
46 correct?

47

48 MR. DELFRATE: The last State season that
49 we had for cow moose hunting was in 1993, and prior to
50 that all antlerless moose hunting was stopped by the

00165

1 State after the bad winter we had in 1989/90. The moose
2 population recovered a little bit. They had one limited
3 harvest in 1993, and then since then, the State has
4 pulled completely off of harvesting of cows. Prior to
5 1990, there had been different types of antlerless hunts,
6 and in the early years, the antlerless harvest was pretty
7 substantial.

8

9

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Chuck.

10

11

MR. ARDIZZONE: I just wanted to add,
12 under our records since 1990, there's only been -- using
13 our registration permit, there's only been four reported
14 harvest of possible cows. We're not sure, the sexes
15 weren't indicated on the permit, but if you assume they
16 were cows, we've only had four since 1990, and five total
17 moose taken under our permit system, and one was
18 definitely a bull moose.

19

20

MR. DEMENTI: Mr. Chair. You don't have
21 an idea if the four were cows or bull moose?

22

23

MR. ARDIZZONE: I can't say for sure,
24 because in our records the sex wasn't indicated.

25

26

MR. DEMENTI: So all these.....

27

28

MR. ARDIZZONE: So even if.....

29

30

MR. DEMENTI: Even if the four were
31 killed, they could have been all four bull moose?

32

33

MR. ARDIZZONE: They could have been.
34 But we have one harvested in 1991, three harvested in
35 '92, and then one harvested in 2001, and 2001 was
36 definitely a bull.

37

38

MR. DEMENTI: Thank you.

39

40

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: James.

41

42

MR. SHOWALTER: Yes. On your reporting
43 of 16(B), which encompasses Kalgin Island, what is your
44 take on that? Because here also in the regulations, it's
45 one moose.

46

47

MR. DELFRATE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr.
48 Showalter, the information I provided excluded Kalgin
49 Island. Kalgin Island is a unique portion, and the
50 proposal is for the remainder of 16(B), which means

00166

1 everything except for Kalgin Island. Kalgin Island has
2 got no Federal land. It's a State managed hunt. It has
3 no predators. And currently has more moose than we can
4 harvest with the hunters that we're sending out there.
5 Our management objectives for Kalgin Island right now are
6 22 to 45 moose, and our survey in December shows 125
7 moose, and that was after harvesting 54 moose off the
8 island. It shows you what a predator-free environment
9 can do.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

12

13 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, and just looking at
14 the text on Page 111, and I just assume this is a
15 misprint, it says on table 2 that the 2001/2002 total
16 moose harvest is 117, and then in the narrative below it
17 says 171.

18

19 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair, that's typo.
20 I'll.....

21

22 MR. CHURCHILL: Just a misprint, not a
23 big deal. I just wanted to make sure that 117 was
24 correct.

25

26 Thank you.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.

29

30 MR. CARPENTER: You know, I had a
31 question about your -- about the calf to cow ratio. It
32 was stated that right now it's about 12 calves to every
33 100 cow?

34

35 MR. DELFRATE: Uh-huh.

36

37 MR. CARPENTER: And I was looking at the
38 table on Page 110, and it looks like, oh, anywhere from
39 '93 to about '97, it looks like the average calf to cow
40 was, you know, 20 to 22, something like that. So it's
41 about cut in half compared to the short-term average I
42 guess.

43

44 I guess what I'm looking at is if we
45 don't know, if the State has no cow season, and we don't
46 know what the -- it's obvious that we don't know what the
47 unreported harvest is, and the Federal statistics don't
48 show any cow harvest, then we either have to blame this
49 problem on habitat or predation, and obviously this area
50 has been able to carry a far greater number of moose than

00167

1 it is right now, so the only thing that I'm concluded to
2 say is that it has to be predation more than anything
3 else. I mean, would you agree with that?

4

5 MR. DELFRATE: Mr. Carpenter, I think
6 that predation has played a significant part in the
7 decline of the moose for the last 15 years. Prior to
8 1990, there was a healthy moose population in 16(B), and
9 16(B) traditionally has a substantial amount of snow,
10 more than most areas where we have high moose
11 populations. I think that the age of the age of the
12 moose population played a small factor in it. I think
13 the weather and the timing of the weather. Like I said,
14 we had -- eight out of 10 years we had some pretty
15 significant snowfalls from the mid 80s to mid 90s, and
16 the moose population tipped over. At the same time wolf
17 numbers were just the opposite curve, and they were going
18 up. And so predation -- and bears have always been
19 strong in the area. So from our calf/cow ratios that we
20 take in the fall, it appears that bears have a
21 significant impact on moose calf survival, at least to
22 the fall. Most are moose calves that are lost to bears
23 or lost in the first six weeks of life, and so, yes,
24 predation is a significant factor in there.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Greg. Or Doug. Yeah.

27

28 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman, either one of
29 you guys. If you had 100 qualified individuals, could
30 they all apply for cow permits and get them in this area
31 presently? I mean, I guess what I'm saying, is there a
32 limit on how many you might put out, or if they qualify
33 you would give them a permit to hunt a cow?

34

35 MR. ARDIZZONE: I believe if they
36 qualify. It's just a registration permit. If you
37 qualify, you can get a registration permit, but we
38 haven't had very many people participating. Since 1990,
39 we've had 13 people participate in the hunt.

40

41 MR. BLOSSOM: Yeah, I see that. I just
42 wondered. There is a danger that a lot more people
43 could, and you would issue them, then?

44

45 MR. ARDIZZONE: That's correct.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fred.

48

49 MR. ELVSAAS: Yeah, reading the proposal,
50 the first thing that caught my eye was Kalgin Island. It

00168

1 is not Federal land, like you say. I don't understand
2 why it's even in the proposal. And if we're looking at
3 Federal lands, and they've taken possibly four cows, it
4 could be no cows, I don't think we should waste our time
5 with this. Basically they're Tier II hunts over there,
6 and subsistence is what we're looking at, and I -- for my
7 money, I say let's just leave it the way it is, and we
8 know a lot more moose are lost to the wolves and the
9 bears, calves are down and so forth. But in regards to
10 hunting, you know, we may not even have a problem here,
11 and we're going to change the regulations, and I've never
12 heard anybody in Tyonek tell me that they have a problem
13 with cows and bulls. They hunt for moose. And I think
14 that's what this is all about. And I say let's just
15 leave it lay, and get on to the next proposal.

16

17 Thank you.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob, question.

20

21 MR. CHURCHILL: And just to revisit, you
22 think that both the brown bear and black bear, although
23 primarily black bear, are a significant part of the
24 predation problem?

25

26 MR. DELFRATE: Yes, thanks, Mr.
27 Churchill, Mr. Chair. I believe that bear predation is
28 responsible for the low calf/cow ratios in the fall.

29

30 I did want to point something out that
31 I'd forgot to in my presentation, was in 1984 the Park
32 Service completed a survey of this same exact area that I
33 sent my technician into. And in that year, they counted
34 198 moose compared to the 27 moose that we have now. So
35 it's a pretty substantial difference on that Federal land
36 that's going to be hunted on.

37

38 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

41

42 MR. CARPENTER: I guess this is a
43 question for Chuck. Looking at all the data, and trying
44 to put this into perspective to some areas that I'm
45 familiar with, because these numbers, these declining
46 calf to cow ratios, declining population, is similar to
47 some of the things that have happened down in Unit 6.
48 When do you feel that the calf to cow ratio will become
49 so low and the population decline will have dipped so low
50 that the Federal side of things, the biologists will

00169

1 recommend that there be no more cow harvest?

2

3

4 MR. ARDIZZONE: I could go either way on
5 this one, Mr. Carpenter. The only reason I choose to
6 preliminarily say oppose is because we don't harvest any
7 cows. I mean, if there was a problem with us harvesting
8 too many cows, subsistence users, I would gladly support
9 it wholeheartedly, but I felt that we were taking the
10 opportunity away from subsistence users if there's a
11 subsistence user out there that needed some meat for the
12 winter, and the -- and could only find a cow moose, that
13 he has an opportunity right now to take that moose. But
14 if we eliminate that, I mean, he's going to have to hunt
15 for a bull moose.

15

16 MR. CARPENTER: I guess just to follow up
17 to that, is -- I mean, I understand where you're coming
18 from, but in order to gain recruitment into an area,
19 unless you go in and take drastic measures in regards to
20 the predators, and I agree that the brown bears do have a
21 significant impact on the calf survival. If you don't
22 eliminate cow harvest or potential cow harvest, you will
23 never regain the recruitment into the population that you
24 once had. So, I mean, I'm kind of looking at this as
25 from a cautious standpoint, that I would hate for these
26 people in five years to have no hunt at all because the
27 recruitment is so poor, rather than potentially give up
28 something that they've never been harvesting anyway
29 theoretically.

30

31 MR. ARDIZZONE: I understand you totally,
32 and I don't disagree with you. It's the Council's
33 decision, whatever Council wants to do.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions.

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I've got a couple
40 questions for you guys, maybe it doesn't matter who
41 answers them. I'm sitting here looking at the map, and I
42 was just wondering what area did the 13 permits -- what
43 area were they used in? Were they used in the Lake Clark
44 area or the Denali area?

45

46 MR. ARDIZZONE: I believe they would be
47 in the northern part of the unit.....

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Up in the Denali area.

50

00170

1 MR. ARDIZZONE:I don't think
2 there's much hunting down near Lake Clark.

3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Down in the Denali area.
5 In the.....

6
7 MR. ARDIZZONE: Up in the Denali area,
8 yes.

9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:Denali area at the
11 top. Who all is -- is there a C&T finding for that area?

12
13 MR. DELFRATE: It's all rural residents
14 of 16(B).

15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All rural residents of
17 16(B). How many rural residents of 16(B) are there? How
18 many households for 16(B)

19
20 MR. ARDIZZONE: I couldn't tell you that.

21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any guess?

23
24 MR. DELFRATE: I think you're looking at
25 probably maybe 300 people. You have communities in
26 Skwentna.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

29
30 MR. DELFRATE: You have a community down
31 by Alexander Creek, which is just a small number of
32 households. There's the Village of Tyonek, and then
33 there's a community around Beluga with a few households.
34 That would be primarily your -- there are some houses,
35 some folks that are living off of Shell Lake and Hewitt
36 Lake, kind of -- that would west of Skwentna. They
37 started out as recreational cabins, and there are people
38 that are now full-time residents there.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, when I look at the
41 size of the map and the distance, none of those are very
42 -- none of those are really very close to -- I mean, it's
43 a long way to that area, which kind of could probably
44 explain why there's only been 13 permits in 13 years.
45 It's an average of one permit a year. I guess what I'm
46 trying to say is, you know, I can understand the biology
47 behind it, but again we're back to working with
48 perception, and we're not working with anything that, you
49 know -- or 12, it says 12 permits and five moose
50 harvested in 13 years. I really don't -- I can't bring

00171

1 myself to think it's had much of an impact, and I don't
2 think closing it down will have much an impact on the
3 subsistence users. My one question is, now that you've
4 got around and talked to all these subsistence users and
5 let them know that there is a Federal hunt, do you think
6 it will make an increase in permits, or when I look at
7 the map and I see the distance -- I mean, people from
8 Tyonek are definitely not going to go up by Denali. They
9 may go over to Lake Clark. But when I look at the
10 distance, do you think that there will actually all of a
11 sudden be a big increase in Federal permits, because you
12 talked to them, and now they know there are Federal
13 permits available, or is the reason they haven't been
14 used in the past is it's just -- it's economically
15 unfeasible to go use them?

16

17 MR. ARDIZZONE: I personally don't think
18 there's going to be a big increase, because most people I
19 talked to were already aware of it. But Gino talked to
20 people down in Tyonek, and I haven't talked to people in
21 that area.

22

23 MR. DELFRATE: Mr. Chair, I don't think
24 there's going to be a substantial increase in the number
25 of permits, but I guess I'd put it this way. If you had
26 two people that decided to go from Shell Lake over to the
27 Preserve/Park and they both were successful in taking cow
28 moose, we've successfully reduced that portion of the
29 herd by 10 percent.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What we've basically
32 done is made sure the wolves had to eat some other cow's
33 calf, instead of those calves.

34

35 MR. DELFRATE: Right. And I think we've
36 both pointed out that really this is not a biological
37 issue. I told the locals that I would do what I could
38 where I could to make this known. If we've done
39 anything, we've gone to the communities and we've told
40 them that we don't think shooting cow moose is a good
41 idea at this point. And, you know, I feel like I've
42 succeeded in doing that. I did get the support of the
43 local communities in this proposal, because they felt the
44 same way. They felt that shooting cows was probably not
45 the wise thing to be doing when we're trying to rebuild a
46 herd, so whatever this committee decides to do, I guess
47 I've put everything on the table.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think the way I look
50 at it right now is the fact that you're actually thinking

00172

1 of putting in -- I've got to make sure we use the
2 politically correct word, some sort of predator
3 management in the area, and it doesn't bode well to have
4 predator management at the same time that you have cow
5 season. And from that perception standpoint, as a
6 Council, we've recognized that we do need -- in cases
7 like this, we do need predator management. And so from
8 that standpoint, it would be, you know, a way of
9 signalling that we do support the idea that we'll do
10 everything possible to bring the moose back, including
11 predator management.

12

13 As far as having an affect on the moose
14 population or the subsistence users, I'm kind of with
15 Fred. If we never put it on the table, it never would
16 have changed anything, so I'll let it go at that. If
17 there's any more discussion, otherwise we'll call the
18 question.

19

20 MR. CHURCHILL: We haven't even put it on
21 the table.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, we haven't put it on
24 the table.

25

26 MR. ELVSAAS: Yeah, I know.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: God. Well, I don't know
29 about you, Fred. I want to get it done.

30

31 MR. CHURCHILL: We're at number 3, Mr.
32 Chairman.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Okay. Oh, boy.
35 Thank you, Bob.

36

37 MR. CHURCHILL: Morning, Ralph.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Good morning. I'm going
40 to have a cup of coffee instead of juice. Okay. So in
41 that case, we've got the Alaska Department of Fish and
42 Game comments, right?

43

44 MR. MIKE: Yeah, we've.....

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So we're on the Federal,
47 State, tribal agency comments, are there any?

48

49 (No comments)

50

00173

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No.

2

3 MR. MIKE: We're moving right along.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We're on Inter-Agency
6 Staff Committee comments, or have we already had those?

7

8 MR. KESSLER: There aren't any.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Fish and Game
11 Advisory Committee comments. Do we have any there?
12 Summary of written public comments. Don, do we have any?

13

14 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We have
15 a total of four written public comments. Two are in
16 support of the proposal, and two are in opposition.
17 Tumongli (ph) Yenlo Advisory Committee supports the
18 proposal. They listened to the Department biologist
19 attending the meeting. Most members agreed that although
20 there wasn't an unmeasurable effect due to the hunt as
21 is, the perception was plenty to justify removing
22 antlerless moose from the book that the proposal
23 addresses.

24

25 Mr. David McHose of Skwentna commented
26 that the moose in Unit 16 has been in decline since the
27 early to mid 1980s due in part to winter cow season
28 managed by ADF&G during the mid 80s resulting in the
29 harvest of over 100 cows per year. Recently the ADF&G
30 supported a 20-day general moose hunt for Alaska
31 residents for spike fork or 50-inch bulls in Unit 16(B)
32 despite opposition by the local tribal committee. The
33 community did not believe that enough surplus bulls
34 warranted the season. The new season will probably
35 result in a larger illegal harvest of cows than the
36 Federal season as no enforcement is present. 140 permits
37 are issued under the State Tier II system for the
38 November 15 through February 28 season. This results in
39 the harassment of cows during January and February as the
40 hunters try to determine if an animal is an antlerless
41 bull, which can result in illegal and accidental harvest
42 of cows.

43

44 The Matanuska Valley Fish and Game
45 Advisory Committee would like to support the Department
46 of Fish and Game Proposal No. WP04-28 to eliminate cow
47 moose hunting in Game Management Unit 16(B). Our
48 community recently met and heard testimony on the status
49 of the moose population in the unit, and we are concerned
50 about the long-term health of that population. We

00175

1 are receiving these permits are people in Youngstown
2 Bend, which is up the Yentna River from Skwentna
3 Community, and other surrounding area as well as Skwentna
4 residents.

5
6 The number of permits you see in the
7 early 1990s were acquired by people primarily as a back
8 up for if they didn't get a Tier II permit from the State
9 or hunt locally around the Skwentna area, so they view
10 this very much as an option for them if they were
11 unsuccessful in acquiring one of the State permits, or
12 harvesting a moose more local to their communities of
13 where they live. And that's indicative of the low number
14 of moose that are actually harvested in terms of the
15 harvest referenced there.

16
17 Complicating this is the fact that the
18 snowfall in the -- that portion of the Alaska Range is
19 fairly significant, as well as the Yentna River has a lot
20 of open water in it, and that makes for extremely
21 difficult travel even from upper parts of Unit 16(B)
22 Skwentna, Youngstown expanded up into our preserve. I
23 spoke with a number of these individuals in the early 90s
24 who said, never again in terms of trying to access up
25 there in the earlier part of the winter due to the deep
26 snow falls and the open water. So there is a significant
27 challenge that occurs in particular earlier on in the
28 winter, just in getting around in that country, and that
29 is a significant limiting factor as well.

30
31 I can't remember, there were a couple
32 other questions that came up earlier. If I haven't
33 addressed those now, maybe you could re-ask them, and I
34 could try to answer them.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions.

37
38 (No comments)

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I just have one. I
41 didn't realize there was a Tier II State season. Do
42 people go all the way up there to take part in the Tier
43 II State season in the same preserve area that the
44 Federal hunt would be taking place?

45
46 MR. TWITCHELL: From what I've been told
47 by local people in Skwentna, no, they prefer to harvest
48 closer to the community in the area. There was a lot of
49 grumbling in the early 90s because a number of the long-
50 term residents did not acquire Tier II permits because of

00176

1 competition elsewhere. So there was a great deal of
2 dissatisfaction with the Tier II. And the hunts that you
3 saw in the early 90s were a result of those long-time
4 local people unsuccessful in getting Tier II, and
5 therefore venturing the long run up into the Preserve
6 area.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I don't know, maybe one
9 of you can answer this question. Is the Tier II still at
10 the level as it was? I mean, we're talking about
11 dropping this small hunt back. Has the Tier II hunt been
12 dropped back in size or anything like that? Or is it --
13 you know, has anything changed in that department?

14

15 MR. DELFRATE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The
16 Tier II hunt has varied quite a bit over the last --
17 since inception. In the earlier years, what happened
18 with Tier II hunt is the permits were issued, and the
19 Department would open a season by emergency order, and
20 the idea was -- the Tier II hunt has been identified by
21 the Board as a separate subpopulation. It's generally
22 the moose that are in the high country that are
23 inaccessible during the fall, and these animals, when
24 they come down into the lower country, that's when the
25 Tier II hunters are supposed to take advantage of them.
26 So in the past, in the earlier years, they would get
27 reports from the locals that said the moose have come
28 close to town, we'd like our season now. And they would
29 open the season for a two-week period, and all the
30 permittees would get to go out, harvest their moose, and
31 then come back to wherever they live. There were some
32 problems in the early 90s or late 80s with a two-week
33 season would hit about the same time that bad weather
34 would hit, and nobody would harvest a moose, and so there
35 would be requests to re-open the season for another two
36 weeks, and the previous biologist that I replaced, Herman
37 Gracey took a different approach. He said, well, we'll
38 allow the Tier II hunt to happen, and we'll put it in the
39 winter season and allow the hunters to take the moose
40 when they have the opportunity instead of opening --
41 there's a big administrative cost with opening the
42 season, and, you know, constantly putting everybody off
43 and answering phone calls, and so we started to -- yeah,
44 we'd just go ahead and make this a long season.

45

46 I think that there will be quite a bit of
47 discussion, because this regulation will come up before
48 the Board in March of 2005, and I think there will be a
49 lot of discussion about getting rid of the February
50 portion of this season, because it is a bull only hunt,

00177

1 and bulls have no antlers, and there's been a lot of
2 complaints about harassment of cows, and harassment of
3 cows could affect the productivity of the herd, and I
4 think that we're going to sit down with the locals, too,
5 and say, you know, we need to do everything possible to
6 increase the productivity of this herd, and that may
7 mean, you know, taking some of those moose that are at
8 risk in February and not hunting them.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So basically thought,
11 the Tier II system will -- I was just looking at the
12 letter that opposes the proposal, that actually when you
13 read it, actually sounds to me like it supports the
14 proposal and he opposes the State hunt, but anyhow, he
15 talks about 140 permits issued under the State Tier II
16 system. That will continue to continue until it goes --
17 until it comes back in front of the Board then?

18

19 MR. DELFRATE: Yes, Mr. Chair, I elected
20 when I gave my presentation to not get into the
21 complexities of how we manage the different hunts, mostly
22 because it is very complex. The Board has taken it upon
23 themselves to identify different subpopulations of moose,
24 and so we manage each of these subpopulations different.
25 In essence, we have a subpopulation of so-called mountain
26 moose that move down in. That's what the Tier II hunters
27 are supposed to be focusing their harvest on.

28

29 The general season that happens the fall
30 is for moose areawide, but a lot of those moose are
31 inaccessible. That season has been -- that season is
32 also very complicated, because the board has also set in
33 place a system whereby we have to project the number of
34 surplus moose to the population, surplus bulls to the
35 population before the season, and then that determines
36 whether or not there is a general season which includes
37 nonresidents, a Tier I season which is only State of
38 Alaska residents, or Tier II season. And in the past
39 four years, we've had all four of those seasons. We went
40 from a general season four years ago to a Tier II only
41 season, because we could not project enough bulls to
42 support subsistence uses for all of the State. And then
43 just this last year we went back to a Tier I season,
44 because the Board made a different determination on how
45 they -- it wasn't the harvest that was as important as it
46 was the number of moose available for harvest, and there
47 were enough moose available for harvest to have a bull
48 season. There was a shortened bull season, and, you
49 know, our bull to cow ratios are well above our
50 objectives in this whole unit. 16(B) south, which is the

00178

1 very southern portion, was as high as 46 bulls to 100
2 cows this last fall. The northern part, we're looking at
3 20 to 25 is our objective, and I believe our surveys were
4 upper 20s and maybe even low 30s for bull/cow ratios, so
5 the harvest of bulls, or the hunting -- the opportunity
6 to hunt bulls, is completely separate from the cow
7 portion of this argument.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So the answer to
10 the question is they had a Tier I hunt this year?

11

12 MR. DELFRATE: Correct.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And you don't know
15 whether they'll have a Tier I or a Tier II hunt next year
16 until the survey data's in, but the hunt will continue on
17 this basis until the Board gets to look at it in 2005.

18

19 MR. DELFRATE: For the 2004 season,
20 there's probably going to be no change recommended by the
21 Department. There will be a Tier II season for the same
22 number of permits, for the same season length. We can't
23 change that this year. The Tier I season, while we were
24 at the Board meeting last week, we did calculate enough
25 surplus bulls, because our survey information is in,
26 we've calculated enough surplus bulls to move forward
27 with a Tier I season, but we're cautioning hunters that
28 the hunting's going to be pretty poor, because a lot of
29 those bulls are not accessible in the fall season.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Thank you. Any
32 other questions by anybody.

33

34 (No comments)

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. In that case,
37 then a motion to put WP04-28 on the table is in order.

38

39 MR. CHURCHILL: I move that we put WP04-
40 28 as written on Page 108 on the table.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second?

43

44 MR. CARPENTER: Second.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
47 seconded. Discussion, Council. Bob.

48

49 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, I guess at this
50 point if this were to totally eliminate the season, I

00179

1 would probably oppose this, but based on the fact that --
2 a number of things. One, that we've had testimony that
3 the general consensus in the community, once they become
4 aware of the issue with the cow moose, and the
5 perceptions issues seem to support this type of ethic,
6 and probably are going to support.

7

8 The other thing that -- sitting on the
9 Anchorage Advisory Committee, we have had an awful lot of
10 testimony from this area, primarily focused on bear
11 predation. I have personally been on the ground quite a
12 bit in this area, and the amount of particularly black
13 bears is mind boggling. I can bring in for the pleasure
14 of the AC, I came into a patch and counted a total of 12
15 black bear rooting, and, I mean, it's just unbelievable
16 the number of bears in this part of the country. And I
17 think we've had clear testimony that the gear are the
18 first -- the primary predator, followed by wolves, and
19 it's keeping the population down.

20

21 I would also like us to consider passing
22 on to the Board, there's two items that are being dealt
23 with, is, one, the Board of Game has already authorized a
24 predator control methods as it relates to wolves. The
25 other thing on the table that I'd like to Board to be
26 aware of is the danger of eliminating bear baiting in
27 this part of the country. It's a valued method of taking
28 bears. And if you've -- I'd encourage you to travel that
29 country. In many places, it's the only practical way to
30 hunt bears out there, and we're in danger of losing that
31 method and means as well.

32

33 So all that being said, I'm going to
34 support this, changing this to a bull hunt, and I would
35 like us as a RAC to pass on to the full Board our
36 concerns about predator control and the loss of bear
37 baiting as a method in this area.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Donald.

40

41 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just
42 for a point of clarification. The motion was to put this
43 proposal on the table for discussion. There's no mention
44 about adopting the proposal.

45

46 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'll.....

49

50 MR. CHURCHILL: I'm sorry, that was my

00180

1 intent, that we move to adopt WP04-28, and I think that
2 was the intent of the second.

3

4 Thank you.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other -- Tom.

7

8 MR. CARPENTER: Just a quick comment.

9 I'm going to support this, too. I think we need to be a
10 little bit cautious when it comes to situations like
11 this. I agree with what Mr. Churchill said. I just
12 think that the statistics are pretty clear. The calf to
13 cow ratios are down. There's a declining population.
14 It's declined 25 percent since 2001. And I just think
15 that the only way to gain recruitment into an area that's
16 struggling is you have to just -- you have to eliminate
17 the cow harvest, and that's really the only way that
18 you're going to increase the population size, so -- the
19 other comment is that I agree that the perception is bad
20 when the State is going to step in, and as controversial
21 as it is, use predator control measures, as limited at
22 they may be right now, but I think the perception's bad
23 that we're still allowing cow harvest when there's
24 predator control being taken, so that's all I have.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gilbert.

27

28 MR. DEMENTI: Yeah, Mr. Chair. I think

29 I'd oppose this proposal, because we're going to be
30 taking away subsistence for this one permitted person in
31 10 years or whatever. One bull moose got in 10 years.
32 And I think we're talking about Federal land here, we're
33 not talking about State land. We should keep that in
34 mind. This is Federal land that we're talking about.
35 It's not the State land. So -- and according to Hollis,
36 we're -- this is pretty remote area, and nobody gets back
37 in there to go bear baiting or anything. Can't do it on
38 park land anyway. So with that, I think I'd oppose this
39 proposal.

40

41 Thank you.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fred.

44

45 MR. ELVSAAS: Thank you. Yeah, I have to
46 oppose this concept. You look at the vast area of 16,
47 the Federal lands is a small portion. The take of the
48 moose is a small portion, and there's not even certainty
49 that cows were taken. You know, we're looking at an
50 issue of what if, you know, the goal of everybody

00181

1 involved with game now is to increase the populations, so
2 what if we have millions of moose out there, should we
3 pass a law today to extend the season and everybody get
4 five moose? You know, what if it doesn't happen, what if
5 it does happen. I say let's leave it alone. And with
6 that, I suggest we oppose it.

7

8 Thank you.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other Council
11 members wish to say anything. Bob.

12

13 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, just as a follow
14 up. One, I absolutely believe the moose that are being
15 taken now are primarily bulls. I don't think we're going
16 to have a negative impact. But I do think for the
17 reasons listed prior, that to support a bull only is not
18 going to really have a negative impact on the subsistence
19 users, and does send a message along that's important,
20 that predation needs to be dealt with, whether we call it
21 management of control is irrelevant to me. So I don't
22 think we're really going to have a negative impact on any
23 of the subsistence users.

24

25 MR. CARPENTER: Question.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question's been
28 called.

29

30 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Better do a hand
31 vote.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, we'd better do a
34 hand vote. All in favor of WP04-28, raise your right
35 hand. All opposed to WP04-28, raise your right hand.
36 Six to five if I counted right, and one abstain. It
37 fails. Six to five and one abstention.

38

39 Yep, let's skip -- we would like to skip
40 to 38 so that we can -- so Gene can be on this one here
41 and then he can leave if he has to. It's the other one
42 on 16, area 16, and that way the biologist can go get
43 back to other work that he has. He would hoping we'd get
44 done with this yesterday, just like we were. Okay.
45 We're going to go to WP04-38 on Page 151.

46

47 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair, Council
48 members, Proposal WP03-38 (sic) was submitted by David
49 McHose, and requests Federal dates for marten trapping in
50 Unit 16 be extended by 28 days. The harvest season would

00182

1 be changed from 10 November through January 31st, to 10
2 November through February 28th.

3

4 The proponent request the harvest
5 regulations for marten be changed to align with the
6 existing seasons in adjacent Units 9, 17 and 19. The
7 proponent feels that the early part of the season, 10
8 November through December 20th, is unproductive as
9 weather and river conditions are not conducive to running
10 trap lines. Extending the season into February would
11 allow more time to allow marten when access to the area
12 is better, due to better travel across frozen rivers when
13 conditions are safer.

14

15 I'll go into a little biological
16 background. One of the best ways to monitor the effects
17 of harvest on marten populations is to examine the age
18 and sex of animals harvested. In a healthy population
19 the harvest should have high ratios of juveniles and
20 males relative to adult females. Overharvesting, poor
21 reproduction and low juvenile survival can result in
22 higher proportions of females in the harvest.

23

24 The status of marten in Unit 16 is not
25 fully known; however, the recent record high harvest of
26 marten in 2001 and 2002 may indicate a peak in the
27 harvest -- or, excuse me, a peak in the marten cycle.
28 Therefore the population could currently be in the
29 downward trend of their cycle, and any additional harvest
30 pressure may limit the population from rebuilding.

31

32 Due to the potentially high trapper
33 density in Unit 16, information taken at the time of
34 sealing is important for determining the status and
35 health of the population. However, often the sex of the
36 animal is unrecorded at the time of sealing and trappers
37 do not keep extremely accurate records of their harvest
38 by sex and month harvested. A relatively high harvest of
39 females late in the season can be indicative of
40 overharvest. The percentage of females in the harvest
41 cannot be effectively analyzed for Unit 16 since a large
42 number of marten that are sealed do not have sex
43 distinguished, and harvest chronology is often uncertain.
44 The percentage of females in the harvest is best
45 available method for managers to assess the health of the
46 marten population.

47

48 In 2001/2002, 40 trappers reported taking
49 804 marten Unit 16.

50

00183

1 Effects of the proposal. If adopted, it
2 would allow more opportunity for Federally qualified
3 subsistence users to harvest marten. However current
4 harvest seasons are set to reduce the opportunity for
5 over-exploitation of marten populations. The marten
6 population could currently be in a downward trend of
7 their cycle, and any additional harvest pressure may
8 limit the population from rebuilding. Extending the
9 season 28 days when travel and weather conditions are
10 better could cause an increase in marten harvest, which
11 could in turn lead to conservation concerns. Even though
12 marten populations appear to be healthy and stable, an
13 extended season could lead to overharvest and sealing and
14 trapper records do not do a good job of tracking female
15 harvest and the harvest chronology of those female marten
16 that are harvested. Without timely and accurate data,
17 it's difficult to manage marten population.

18
19 The proponent requests that the marten
20 harvest season in Unit 16 be aligned with Units 9, 17 and
21 19. These units are on the opposite side of the Alaska
22 Range. While some movement between subpopulations may
23 occur, Unit 16 is managed separately from Interior and
24 Bristol Bay marten populations. A change in the harvest
25 season in Unit 16 could cause State and Federal
26 regulations to diverge, and could cause problems with law
27 enforcement.

28
29 The preliminary conclusion is to oppose
30 this proposal. Are there any questions.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Chuck.
33 Bob.

34
35 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, I was looking at
36 the previous proposal on 13(E) which we seem to be going
37 just the absolute opposite direction on. Any comment?

38
39 MR. ARDIZZONE: I guess my only comments
40 is there's different area biologists, and there's
41 different availability of data for the two populations.

42
43 MR. CHURCHILL: Okay. Thank you.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
46 Chuck.

47
48 (No comments)

49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Chuck, I just have a

00184

1 couple real quick. Currently the Federal season and the
2 State seasons align in 16?

3

4 MR. ARDIZZONE: I believe that's correct.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And currently -- the
7 current biological philosophy is basically that when you
8 have cyclic animals at the low side of the cycle, you
9 don't exploit them, so that you can exploit them higher
10 at the high side of the cycle, and yet you go back into
11 history and you read on cyclic animals and research that
12 was done in the past, and I know that we have this
13 micromanagement attitude in our culture today, but like
14 Minnesota with their grouse, which was a cyclic animal,
15 found out that it didn't matter whether you harvested
16 them at the low end or whether you didn't harvest them at
17 the low end. The cycle still stays the same and the
18 cycles cycle. They've done the same thing with rabbits.
19 Hudson Bay's records on rabbits and things like that.
20 And then on top of that, we have animals that cycle in
21 one part of the country, and they're not cycling in
22 another part of the country in correspondence with it. I
23 just -- as a trapper, the guy's reasons are very good,
24 the idea that, you know, it doesn't matter how many
25 you've got if it's a time of the year and the conditions
26 are such that you can't get around, if you're going to
27 harvest any animals, you have to have the time of the
28 year that you can travel.

29

30 It looks like you have 40 trappers in
31 that area, and they took 804 marten. What is kind of the
32 average over time? Or what -- I mean, we have 804 taken.
33 What is the average for that area?

34

35 MR. ARDIZZONE: I'm going to have to
36 defer to Gino. He might have some better data.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Any other
39 questions for Chuck.

40

41 (No comments)

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Alaska Department of
44 Fish and Game.

45

46 MR. DELFRATE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
47 Staff comments are in your book on Page 155. In addition
48 to those comments, I guess I could answer your question
49 first, if you want to repeat that?

50

00185

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I just was wondering
2 what the long-term average marten take in 16 was?

3
4 MR. DELFRATE: There really is not
5 average harvest of marten. It's been real -- the average
6 take per trapper has stayed relatively similar in the
7 last 10 years, except the number of trappers has doubled
8 in just the last five. So we've got more trappers.
9 Prior to about 1995, we had about 20 trappers that
10 trapped in 16(B) for marten. Or that reported being
11 successful for marten on a regular basis. And since that
12 time, we've got more trappers. We've got -- 16(B) is
13 relatively accessible from not only the Matanuska Valley,
14 but also from the Kenai Peninsula and from Anchorage by
15 some airplane trappers and for others.

16
17 In addition to the information that Chuck
18 and I worked on, since that time, I was going through our
19 furbearer files, and I found a real interesting
20 discussion that went on regarding seasons. In 1992 the
21 Department closed or severely shortened the season to one
22 month in response to the trappers' concerns that marten
23 numbers were way down. They wanted to see the shortened,
24 and so we went to the Board, and the Board agreed, and
25 they essentially closed the season, because it went to
26 about a 30-day season. And then we caught a whole lot
27 more information from the locals that 30 days is much too
28 short. We can't -- I mean, rivers are still open at
29 times, and we -- they can't get out to do it. And so our
30 assistant area biologist at the time, he went, and since
31 it was only 20 trappers, and only about five of those are
32 the real hardcore trappers, he went and he said, okay,
33 what season do you want? And most of the trappers he
34 talked to were locals in 16(B), and the local -- the
35 consensus so to speak from the local trappers was they
36 wanted a -- they wanted a season that started early.
37 They felt that November 10th was when fur was good, and
38 it -- the reason they wanted the early season is they did
39 not want to compete with non-local trappers. As
40 conditions got better into February, more non-locals
41 would go out there and, of course, they'd set right on
42 top of everybody that was already out there, and
43 everything else. And so I believe it was 1995 the
44 Department went back to the Board with this consensus
45 proposal that said, okay, November 10th to the end of
46 January. And the other reasoning was that about three
47 months -- the locals felt that that was plenty of time to
48 catch the marten that were on their trap line, and they
49 didn't need that February season to compete with the non-
50 locals. So I think that that was some pretty strong

00186

1 information that they wanted to have the season to
2 themselves, and they really weren't interested in the
3 february season. And now this proposal is adding that
4 February season.

5
6 Our information as far as the biological,
7 I don't think we're overharvesting our marten. I think
8 our population has declined. I was talking to a fur
9 buyer a couple days ago and he said that, you know marten
10 regionwide and probably statewide are going down, because
11 he has seen many fewer marten in his store. But that
12 goes beyond this proposal.

13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions.

15
16 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, we have two
17 different trapping seasons for Marten within 16, correct?

18
19 MR. DELFRATE: There's a 16(A) season and
20 a 16(B) season.

21
22 MR. CHURCHILL: And the (B) is about a
23 month longer if I remember correctly.

24
25 MR. DELFRATE: 16(B). That's correct.
26 16(A) ends on December 31st, and that's strictly due to
27 the much better access from the road system. We've got
28 snow machine access and road access on 16(A).

29
30 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, I'm from
31 Petersville, that sort of thing. And so it's an access
32 issue, the difference in the season.

33
34 Thank you.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions.

37
38 (No comments)

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Has the increase in
41 trappers been because of people moving into the area, or
42 has it just been from people coming from someplace else
43 and just recreationally trapping in the area?

44
45 MR. DELFRATE: I'm not really sure. I
46 would suspect it's a little bit of everything. I think
47 that the long-time trappers haven't stopped trapping
48 martens, but there are some folks -- I think in some
49 cases it's the advent of better snow machines. We've got
50 people that can now get to 16(B) with some of these

00187

1 larger, better, faster snow machines. They can go out
2 for a day, check a few traps. You know, the hardcore
3 trappers are the ones that are catching the bulk of the
4 marten, and then when you look at some of the others, you
5 know, there may four, six, eight, 10 marten that are
6 being caught by a lot of these others that I would
7 probably consider more recreational, although I've been
8 chastised before by calling a trapper a recreational
9 trapper.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. One other
12 question, and I don't know if we can answer this one or
13 not. Was this proposal submitted by a local resident?

14

15 MR. DELFRATE: Yes.

16

17 MR. ARDIZZONE: Yes.

18

19 MR. DELFRATE: Yes, Dave McHose is a
20 Skwentna resident and has been in that area for about 10
21 to 12 years.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions.

24

25 (No comments)

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

28

29 Oh, Gilbert.

30

31 MR. DEMENTI: Does the State have a
32 sealing like the Federal Government on marten pelts?

33

34 MR. DELFRATE: Yes, we require that all
35 marten taken in 16(B) are sealed.

36

37 MR. DEMENTI: And that's the way you keep
38 track of the.....

39

40 MR. DELFRATE: Yes.

41

42 MR. DEMENTI: Okay. Thank you.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Then I'll have one last
45 question. With that sealing, you're not -- you don't get
46 the male/female sex ratio?

47

48 MR. DELFRATE: We allow -- if trappers
49 bring their furs to us, our Staff are trained on how to
50 sex marten, and from what I've seen is a lot of the

00188

1 marten go to either fur buyers or appointed sealers. We
2 have an appointed sealer that's in Skwentna, and in many
3 cases, they either don't take the time, or -- I'm not
4 sure what the condition of the pelts are, but we don't
5 get as good of sex information from our appointed sealers
6 as we do from our Staff.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, it must just be
9 because they don't take the time, I mean, because --
10 okay. So you don't have good male/ female sex ratio for
11 the area. I mean, you don't any data on that at all?

12

13 MR. DELFRATE: Well, we do have data.
14 And of the -- like of the 800 that were taken two years
15 ago, probably 500 had sex information, and of that 500,
16 we were seeing about 30 to 45 percent females, depending
17 on who the trapper was and where they were. But we
18 haven't see anything that would suggest a significant
19 female ratio until you get up into that 40, 45 percent.
20 But some of those might be just a handful of marten.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That was my next
23 question, is what do you consider a high female sex
24 ratio?

25

26 MR. DELFRATE: Anything over about 40
27 percent would be where I would start getting at least a
28 little bit concerned, but again I don't think our harvest
29 is substantial at its current levels.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All right. Okay. Any
32 other questions.

33

(No comments)

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Other
37 Federal, State, tribal agency comments.

38

(No comments)

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: None. Inter-Agency
42 Staff Committee comments?

43

MR. KESSLER: There are none.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Fish and
47 Game Advisory Committee comments.

48

(No comments)

49

50

00189

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And summary of written
2 public comments.

3
4 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We
5 didn't receive any written public comments that would be
6 in the book, but we did receive comments from the Denali
7 Resource Commission, and it was in your blue folder that
8 was handed out. On Proposal No. 38, the Denali
9 Commission unanimously supported this proposal to extend
10 the marten season in Unit 16 by 28 days. The majority of
11 the 22.6 percent of NPS lands in Unit 16 are high in the
12 mountains of Alaska, and sit in mountain ranges well
13 above the marten habitat. The data presented in this
14 analysis is almost exclusively from non Federal lands.
15 Only a couple of trappers are known to be active on NPS
16 lands, and while their marten harvests are unknown at
17 this time, we believe it to be minimal. It is very
18 difficult to access these lands in the fall and early
19 winter due to open rivers and deep snow conditions. The
20 Commission believes there is no biological reason to
21 shorten the marten season in Unit 16(B).

22
23 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. With that,
26 if I may, could I ask Hollis to come up here? If I
27 understand right, this proposal deals with -- basically
28 the only Federal land we would be talking about is
29 Denali National Park, right? Park or Preserve?

30
31 MR. TWITCHELL: Well, I think primarily,
32 because I think the main trapping is in the Denali
33 Preserve. I'm not familiar with what trapping may be
34 going on down in Lake Clark area, but I know the northern
35 part of Lake Clark is also very high in the mountains,
36 and not typically in marten habitat.

37
38 We've had a fairly minimal amount of
39 trapping effort in Denali Preserve areas, which is in the
40 upper portion of 16(B). That's primarily in the lowlands
41 between the east fork and the west fork of the Yentna
42 River drainage. And that is the only locations that
43 I've been trapping activity going on in the Denali
44 Preserve. And again the trapping effort seems to be
45 quite light. I've only seen one trapper operating in
46 that area in the past. And as I said earlier, the fall
47 time, early winter, it's very difficult to access that
48 country by the ground due to the snowfall and the open
49 water, so the access into that country is better later in
50 the winter when there's deeper snow and some of the river

00190

1 channels get covered over for travel.

2

3

4 I do remember conversations I had with
5 Joe Delia out of Skwentna in the early 90s. And he was
6 very, very concerned about trapping in the Skwentna area.
7 His comments to me then was that there were increasing
8 numbers of new trappers coming into the country, and he
9 was complaining that he had to go out every year onto his
10 trapline just to maintain his ownership or physical
11 presence on the trapline, to keep other people from
12 moving in. So that was a major, major concern that he
13 had. So I know the trapping effort down in the Skwentna,
14 Youngstown, lower part of the Yentna River from the
15 comments I've received there was have increased
16 significantly. I didn't see that sort of effort being
17 expended up into the preserve areas. As I indicated,
18 I've only seen one trapper operating in that area in the
19 90s.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Is that trapper the
21 person that submitted the permit -- the proposal?

22

23 MR. TWITCHELL: That's correct.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So he's the only trapper
26 that operates up in that area?

27

28 MR. TWITCHELL: That I'm aware of.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And you say that area is
31 basically hard to access in the early part, the middle
32 part of the season. It only gets accessible -- in other
33 words, it would be like at the head of the Lacuna or some
34 place like that where you have to go up rivers that until
35 they freeze, you can't go up them?

36

37 MR. TWITCHELL: That's correct. Keep in
38 mind, this is the Preserve area, and so aircraft access
39 into it is possible, but I just don't see that occurring,
40 so the access for trappers into that country has been
41 almost exclusively by snow machine.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any other
44 question for Hollis?

45

46 (No comments)

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We don't have
49 anybody down here for public testimony.

50

00191

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have anybody else,
4 Donald?

5

6 MR. MIKE: (Shakes head negatively)

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

9

10 With that, a motion to put this proposal
11 on the table is in order.

12

13 MR. CHURCHILL: I move we put WP04-38 as
14 written on Page 152 in our workbook, that we adopt it.

15

16 MR. CARPENTER: Second.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second.
19 It's been moved and seconded that we adopt WP04-38. With
20 that, discussion, Council members. I know you guys all
21 want to get out early today, but that doesn't mean you
22 don't say anything. James.

23

24 MR. SHOWALTER: Yes, I've got a question.
25 Is the trapping season in the (B) and (A) section of 16?

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No.

28

29 MR. CHURCHILL: It's specifically (A)
30 runs 11/10 through 12/31, and (B) runs 11/10 through
31 1/31. For the State.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gilbert, you were going
34 to say? Oh. James.

35

36 MR. SHOWALTER: Yes. So then there's a
37 different closing dates, so then this would extend 28
38 days to those existing closing dates, is that correct?

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Negative. This would
41 extend 16(B) on the Federal land an extra month longer
42 than it currently is, and it's already a month longer
43 than 16(A). So it would actually make the Federal land
44 in 16(B) two months longer than 16(A). No other
45 discussion?

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, if there's no
50 other discussion.....

00192

1 MR. CHURCHILL: Call the question.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Boy. You told me you
4 were going to shut me up.

5

6 MR. CHURCHILL: No, no, I'm just moving
7 things along. The Chair always has the right to put
8 comments on the record.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. The Chair always
11 the right to comment on the record after the vote, is
12 that what you're saying?

13

14 MR. CHURCHILL: Prior to the question.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Prior to the question.
17 I recognize the question. Okay.

18

19 MR. CHURCHILL: No, no, you didn't. What
20 I'm saying is.....

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, I'm going to
23 comment on it then, if I'm allowed to make a comment, I'm
24 going to make a comment on it. I mean, we're dealing
25 with Federal land, first of all. It's at the head of the
26 Yentna River. Having been a trapper and also having
27 trapped river systems, having listened to Hollis, I see
28 no biological impact to have a trapper go up the river at
29 that time of the year when he can't get up it the rest of
30 the time of the year, and I am going to vote in support
31 of this proposal. And I'll just let it go at that.

32

33 Now, the question's been called. Oops,
34 wait a second. We have a hand up there. I haven't
35 recognized your question. Doug.

36

37 MR. BLOSSOM: When you said to James
38 about the trapping season, isn't it the other way around,
39 that 16(A) will be two months longer this way than it was
40 before, and not (B). So that means the area up there
41 where they're trapping heavier will be two months longer?

42

43 MR. ARDIZZONE: Well, than the State.
44 Than the State.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Wait.

47

48 MR. CHURCHILL: The Federal is all one
49 season, if I understand correctly, and it ends the 31st
50 of January. The State has the two different seasons

00193

1 between (A) and (B).

2

3 MR. BLOSSOM: Right. But presently (A)
4 closes the end of December for the State.

5

6 MR. CHURCHILL: Exactly right.

7

8 MR. BLOSSOM: So it will be two months
9 longer in this area then.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Up in the area -- up in
12 the Federal up there. Right. Than (A). But according
13 to Hollis there's only one area that's -- if you look in
14 16(A), if I'm correct, Hollis, 16(A) is all high
15 mountain country isn't it, the Federal land there? I
16 mean, that's.....

17

18 MR. TWITCHELL: Thank you, Chair. Board
19 members. 16(A) does extend down into the lower reaches
20 of the Tokositna/Ruth Glacier areas, so there is some
21 timbered habitat down in that area. There's -- and this
22 is National Park areas here now, as differentiated from
23 16(B) which is National Preserves. So the eligibility
24 requirement for Federal users is much narrower there with
25 resident zones and individuals with subsistence use
26 permits. There is only one individual that lives within
27 the Park in 16(A), and he's not a trapper. So there's no
28 trapping activity going on in 16(A) that I'm aware of.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And there can be no
31 airplane traffic in 16(A).

32

33 MR. TWITCHELL: That's correct.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So 16(A) is
36 basically not really a part of the discussion to a
37 certain extent.

38

39 MR. TWITCHELL: I know of no trapping
40 activity in there, even though there is ont local
41 resident that lives year round within the Park area, but
42 he's not a trapper that I'm aware of.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Dean.

45

46 MR. WILSON: Being familiar with trapper
47 on the rivers and different things around our area, I'm
48 also aware that for the trapping season being November
49 10th through the end of January, which is our area is an
50 awful lot, it's pretty tough to take advantage of that

00194

1 entire season. It's kind of deceiving when you take a
2 look at the weather and the rivers, the conditions that
3 this person is talking about. I know that his main
4 purpose it looks like is to access different areas
5 primarily late in the year, and so we're -- I don't think
6 we're looking at something that is going to knock out a
7 huge -- a lot more marten in a given area. I think we're
8 talking about getting a few more marten in one area, and
9 several more marten in a different area is what this
10 person is looking at, extending up the river. With that
11 being, you know, as far as the trappers go, it's tough
12 enough to try to get trappers out in these areas
13 sometimes, and also it's quite an effort, not only
14 financially, but also just a physical effort to get up in
15 there. And I'm going to support this thing to extend
16 them and help the trapper out in that area.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hollis.

19

20 MR. TWITCHELL: I just wanted to pass on
21 one other focus that the Denali Subsistence Resource
22 Commission had when they were discussing this, and there
23 was acknowledgement that there's a very important need to
24 have good sealing harvest records, particularly for this
25 species, and they were a little bit concerned that that
26 harvest information, particularly of females was not
27 being captured as well, and so although they didn't
28 include that in their comments to you, that was something
29 that was brought up with the different furbearers
30 proposals that were in front of them. They recognized
31 the need to have reliable data in terms of harvest
32 records.

33

34 Thank you.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, if there's no
37 further discussion, I'll recognize your question. Okay.
38 The question's recognized. WP04-38, all in favor signify
39 by raising your right hand. This is going to be another
40 one of those close ones. I thought.

41

42 MR. ELVSAAS: Pretty close.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify
45 raising your left hand. I thought I'd get you that way.
46 Okay. Motion carries. Now, this is on the Federal land,
47 and if it turns out to be a problem, it will be right
48 back in our lap.

49

50 Okay. With that we're going to go back

00195

1 to 29. I think the justification on that last one is
2 that I didn't see any conservation concerns with the kind
3 of impact we're talking about. 29. Lengthen the hunting
4 season for coyote in Unit 1 -- 11. Better put my glasses
5 back on. Submitted by the Alaska Department of Fish and
6 Game.

7

8 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair, I wrote the
9 analysis.....

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Can we take 29 and 30
12 together, would you think?

13

14 MR. ARDIZZONE: I was just going to
15 mention, I wrote them together since they're the same
16 species.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: They're the same and
19 they're also dealing with the same people.

20

21 MR. ARDIZZONE: Yes. So I'll cover them
22 both at the same time.

23

24 Proposals WP04-29 and WP04-30 were
25 submitted by the State of Alaska and request Federal
26 harvest dates for coyote hunting in Units 11 and 13 be
27 extended by 22 days, and the annual harvest limit be
28 raised from two to 10 in Unit 13. The harvest season
29 would be changed from 1 September through April 30 to 10
30 August through April 30th.

31

32 The proponent requests that the harvest
33 regulations for coyote hunting be changed to align with
34 existing State seasons, which would provide additional
35 opportunity for subsistence hunters on Federal park
36 lands.

37

38 Some biological background. Coyotes have
39 greatly expanded their ranges in Alaska over the last 30
40 to 40 years. However, the status of coyote populations
41 in Unit 11 and 13 are not fully known. Based on
42 information from trapper questionnaire and sighting of
43 coyotes by ADF&G area biologists during aerial surveys of
44 other species, coyote populations in the units are
45 considered healthy. Although the exact coyote population
46 numbers are not available, data from trapper
47 questionnaires are used by ADF&G to determine relative
48 abundance and broad trends of furbearers. In Unit 11 and
49 13, coyotes were determined to be common or abundant
50 depending on the habitat type. Overall the population of

00196

1 coyotes in the Units 11 and 13 are considered stable and
2 current harvest levels are considered, excuse me,
3 sustainable.

4

5 The effects of this proposal. The
6 proposed change would reduce confusion among Federal
7 subsistence hunters by aligning Federal/State
8 regulations. This proposal would provide additional
9 opportunities for Federally qualified subsistence users
10 to harvest Coyotes in Wrangell-St. Elias National Park
11 and Denali National Park, since State regulations do not
12 apply there. Currently the coyote population is
13 considered to be abundant with a stable population. This
14 proposal should have minimal effect on the overall coyote
15 populations in Units 11 and 13. Are there any questions.

16

17 Oh, excuse me. Preliminary conclusion
18 would be to support this. Are there any questions.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Alaska
21 Department of Fish and Game comments.

22

23 (No comments)

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, any questions for
26 Chuck.

27

28 (No comments)

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Alaska Department of
31 Fish and Game comments.

32

33 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
34 Terry Haynes, Department of Fish and Game.

35

36 These are Department proposals to align
37 the State and Federal seasons. By adopting these
38 proposals, there would be additional opportunity provided
39 for Federally qualified subsistence users. And if you
40 have specific questions about biology or management,
41 Becky Kelleyhouse is here and can try to answer those for
42 you.

43

44 Thank you.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have any questions
47 for Terry or for Becky?

48

49 (No comments)

50

00197

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none, we'll go
2 on to other -- thank you, Terry.

3

4 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We'll go on to other
7 Federal, State and tribal agency comments. Hearing none,
8 Inter-Agency Staff Committee comments.

9

10 MR. KESSLER: There aren't any on this.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: There aren't any. Fish
13 and Game Advisory Committee comments. There aren't any.
14 Summary of written public comments.

15

16 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chairman, the Denali
17 Commission unanimously supported these proposals to
18 extend the coyote hunting season in Units 11 and 13 by 22
19 days, and raise the bag limit from 10 to -- from two to
20 10. This proposal would provide additional opportunity
21 for subsistence user, would have minimal impact on the
22 coyote populations, which is healthy, and would align
23 Federal and State regulations.

24

25 The AHTNA, Incorporated, is in support of
26 29 and 30, supporting the proposal to lengthen the season
27 for coyote hunting in Unit 11 so that Federal subsistence
28 users will have more opportunity to hunt coyotes.

29

30 The Wrangell-St. Elias National Park
31 Subsistence Resource Commission support the proposal as
32 written for 29 and 30.

33

34 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Donald. Any
37 public testimony.

38

39 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair, I didn't receive
40 any public testimony, thank you.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Donald. A
43 motion to put WP04-29 and 30 on the table for adoption is
44 in order.

45

46 MR. CHURCHILL: Just a question. Should
47 we not vote on these separately or.....

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think we can vote on
50 them together. We considered them together. I don't see

00198

1 any problem with it, do you? If you do.....

2

3 MR. CHURCHILL: In the State forum it
4 would be, but in the Federal it may not be. If Donald
5 doesn't think there's a problem, I'd be happy to move
6 that we adopt WP04-29 and WP04-30.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bill Knauer says it's
9 okay.

10

11 MR. CARPENTER: Second.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
14 seconded to adopt WP04-29 and 30 lengthening the coyote
15 season and increasing the bag limit. Discussion. Bob.

16

17 MR. CHURCHILL: One item that has not
18 been brought forward is there's a fair amount of evidence
19 that coyotes have the -- are having the ability to
20 depress sheep populations, and I think that would be yet
21 another reason for supporting this. And it's certainly
22 not predator control, but it involves management of the
23 predation.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.

26

27 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chair, I think
28 there's unanimous support for this from all the public
29 comment, both the Wrangell-St. Elias, Denali Park
30 commissions and I think this gives more opportunity and
31 aligns both State and Federal seasons, and I'll call the
32 question.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The questions been
35 called. I didn't have anything to say. Yes, the
36 question's been called. All in favor of adopting WP04-29
37 and 30, signify by saying aye.

38

39 IN UNISON: Aye.

40

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

43

44 (No opposing votes)

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. We will
47 now go on to WP04-31 and 32. Okay. Chuck.

48

49 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair, Council
50 members, Proposals WP04-31 and 04-32 were submitted by

00199

1 the State of Alaska and requests Federal harvest dates
2 for red fox hunting in Units 11 and 13 be extended by 28
3 days, and that the annual harvest limit be raised from
4 two to 10. The harvest season would be changed from 1
5 September through February 15 to September 1 through
6 March 15th.

7

8 This one should be fairly quick.
9 Biological background. The status of red fox populations
10 in Unit 13 and 11 are not fully known, but based on
11 trapper response to questionnaires, harvest is moderate.
12 In Units 11 and 13 red fox were determined to be common
13 and the population appears to be stable. Harvest of red
14 fox are well within sustainable levels.

15

16 Effects of this proposal. The proposal
17 would change -- this proposal would reduce confusion
18 among Federal subsistence hunters by aligning Federal and
19 State regulations. The proposal would allow additional
20 opportunities for Federally qualified subsistence users
21 to harvest red fox by lengthening the season and
22 increasing the harvest limit in Wrangell-St. Elias
23 National Park and Denali National Park since State
24 regulations do not apply there. Currently the red fox
25 population is considered to be stable and this proposal
26 would have little impact on overall population.

27

28 Preliminary conclusion is to support this
29 proposal.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Chuck.
32 Bob.

33

34 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, what's the logic on
35 only allowing the harvest of two fox prior to October 1?

36

37 MR. ARDIZZONE: I'm not sure on the exact
38 logic on that. Maybe Becky could answer that.

39

40 MS. KELLEYHOUSE: Rebecca Kelleyhouse,
41 Fish and Game. I think that's just kind of a straight
42 forward idea that's -- it's been in the regulations for a
43 long time on the State side, and it's basically just
44 because the hides are just not prime by that time, so
45 it's not worth taking them.

46

47 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Any other
50 questions for Chuck.

00200

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Alaska Department of
4 Fish and Game. Terry.

5

6 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As
7 with the previous proposal, adoption of these proposals
8 would align the State and Federal seasons, provide
9 additional opportunity for Federally qualified
10 subsistence users, and reduce confusion.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And you don't feel there
13 would be any conservation concern?

14

15 MR. HAYNES: We're not concerned about
16 that at this time.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

19

20 MR. HAYNES: Thank you.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Terry
23 or Becky?

24

25 (No comments)

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Becky, for
28 your comment.

29

30 From past from being on the Advisory
31 Council, I'm pretty sure that that's why that's in there
32 is because the fur just isn't prime, but that still
33 allows somebody that's hunting to take one for a trophy
34 to hang on their wall.

35

36 Okay. Other Federal, State, tribal
37 agency comments. Hearing none, Inter-Agency Staff
38 Committee comments?

39

40 MR. KESSLER: There are none.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: There are none. Fish
43 and Game Advisory Committee comments.

44

45 (No comments)

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: None. Summary of
48 written public comments.

49

50 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The

00201

1 Denali Commission unanimously supports these proposals to
2 extend the red fox hunting seasons in Units 11 and 13 by
3 28 days, and raise the bag limit from two to 10. This
4 proposal would provide additional opportunity for
5 subsistence users. It would have minimal impact on the
6 red fox populations, which is healthy, and would align
7 Federal and State regulations.

8

9 The AHTNA, Incorporated, is in support of
10 Proposal 31 and 32 to lengthen the season for red fox
11 hunting in Unit 11 so that Federal subsistence users will
12 have more opportunity to hunt red fox and to increase
13 take of red fox to 10 foxes and no more than two red
14 foxes before October 1.

15

16 The Wrangell-St. Elias National Park
17 Subsistence Resource Commission opposes Proposals 31 and
18 32 due to conservation concerns.

19

20 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. That was our
23 written testimony. Do we have any public testimony,
24 Donald?

25

26 MR. MIKE: We did not receive any, Mr.
27 Chair, thank you.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Donald.

30

31 MR. CHURCHILL: Mr. Chair, I move that we
32 put WP04-31 and WP04-32, we adopt.

33

34 MS. WELLS: Second.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
37 seconded that we adopt WP04-31 and 32. I have one
38 question, and I just wondered if we had anybody here from
39 the SRC or from Wrangell-St. Elias. Barbara, may I ask
40 you a question?

41

42 MS. CELLARIUS: Sure.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Barbara, the only ones
45 in opposition are Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource
46 Commission. You attended their meeting? Can you give us
47 an idea of what they saw as concerns?

48

49 MS. CELLARIUS: Mr. Chair, some of the
50 local hunters and trappers are concerned that -- about

00202

1 the health of the red fox population in those areas. I
2 think part of the concern related to the food supply, how
3 many rabbits there were around for them to be eating, and
4 they did not feel that at this point it was prudent to
5 lengthen the season or increase the bag limits.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Roger. Roger. That's
8 what I kind of thought. I'd like to speak to that though
9 from the standpoint that in most areas of Unit 11, foxes
10 aren't in great abundance anyhow like they are in Unit
11 13. It's not real fox country, and they seem to come and
12 go with the rabbits and the voles. So for myself, being
13 a resident of Unit 11 and the amount of foxes that I've
14 seen in all the years I've been there, I don't think this
15 will have an effect one way or the other, because I don't
16 think there's going to be a great increase in taking
17 foxes, because there just aren't a great number of foxes
18 to increase your take on, unless you get over there by
19 Sanford and Mount Drum, and nobody really gets there. I
20 don't see a conservation concern as a resident of Unit
21 11, I'll put it that way. Gloria.

22

23 MS. STICKWAN: Do you guys have to keep
24 statistics on foxes or any other trapping animals?

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: There are no record --
27 the question is there are no records on foxes. There are
28 no sealing of fox skins or records on foxes, right?
29 Right. So -- thank you, Barbara.

30

31 MS. CELLARIUS: You're welcome.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I just wanted to
34 acknowledge what they said. Any other questions or
35 deliberations or discussions by any members of the
36 Council. Anybody you'd like to ask questions of.
37 Hearing none.....

38

39 (No comments)

40

41 MR. CHURCHILL: Call the question.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question's in order.
44 WP04-31/32, lengthen red seasons and increase the bag
45 limit. All in favor signify by saying aye.

46

47 IN UNISON: Aye.

48

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

00203

1 (No opposing votes)

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. We are
4 now going to WP04-33, unless I have a consensus that we
5 need a break. Do I have a consensus that we need a
6 break? Okay. We will take a 10-minute break.

7

8 (Off record)

9

10 (On record)

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We've all had a
13 nice break. We'll get back in session. We're on WP04-
14 35, lengthens the trapping season for beaver in Unit 13.

15

16

17 MR. CHURCHILL: 33 and 34.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, did I -- I'm sorry,
20 I skipped 33 and 34. Thank you, Bob.

21

22 MR. CHURCHILL: You clever dog, you.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, I'd already turned
25 the page. I just thought that was past. 33 and 34.
26 This is on lengthening the hunting season for lynx in
27 Unit 11 and Unit 13. Chuck.

28

29 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair and Council
30 members, WP04-33 and 04-34 were submitted by the State of
31 Alaska and requests Federal harvest dates for lynx
32 hunting in Units 11 and 13 be extended by 51 days. The
33 harvest season would be changed from December 15th
34 through January 15th to November 10th through January
35 31st.

36

37 Lynx populations are cyclic throughout
38 their range with highs and lows occurring approximately
39 every eight to 11 years. Lynx management decisions need
40 to be responsive to these cyclic population cycles and
41 rely on indicators such as the over-all harvest and the
42 percentage of kittens within the harvest.

43

44 Currently lynx populations in Unit 11 and
45 13 are in the low portion of their cycle based on sealing
46 records, lynx track index and field observations. In
47 Unit 11 and 13, the combined annual lynx harvest averaged
48 426 animals between 1996 and 2000. Lynx harvest was low
49 in 2000 and 2003. Reported number of lynx shot or hunted
50 in Unit 11 during the 2000/2001 season was zero. In 2001

00204

1 to 2002, four lynx were harvested, and in 2002/2003
2 season no lynx were harvested. And remember, this is
3 hunting.

4

5 The reported lynch shot in Unit 13 during
6 the 2000/2001 season was 27. 2001 to '02 was 29. And
7 2002 to '03 were five.

8

9 Currently the lynx population in Units 11
10 and 13 are low, but considered stable.

11

12 So I'll go into the effects of this
13 proposal. This proposed change would reduce confusion
14 among Federal subsistence hunters by aligning Federal and
15 State regulations. This proposal would allow additional
16 opportunities for Federally qualified subsistence users
17 to harvest lynx by lengthening the season in Wrangell-
18 Elias National Park and Denali National Parks, since
19 State regulations do not apply there. Currently the lynx
20 population is low but considered stable. Lynx harvest
21 levels are not anticipated to increase even in the event
22 this proposed change is adopted, because lynx harvest by
23 firearm are generally low and generally occur on an
24 incidental basis.

25

26 Therefore the preliminary conclusion
27 would be to support this proposal. Are there any
28 questions.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Chuck. Any
31 questions for Chuck.

32

33 (No comments)

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Alaska Department of
36 Fish and Game.

37

38 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
39 This is another Department proposal to align the State
40 and Federal seasons. As with the previous two, this
41 would provide additional opportunity for Federally
42 qualified subsistence users under the Federal regulations
43 and reduce confusion for hunters.

44

45 Thank you.

46

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

49

50 (No comments)

00205

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Other Federal, State and
2 tribal agency comments.

3

4 (No comments)

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hollis, could I ask you
7 to come up, because I'd like to ask you a couple
8 questions real quick as Park. Now, an animal that's shot
9 while trapping isn't considered a hunted animal, is it?

10

11 MR. TWITCHELL: The NPS regulations when
12 -- in the definition for trapping, doesn't mention a
13 firearm, so the NPS interprets free roaming furbearers
14 not in a trap would have to be taken under a hunting
15 provision rather than the trapping. So our trapping
16 definition indicates the animal is in the trap. You can
17 shoot an animal in a trap with a firearm to dispatch it,
18 but a free roaming one not in a trap needs to be taken
19 under the hunting regulation provisions.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And so that can only
22 take place in the preserve, that can't take place in the
23 Park itself, right?

24

25 MR. TWITCHELL: This would be the Park
26 and Preserve.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, so you could with --
29 a Federally qualified subsistence user with a hunting
30 license could shoot a free roaming animal in the Park
31 proper?

32

33 MR. TWITCHELL: That's correct. Under
34 the hunting seasons and bag limits.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Under the hunting season
37 and bag limits, if there was a hunting season and a bag
38 limit.

39

40 MR. TWITCHELL: That's correct.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. That's where I
43 had a mistaken idea that that was a no-no in the park
44 itself.

45

46 MR. TWITCHELL: No, it's within the
47 hunting season, harvest limits, and the dates.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But they're only classed
50 as hunting, not as trapping?

00206

1 MR. TWITCHELL: That's correct.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Under State regulations
4 a trapper is allowed to shoot a free roaming animal under
5 his trapping license, isn't he, Terry? So he can shoot a
6 free roaming animal as long as there's a State trapping
7 season, if he has a State trapping license?

8

9 MR. HAYNES: Yes.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So there's the
12 difference between the Federal and the State. Okay.
13 Thank you, Hollis. That's -- unless you have something
14 that you'd like to add to this, those questions that I
15 needed to get straight in my mind when we dealt with
16 this.

17

18 MR. TWITCHELL: No, I don't. I think the
19 SRC's comments will be pretty clear.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Any other tribal
22 agencies or State agencies that wish to speak to this.
23 Inter-Agency Staff Committee comments.

24

25 MR. KESSLER: No comments.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No comment. Fish and
28 Game Advisory Committee comments. Summary of written
29 public comments.

30

31 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We
32 received three written public comments. Two are in
33 support and one in opposition.

34

35 The Denali Commission unanimously
36 supported these proposals to extend the lynx hunting
37 season in Units 11 and 13 by 51 days. This proposal
38 would provide additional opportunity for subsistence
39 users by significantly lengthening the season by dates by
40 51 days, yet provide some level of protection for the
41 lynx population by retaining a harvest limit of two lynx.
42 In retaining this limit, it is not expected to impact the
43 lynx population, and would align Federal and State
44 regulations. Passage of Proposal WP04-36 will address
45 the conservation concerns the Commission has by providing
46 the Federal Subsistence Board delegated authority,
47 flexibility to adjust seasons dates to meet conservation
48 needs for the protection of the lynx population.

49

50 The AHTNA, Incorporated supports

00207

1 Proposals 33 and 34 to lengthen the seasons for lynx,
2 which will provide increased opportunity to hunt lynx in
3 Units 11 and 13.

4

5 The Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence
6 Resource Commission opposes 33 and 34 due to conservation
7 concerns.

8

9 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Donald. Any
12 public testimony?

13

14 MR. MIKE: None, Mr. Chair.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: None. A motion for.....

17

18 MR. CHURCHILL: I move that we adopt
19 WP04-33 and WP04-34.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second?

22

23 MS. WELLS: Second.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
26 seconded that we adopt WP04-33 and WP04-34. Any
27 discussion. Tom.

28

29 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chair, there doesn't
30 seem to be any biological concerns. I think this will
31 increase subsistence opportunity and align seasons that
32 will make enforcement a lot easier. I would be in
33 support of this.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob. Any other
36 discussion

37

38 (No comments)

39

40 MR. CHURCHILL: Call the question.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question's been
43 called. All in favor of supporting WP04-33 and 34,
44 signify by saying aye.

45

46 IN UNISON: Aye.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify
49 saying nay.

50

00208

1 (No opposing votes)

2

3

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. WP04-35, lengthens the trapping season for beaver in Unit 13. Submitted by Alaska Department of Fish and Game. Chuck.

6

7

MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair, Council members, Proposal WP04-35 was submitted by the State of Alaska and requests a Federal harvest date for beaver trapping in Unit 13 be extended by 31 days. The harvest season would be changed from 1 October through May 15th to September 25th through May 31st.

13

Historic data are limited for furbearers in Unit 13 prior to the initiation of sealing requirements. Beaver sealing became mandatory in 1971. Due to limited funding, ADF&G does not routinely conduct beaver cache surveys or inventories for beaver. However, frequent field observations of beaver ponds and food caches made during aerial big game surveys suggest beaver numbers are high.

22

Trapper responses consider beavers to be abundant on their lines. Beaver harvest in Unit 13 has steadily increased between 1998 and 2003 with an average of 234 beaver harvested per year. A harvest of 342 beaver in 2002 to '03 was the highest annual harvest ever recorded.

29

And I think I'll just to effects. This proposal would change -- this proposed change would reduce confusion among subsistence users by aligning State and Federal regulations. It would allow additional opportunities for Federally qualified subsistence users to harvest beavers by lengthening the season in Denali National Park, since State regulations do not apply there. Currently the beaver population's considered abundant, and the current harvest is considered sustainable. Therefore, this proposal should have little effect on the over-all beaver population.

41

Preliminary conclusion would be to support this proposal. Any questions.

44

45

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

46

47

MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, are these animals also used as a food source in these areas?

49

50

MR. ARDIZZONE: I'm not sure in this area

00209

1 if they use it as a food source or not.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.

4

5 MS. STICKWAN: (Indiscernible - away from
6 microphone) as food source.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: They are used as a food
9 source, and I was going to testify to that also. Any
10 other questions for Chuck.

11

12 (No comments)

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Alaska Department of
15 Fish and Game. Terry.

16

17 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
18 should have made a little recording that I could play
19 back. This is another Department proposal to align the
20 State and Federal regulations. Its adoption would
21 provide additional opportunity to Federally qualified
22 subsistence users and reduce confusion.

23

24 Thank you.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And there are no
27 conservation concerns?

28

29 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, no
30 conservation concerns at this time.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Other
33 Federal, State, tribal agency comments.

34

35 (No comments)

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Inter-Agency Staff
38 Committee comments.

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fish and Game Advisory
43 Committee comments.

44

45 (No comments)

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Summary of written
48 public comments.

49

50 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. There

00210

1 were three written public comments received. All three
2 supported the proposal.

3

4 The Denali Commission unanimously
5 supported this proposal to extend the beaver trapping
6 season by 31 days in Unit 13. The Commission concurs
7 with the justification that's stated in the Staff
8 proposal analysis. The beaver population is considered
9 healthy.

10

11 The AHTNA, Incorporated supports the
12 proposal to lengthen the season for beaver trapping from
13 October 10th to May 15, to September 25 to May 31st, so
14 that Federal subsistence users will have increased days
15 to trap for beaver in Unit 13.

16

17 The Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence
18 Resource Commission supports the proposal as written.

19

20 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Donald. Any
23 written -- I mean, any public testimony? I don't have
24 any cards up here.

25

26 MR. MIKE: I did not receive and
27 requests, sir.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With that a
30 motion is in order.

31

32 MR. CHURCHILL: I'd like to move that we
33 adopt WP04-35 as written on Page 133.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second.

36

37 MR. CARPENTER: Second.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Discussion. Any
40 comments, questions. Tom.

41

42 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chair, I don't
43 believe there's any conservation concerns. I believe
44 this increases the subsistence opportunity, and reduces
45 enforcement problems. And I'll call the question.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tom. All in
48 favor of WP04-35 signify by saying aye

49

50 MR. CHURCHILL: I'll call the question.

00211

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's already been
2 called.

3
4 MR. CHURCHILL: Was it?
5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yep, he called it. So
7 we'll have to do that again now, because -- all in favor
8 of WP04-35, signify by saying aye.

9
10 IN UNISON: Aye.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
13 saying nay.

14
15 (No opposing votes)

16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. With
18 that we go on to WP04-36, delegates authority to the
19 Office of Subsistence Management to adjust trapping
20 seasons and harvest limits for lynx in Units, 6, 7, 11,
21 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 20. Chuck.

22
23 MR. CHURCHILL: Mr. Chair, you can
24 continue. You're doing a good job.

25
26 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair, Counsel
27 members, WP04-36 was initiated by the Office of
28 Subsistence Management, and is a housekeeping measure to
29 move the delegated authority for annual lynx season
30 adjustments from special action provisions to the Federal
31 Subsistence Board delegated authority to be described in
32 Subpart D.

33
34 This regulatory action will clarify
35 implementation procedures for delegation of authority to
36 the Assistant Regional Director for Subsistence
37 Management. The current delegation of authority letter
38 allows the Assistant Regional Director to implement
39 changes to seasons and harvest limits through special
40 action provisions. However, they do not allow for such
41 changes in seasons and harvest limits to exceed 60 days
42 without conducting a public hearing. As the Board's
43 intent was to allow OSM to make annual adjustments in the
44 lynx harvest regulations for the specified units using
45 current harvest information and a lynx harvest management
46 strategy, a regulatory change is needed. To accomplish
47 this, the change -- the delegation of authority letter
48 for the lynx special actions should be withdrawn, and the
49 delegated authority should be articulated in Subpart D.
50

00213

1 unless the Alaska Department of Fish and Game has that
2 maximum season in theirs, which I don't think it does,
3 but I'm not positive on that, I can't see -- if you're
4 going to manage it within a strategy, I can't see why
5 you'd put a maximum season on it ahead of time, so.....

6

7 MS. STICKWAN: What does it mean by
8 maximum season?

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That means that it can
11 be no longer than November 10th to February 28th. Our
12 old lynx seasons used to run November 10th to March 31st,
13 so consequently, unless there is a biological reason for
14 that, if you're already managing it, you're not going to
15 run a season longer unless there's a need to run the
16 season longer, so I can't -- unless -- you know, I can't
17 see any reason to have a -- I just wondered if you knew
18 why the maximum season was put in there?

19

20 MR. ARDIZZONE: I'm not sure, Mr. Chair.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Any other
23 questions for Chuck.

24

25 (No comments)

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Alaska Department of
28 Fish and Game.

29

30 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
31 The Department supports this proposal. Whether or not
32 there should be dates included in the recommendation as
33 Chuck proposed, I'm not sure about that. It might appear
34 to unnecessarily restrict the -- if the harvest
35 management strategy would recommend season dates outside
36 of -- you know, before November 10th, or after February
37 28, then that might pose problems.

38

39 This Department has used this strategy
40 for establishing the lynx trapping seasons for a number
41 of years as the analysis points out. And the -- for the
42 past several years, the Federal Board has supported that
43 approach and as is pointed out in the analysis, they've
44 just had to each year go through steps to implement that.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Um-hum.

47

48 MR. HAYNES: This proposal would
49 streamline that process and we certainly appreciate the
50 fact that the Federal Board has supported using this

00214

1 strategy. We think it's important for lynx management,
2 and encourage you to support it as well.

3

4 Thank you.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Other
7 Federal, State -- oh, any questions for Terry.

8

9 (No comments)

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I understand from what
12 I've asked you before that their management strategy is
13 in agreement with yours? I mean, it's a joint strategy,
14 right?

15

16 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, each spring
17 our furbearer biologists crunch the numbers, recommend
18 the season dates that will be implemented in State
19 regulation. We then provide that information to the
20 Office of Subsistence Management, and the Staff there
21 then have developed the special action request so that
22 the Federal Board could consider that information, and if
23 it agreed, implement those dates in the Federal
24 regulations for that year.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Gloria.

27

28 MS. STICKWAN: Does the State have any
29 other management strategy for other furbearing animals?

30

31 MR. HAYNES: This is -- I shouldn't say I
32 know one way or the other, but this is a special strategy
33 that's used for lynx management. I'm not aware of any
34 other comparable strategies that we're using to determine
35 furbearer seasons for other species each year. So I
36 would say this is the only one that's in play right now.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Terry.

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Terry.

43

44 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Other Federal, State,
47 and tribal agency comments.

48

49 (No comments)

50

00215

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Inter-Agency Staff
2 Committee comments.

3
4 MR. KESSLER: None at this time.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fish and Game Advisory
7 Committee comments. Summary of written public comments.

8
9 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. There
10 was three written public comments received, all in
11 support of the proposal.

12
13 The Denali Commission unanimously
14 supported this proposal to move the delegated authority
15 for annual lynx season adjustments from the special
16 action provisions of Section 19 to develop a season to
17 Board delegated authority to be described in Subpart D,
18 section 26. The Commission concurs with the
19 justification as stated in the Staff proposal analysis.
20 Passage of this proposal is necessary to address
21 conservation concerns we have regarding WP04-33/34 to
22 lengthen the lynx season by 51 days.

23
24 The AHTNA, Incorporated supported the
25 proposal allowing the Assistant Regional Director open,
26 close or adjust Federal subsistence season and to harvest
27 and possession limits for lynx.

28
29 The Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence
30 Resource Commission supports the proposal as written.

31
32 Thank you, Mr. Chair. And there were no
33 written public testimony received.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Any public
36 testimony.

37
38 MR. MIKE: There was none.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Donald.

41
42 MR. CHURCHILL: I move we adopt WP04-36
43 as written on Page 139.

44
45 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved that we
48 adopt WP04-36 as written on Page 139. That's the
49 original. Do we have any discussion, any comments on it.
50 Bob.

00216

1 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, I don't see the
2 danger of eroding the involvement of the RACs in this
3 particular delegation, but I think we need to be cautious
4 when authorities are delegated away from our process. I
5 just want that on the record. But I don't see that as
6 being a real danger in this -- in proposal 36.

7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I wish Bill Knauer was
9 out there. I'd like to ask him a question at this point
10 in time. Gloria.

11
12 MS. STICKWAN: It's just for 60 days and
13 after that they'd have a public hearing, right?

14
15 MR. ARDIZZONE: That's currently the way
16 it's done under special actions. A special action only
17 lasts 60 days. And, right, beyond that we'd have to have
18 a hearing. This would allow it to be changed and not
19 have to worry about trying to get to the public and get
20 it changed in time for the season.

21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right. Now, possibly
23 somebody else can answer my question then. Once this
24 authority is delegated, a proposal can be put in to
25 undelegate that authority, can't it? I mean, should
26 there be abuse of authority, anybody can put a proposal
27 in to bring in front of the RAC to undelegate that
28 authority. So basically the longest it would last, if
29 there was a real abuse of power, the longest it would
30 last would be a year before anything could be addressed
31 on it?

32
33 MR. ARDIZZONE: I believe that's correct,
34 yeah, but.....

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

37
38 MR. CHURCHILL: From my experience on the
39 State side, that will probably never, ever happen. Once
40 you delegate these authorities, I've never seen them come
41 back, so -- and as Gloria's concern, this delegate --
42 they can do anything they want in season. This is not a
43 60-day limit. This is as no holds barred is the way I
44 read it. Is that not right, Chuck?

45
46 MR. ARDIZZONE: We follow the lynx
47 management strategy. We won't just go change things just
48 to change them. I mean, we follow the State. You know,
49 if changes need to be made -- we currently do it now
50 anyway under special action provisions. This is just

00217

1 trying to make it a little cleaner so if, you know, the
2 season goes more than 60 days, that we can do it in
3 house.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Can I ask a question
6 then as long as we're on this way of doing things, that
7 authority's not delegated in the Fish and Game, is it?
8 That strategy has to go in front of the Board every year?
9 It is delegated? So there's a delegated authority in the
10 Fish and Game that has the authority to shorten or
11 lengthen the lynx seasons. Becky.

12

13 MS. KELLEYHOUSE: Yeah. Becky
14 Kelleyhouse, Fish and Game. I did just want to mention
15 that, yeah, this has been delegated to the Department
16 through the Board process, and under our last
17 Southcentral meeting in March of 2003, there was a
18 proposal by the public to bring it back to the Board, and
19 the Board said, we don't want it. Keep it how it is.
20 Keep it under the Fish and Game annual strategy. So this
21 would just match and make it easier for the feds to
22 follow our tracking strategy.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Would there be anything
25 required in it though that they would be required to
26 follow the management strategy? I mean, could they --
27 could in the future if political climates change or
28 something like that, could the strategy of the person to
29 whom you're delegating the authority just decide that as
30 far as the Federal Government was concerned, lynx season
31 was closed? Would that be a possibility?

32

33 MS. KELLEYHOUSE: I can't answer that
34 direct question. Under the current memorandum of
35 agreement though, they have to be in alignment I believe.

36

37 MR. ARDIZZONE: Right in the proposal it
38 states within the guidelines listed within the lynx
39 management harvest strategy, which would come from the
40 State.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Terry. That was
43 a what if.

44

45 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If
46 it would be beneficial to clarify in the proposed
47 regulation on Page 139, to only within guidelines listed
48 within the Department of Fish and Game lynx harvest
49 management strategy, that might just clarify that there
50 is a specific Department strategy that -- so that someone

00218

1 wouldn't, you know, in theory, another lynx harvest
2 management strategy could be referenced.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Like they have in
5 Colorado?

6

7 MR. HAYNES: So that might be just one
8 way of clarify the source of the harvest management
9 strategy that has been followed, and that is the intent
10 of this proposal.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That at least would put
13 it so that there's two government entities involved in it
14 with which you could interact before -- I mean, both
15 government entities would have to decide on a very
16 drastic course of action before anything could happen.
17 That to me would be a very friendly amendment to put in.
18 Chuck.

19

20 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair, I just wanted
21 to get some clarification. The proposed regulation as it
22 reads on 139 does not read as it does on Page 140. It
23 doesn't have the units included. The proposed regulation
24 should be on Page 140. The only change we made later on
25 was to add the dates, and if -- I'm not sure what Mr.
26 Churchill's intent was, but I just want to get some
27 clarification, because they're not exactly the same.

28

29 MR. CHURCHILL: Chuck, you're talking
30 about 142 versus 1.....

31

32 MR. ARDIZZONE: No, I'm talking about
33 Page 139, proposed regulation, and Page 140 proposed
34 regulation.

35

36 MR. CHURCHILL: Oh, okay.

37

38 MR. ARDIZZONE: If you look on Page 140,
39 that's the way it should read with the units. You don't
40 read that on Page 139. And just we should have Unit 12
41 added also, just since it's not in type on that page.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

44

45 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, I guess that
46 actually in fact, having read that and looking at my own
47 notes, was my intent, as written on 140, and thank you
48 for the correction, because I did not say that. I said
49 139. I'd like to change that to 140, and if the second
50 agrees, we can move forward.

00219

1 MR. ARDIZZONE: With the addition of Unit
2 12.

3
4 MR. CHURCHILL: Yes.

5
6 MR. ARDIZZONE: Yes. Thank you.

7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Does the second agree?

9
10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The second agrees.
13 Okay. So we're dealing with the proposed regulation as
14 written on Page 140, 141 with the addition of Unit 12.
15 Does anybody else on the Council feel it necessary to
16 propose an amendment? If not, I'm going to ask my ask my
17 vice chair to take over. Gloria.

18
19 MS. STICKWAN: I think this should be
20 reviewed. Shouldn't give them the authority without some
21 kind of -- I think it should be looked at. We shouldn't
22 just give them the authority period without a limit on it
23 or a date or something.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Interesting. She said
26 she doesn't think we just give them that authority
27 without having some form of being able to review it.
28 Chuck.

29
30 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair, basically we
31 already have the authority to change it with special
32 actions. This is just changing the way we would do it.
33 It wouldn't be under special actions. It would just.....

34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, but if you do it
36 under special actions, then it only lasts for 60
37 days.....

38
39 MR. ARDIZZONE: Correct.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:without having the
42 public a chance to comment on it.

43
44 MR. ARDIZZONE: Correct.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think that's what
47 Gloria's getting at right there is that that way the
48 public has a chance to comment on it. I myself
49 personally would have difficulty with this if it wasn't
50 under, like Terry said, either under some joint

00220

1 management plan that was stated, or that there was, like
2 Gloria said, a chance for public review. And I feel
3 strongly enough about it that if nobody else will make
4 the amendment, I'll step down and let my vice chair take
5 over, and I'm going to make an amendment.

6

7 MR. ELVSAAS: Are you looking to have the
8 dates sides?

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, we're not. We're
11 leaving the dates out of there. So having said that,
12 would you be willing to take over the meeting at this
13 point in time?

14

15 MR. ELVSAAS: I will.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

18

19 MR. ELVSAAS: My first order of business
20 is I don't think we want to hear any amendments.

21

22 MR. CHURCHILL: Oh, boy, are you in a
23 jam.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. I don't know if
26 you can do that unless the question's been called.

27

28 MR. ELVSAAS: But at this point, as I
29 understand it, you wish to make an amendment.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I wish to propose an
32 amendment. I would like to propose that we put in within
33 the ADF&G lynx harvest management strategy instead of
34 just the lynx harvest management strategy. I don't want
35 two lynx management strategies floating around.

36

37 MR. CHURCHILL: Second.

38

39 MR. ELVSAAS: That was your proposal?

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That was my proposed
42 amendment. It's been seconded. I won't even bother to
43 speak to it, because I've already said my piece on it.

44

45 MR. ELVSAAS: All right. I think it's
46 pretty clear, and, Mr. Churchill, you made the second?

47

48 MR. CHURCHILL: I made the second.

49 Gloria.....

50

00221

1 MR. ELVSAAS: Somebody wish to speak?

2 Gloria.

3

4 MS. STICKWAN: I just think we ought to
5 have a date in there. I don't know, maybe five years or
6 something.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We could have an
9 amendment like that.

10

11 MR. CHURCHILL: A sunset.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: A sunset. But we have
14 to add that after we vote on this amendment.....

15

16 MS. STICKWAN: Okay.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:then we can make
19 another amendment. That would just show our concern.

20

21 MR. ELVSAAS: I think that is a better
22 amendment myself. But let's deal with this one at this
23 point.

24

25 MR. CHURCHILL: Based on the acting
26 chair, I call the question.

27

28 MR. ELVSAAS: The question's been called.
29 All in favor of the amendment, say aye.

30

31 IN UNISON: Aye.

32

33 MR. ELVSAAS: Opposed, nay.

34

35 (No opposing votes)

36

37 MR. ELVSAAS: Motion carries. You wish
38 the chair back?

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's up to you.

41

42 MR. ELVSAAS: It's up to you, you take
43 the chair, Mr. Chairman.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. I'll take
46 the chair back then. Gloria, would you like to propose
47 what you did for an amendment?

48

49 MS. STICKWAN: I just offer an amendment,
50 a friendly amendment to review at five years.

00222

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So an amendment
2 that there's a sunset clause on this at the end of five
3 years, it has to be reviewed and reauthorized.

4
5 MS. STICKWAN: Yes.

6
7 MR. CHURCHILL: Second.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Second. It's been moved
10 and seconded that we put a sunset clause on this
11 delegation that after five years it has to be reviewed,
12 and reauthorized.

13
14 MR. CARPENTER: Question.

15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question's been
17 called. All in favor of the amendment, signify by saying
18 aye.

19
20 IN UNISON: Aye.

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

24
25 (No opposing votes)

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Now we have the
28 proposal in front of us and it has two amendments. It
29 has the amendment of the sunset clause and the ADF&G lynx
30 harvest management strategy. Any further discussion on
31 the proposal?

32
33 MR. ELVSAAS: Question.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question's been
36 called. All in favor of the proposal as amended, signify
37 by saying aye.

38
39 IN UNISON: Aye.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I mean, my fault, I said
42 all opposed. All in favor of the proposal as
43 amended.....

44
45 MR. ELVSAAS: You did.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Did I say in favor or
48 did I say -- I did say, okay. Just to make sure, all in
49 favor of the proposal as amended signify by saying aye.

50

00223

1 IN UNISON: Aye.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
4 saying nay.

5

6 (No opposing votes)

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. I'm not sure
9 whether I did, and I don't want it on the record the
10 other way.

11

12 Okay. WP04-37, executive summary -- I
13 mean, executive -- WP04-37, lengthen the trapping season,
14 remove the sealing requirements for Unit 13 marten.
15 Chuck.

16

17 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair and Council
18 members, Proposal WP04-37 was submitted by the State of
19 Alaska, and requests Federal harvest dates for marten
20 trapping in Unit 13(E) be extended by 28 days, and that
21 the sealing requirement for marten pelts harvested in
22 13(E) be rescinded. The harvesting dates would be
23 changed from 10 November to January 31st to November 25th
24 through February 28th.

25

26 The proponent requests the harvest
27 regulations for marten trapping be changed to align with
28 existing state regulations. This would allow for
29 additional trapping opportunity in remote parts of Unit
30 13(E) once rivers freeze.

31

32 Marten numbers in Unit 13 peaked in about
33 1988 and have fluctuated annually since. Marten
34 abundance estimates are developed from trapper
35 questionnaires. Trappers with traplines located in
36 favorable marten habitat report marten to be abundant
37 between 1995 and 1996, but only common between 1997 and
38 2002. Marten harvest data are not obtained on a unitwide
39 basis. Sealing of marten has been required in Unit
40 13(E).

41

42 Between 1992 and 2002, the annual harvest
43 from Unit 13(E) averaged 68 martens. Males consistently
44 predominate in the harvest years. The annual harvest of
45 31 to 93 marten from Unit 13(E) is considered
46 biologically insignificant to the population. And the
47 shortened season in Unit 13(E) is unnecessarily
48 restricting harvest opportunity.

49

50 The effects of this proposal. It would

00224

1 reduce confusion by aligning Federal and State
2 regulations. It would allow additional opportunities for
3 Federally qualified subsistence users to harvest marten
4 by lengthening the season in the portion of Denali
5 National Park not closed to subsistence activities since
6 State regulations do not apply there. This proposal
7 would also remove the sealing requirements for marten in
8 13(E). Currently the marten population is considered
9 stable, and the current harvest is considered
10 sustainable.

11

12 Preliminary conclusion would be to
13 support this proposal.

14

15 Are there any questions.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Chuck.

18

19 (No comments)

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's kind of
22 interesting, because basically this is the other end of
23 Denali, and we're voting on a proposal submitted by the
24 Alaska Department of Fish and Game that's exactly like
25 what we did on the proposal at the other end of Denali in
26 Unit 16. Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

27

28 MS. KELLEYHOUSE: Mr. Chair, this is
29 Becky Kelleyhouse, Fish and Game.

30

31 Yes, this proposal would align the State
32 and Federal regulations based on the changes the board
33 made back in March of 2003. It would definitely add some
34 trapping opportunity for subsistence users within Unit
35 13, and reduce confusion for trappers considering it's
36 already legal at least on BLM lands in Unit 13. This
37 would however affect the Denali Park lands like you just
38 did bring up.

39

40 One thing that I wanted to mention was in
41 the ten years that we had marten sealed from Unit 13(E),
42 the annual harvest was between 30 and 90 marten, and it's
43 a huge area in Unit 13(E), so it's quite insignificant.
44 The sex data is not reliable. Enough people don't
45 respond with sex of the marten, so we can't necessarily
46 tell whether or not there's a conservation concern in the
47 small corridors where the marten are actually harvested.

48

49 When the Board took our proposal, they
50 amended it slightly, and included all of Unit 13 in this

00225

1 longer season. That was not what we had originally
2 proposed. However, that's the current State law now.
3 And they did drop the sealing requirement, because of the
4 time and effort it takes to seal marten on the trappers
5 behalf and our behalf.

6
7 So the reason we put this in was strictly
8 as an alignment proposal, but I did want to mention,
9 given the earlier conversation on extending the season,
10 currently we have little to no harvest of marten within
11 this Denali Park area in Unit 13(E), like less than five
12 per year. And extending the season for another month, we
13 do not think is going to add a substantial number to the
14 harvest, but keep in mind the other half of this proposal
15 was to drop the sealing requirement to match it to the
16 rest of the unit. So you could increase the season, but
17 we will not have any sort of data to tell whether or not
18 it's having an effect. So if you wish to keep the
19 sealing requirement for the Federal harvest, that's one
20 consideration.

21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So basically, Becky,
23 what you're saying is that the sealing requirement has
24 been dropped by the State, and so there will be no
25 information coming -- any new information coming on
26 marten now in the future because there's no sealing
27 requirement?

28
29 MS. KELLEYHOUSE: Correct, for State
30 lands.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Then why did we have
33 such a big fuss over 16 is what I can't figure out. But
34 anyhow, okay. Any questions for Becky.

35
36 MS. STICKWAN: I have a question. What
37 does the State think about the sealing requirement being
38 deleted?

39
40 MS. KELLEYHOUSE: Well, given the really
41 low harvest, you know, 30 to 90 marten in that entire
42 large area, and most of the harvest came from along the
43 Parks Highway from two or three trappers, we had
44 originally proposed lengthening the season and dropping
45 the sealing requirement for east of the railroad, which
46 is a remote part of Unit 13(E), and the Board decided to
47 take it to the entire unit, which would include the Parks
48 Highway corridor. And now it basically is in the hands
49 of the local trappers that trap that stretch to -- it's
50 an understanding between those three guys that they

00226

1 better not overharvest the area, otherwise they're
2 shooting themselves in the foot. So the Board kind of
3 gave them the option to self-regulate themselves, and I
4 don't necessarily think dropping the sealing requirement
5 is a big concern. It does not make sense in light of the
6 small number of marten that are harvested. We do not get
7 enough data to be able to do anything with it.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
10 Becky.

11

12 (No comments)

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

15

16 MS. KELLEYHOUSE: Thanks.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Other Federal, State,
19 tribal agencies. Inter-Agency Staff Committee comments.

20

21 MR. KESSLER: Mr. Chair and Council, I'm
22 Steve Kessler with the Forest Service, and member of the
23 Inter-Agency Staff Committee. This is one that we did
24 have some comments on. It has to do with the sealing
25 requirements. Although there's only a small amount of
26 marten habitat in 13(E) on Federal land, and a relatively
27 small amount of marten trapping, we still are concerned
28 about removing the requirement for sealing. It's the
29 only way to get any information about what is actually
30 being harvested, and if we did not have the sealing
31 requirement, we would not know how many marten are
32 actually coming out of the area. It's also the best way
33 through establishing male and female ratios to manage the
34 harvest and to understand what's going from the
35 conservation standpoint in that area.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any
38 questions. Tom.

39

40 MR. CARPENTER: Just to be clear, does
41 16(A) and 16(B) have a sealing requirement, Federal?

42

43 MR. ARDIZZONE: Yes.

44

45 MR. CARPENTER: Thank you.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Dean.

48

49 MR. WILSON: My understanding is there's
50 only really three trappers that are in that area.

00227

1 There's only 30 to 90 marten getting caught, an
2 insignificant number is what the argument is. Have you
3 guys actually tied in with the three trappers yourself?
4 Because it may -- might be another method for getting
5 some numbers and getting some data on them, rather than
6 trying to seal every little marten that comes through.
7 You're looking at a certain amount of work there for a
8 little marten, you know.

9

10 MR. ARDIZZONE: I'm not familiar with the
11 trappers. Maybe Becky can answer that question.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Becky or Hollis.

14

15 MS. KELLEYHOUSE: Well, just to clarify,
16 those three trappers trap the Parks highway.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: They don't park.

19

20 MS. KELLEYHOUSE: It's not -- they're not
21 currently trapping Federal lands and they probably won't
22 be trapping Federal lands.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hollis, could I ask you
25 a question or two? Our indication is there's not much
26 trapping activity in that area of the park, is that
27 consistent with your experience?

28

29 MR. TWITCHELL: Hollis Twitchell, Denali
30 Park. Mr. Chair, Council members, I think that's a
31 pretty good characterization in terms of marten. There's
32 limited amount of marten habitat, timbered country in
33 this Broad Pass area, Unit 13(E). It's limited to just a
34 couple portions, some drainages right around Cantwell in
35 particular. So there is a limited amount of marten
36 trapping going on, but there is trapping that does occur
37 out of the Cantwell area, and I think when you get to the
38 comments, you'll hear the SRC's concerns as well.

39

40 And I guess I'll go ahead and just
41 mention here is that we have two members on the Denali
42 Subsistence Resource Commission who actually live in
43 Cantwell, and they're the ones that took the lead and
44 recommended that they would like to see a retaining of
45 some sort of sealing or harvest monitoring for marten in
46 particular, but they also had concerns for other
47 furbearers as well.

48

49 So with that, the area is limited in
50 terms of marten habitat. There is trapping going on out

00228

1 of the Cantwell area, and I don't have the numbers of
2 what harvest they may have made on marten within the park
3 area.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Then that sealing would
6 take place through your office then, wouldn't it?
7 Through the Park Service office?

8

9 MR. TWITCHELL: The sealing could be done
10 in two ways. If either the brown shirt or the Trooper in
11 Cantwell would be interested in capturing that data, it
12 makes an obvious connection right there. We have sealing
13 requirements for grizzly bear, and the harvest of grizzly
14 bear in the park areas there are sealed through the local
15 Trooper or brown shirt. If the Troopers or ADF&G do not
16 want to do that, then certainly the Park Service would be
17 willing to try to work with the community.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So it wouldn't be any
20 hardship though for people to have -- I mean, there would
21 be plenty of opportunity for local people to have them
22 sealed then probably.

23

24 MR. TWITCHELL: I think it could. With
25 the Trooper being stationed right there in Cantwell, it
26 seems a logical connection right there.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any other
29 questions for Hollis.

30

31 (No comments)

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Hollis.

34

35 Fish and Game Advisory Committee
36 comments.

37

38 (No comments)

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Summary of written
41 public comments.

42

43 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair, we received two
44 written public comments, one in support with
45 modification, and one in support of the proposal.

46

47 The Denali Commission unanimously
48 supported Proposal No. 37 as amended to extend the marten
49 trapping season by 28 days. The Commission unanimously
50 supported to amend this proposal to retain the marten

00229

1 sealing requirements. This proposal would provide
2 additional opportunity for subsistence users. It would
3 have minimal impact on the marten population, which is
4 considered stable, and it would align Federal and State
5 regulations. The Commission believes that it is
6 critically important to retain the sealing requirements,
7 because it provides important biological data needed to
8 monitor the species. This biological data is an
9 important tool for managers and advisory groups, and is
10 too important to lose.

11

12 AHTNA, Incorporated supports the proposal
13 to lengthen the season for marten trapping from November
14 10th to January 10th to November 10th to February 28th,
15 and delete sealing requirements for marten trapping.

16

17 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Do we have
20 any public testimony?

21

22 MR. MIKE: None received, sir.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: A motion's in order.

25

26 MR. CHURCHILL: I move that we adopt

27 WP04-37.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. WP04-37, lengthen
30 the trapping season and remove the sealing requirement
31 for Unit 13(E).

32

33 MR. CARPENTER: Second.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been seconded.
36 Okay. Discussion. Comments from the Council. Gilbert.

37

38 MR. DEMENTI: Yeah, I believe to keep
39 track of the sex trapped in that area, we should keep the
40 sealing intact.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Would you like to make
43 an amendment to that effect?

44

45 MR. DEMENTI: Yes, I would.

46

47 MR. CARPENTER: Second.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
50 seconded that we amend WP04-37 to drop the removal of the

00230

1 sealing requirement, to retain sealing.

2

3 MR. CHURCHILL: Remove the removal.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: To remove the removal of
6 the sealing requirement and retain the sealing. Any
7 discussion on that.

8

9 (No comments)

10

11 MR. CHURCHILL: Question.

12

13 MR. ELVSAAS: Did you get a second.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria. Yeah, we have a
16 second.

17

18 MS. STICKWAN: This is just for Unit
19 13(E)?

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Just for, yeah, Unit
22 13(E) in the park.

23

24 MR. ARDIZZONE: In the Park.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's only on Federal
27 land.

28

29 MS. STICKWAN: I was just concerned about
30 the whole unit.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What?

33

34 MS. STICKWAN: I was concerned about the
35 whole unit not having any sealing requirements for.....

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, but we can't do
38 anything about that, because the State dropped their
39 sealing on the rest of the unit, so we can't do anything
40 about instituting sealing on the whole unit.

41

42 MS. STICKWAN: On the.....

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: On the Federal lands.
45 No, this applies to all Federal lands, doesn't it?

46

47 MS. STICKWAN: In 13(E).

48

49 MR. CHURCHILL: Within 13.

50

00231

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Within 13.

2

3 MR. ARDIZZONE: Just 13(E).

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, just within.....

6

7 MR. ARDIZZONE: There are no sealing
8 requirements in 13, other portions.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So this only
11 applies to 13(E) then. Okay. Yeah, it just applies to
12 13(E), Gloria.

13

14 MS. STICKWAN: All right. That was my
15 concern, is that it should be covering all of Unit 13
16 Federal public lands I think.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, why does this --
19 maybe I can ask you a question. Why does this apply only
20 to Unit 13(E), because it says right there, requirement
21 for Unit 13 marten. If we require sealing for Unit 13
22 marten, doesn't it apply to all Unit 13?

23

24 MR. ARDIZZONE: We only require sealing
25 where the State requires sealing, and they don't require
26 sealing in 13.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But they don't require
29 sealing in 13(E) any more either.

30

31 MR. ARDIZZONE: Right. So the only
32 change you would be making is removing the sealing
33 requirement for 13(E).

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If we were removing the
36 sealing requirement.

37

38 MR. ARDIZZONE: Right.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But if we put sealing
41 requirement on for Unit 13, then we're putting sealing
42 requirement on all Unit 13. Yeah. Tom.

43

44 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman, I think
45 you'd have to make another amendment to the original
46 proposal to say that. The original proposal only speaks
47 to 13(E) and its sealing requirement, because that's all
48 that the State used to have, which they don't any more.
49 So.....

50

00232

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

2

3 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah. I mean, I think
4 where the confusion is coming from for me, is that as the
5 proposal unifies all of 13, where previously we had one
6 set of regulations for A through D, and another one for
7 E. And if we in fact drop -- the intent was to drop the
8 language and unify 13, that was one thing if it was
9 passed in whole. Now that we're removing the sealing
10 requirement, arguably the language says Unit 13 and
11 applies the sealing requirement to the entire unit. So I
12 just think it's critical we do whatever we choose to do
13 and be clear about it. And I hear Gloria saying, and I'm
14 interested in that, that we apply that sealing
15 requirement across the entire unit. So I mean, I think
16 that's what driving it.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Chuck.

19

20 MR. ARDIZZONE: I'm just trying to get it
21 clear in my head also, Mr. Chair. Currently the only
22 place that's Federally required to seal is 13(E). And so
23 you're going to want -- you want to add a sealing
24 requirement for all the unit?

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, if we go with the
27 proposal the way it's written, we're removing it from
28 16(E).

29

30 MR. ARDIZZONE: From 13(E).

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: 13(E). I mean 13(E).
33 But if we add sealing requirement, we're adding it to all
34 unit 13. Because I mean that's what -- that how it will
35 be -- that's how this proposal will read. If we add
36 sealing requirement, we're adding it to all of Unit 13.
37 If we remove sealing requirement, we're only removing it
38 where it is currently necessary, which is 13(E).

39

40 MR. ARDIZZONE: Okay.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So I mean, that -- we
43 need to keep that in mind. Terry.

44

45 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
46 Since the State currently does not have sealing
47 requirements for marten in Unit 13, I'm not going to
48 speak for the Alaska Bureau of Wildlife Enforcement and
49 assume that they'll -- if you adopt this proposal, they
50 want to take on additional responsibilities only for

00233

1 marten taken on Federal lands. We would certainly
2 encourage them to do that, but just so you know, they're
3 not obligated to do sealing for marten taken in 13 on
4 state lands, or currently on Federal lands outside of
5 13(E). So this is additional work that we would want to
6 communicate with the Bureau of Wildlife Enforcement, what
7 used to be called the brown shirts, they're blue shirts
8 now, and encourage them to do this in order to address
9 the concerns that you have, but the Department's not in a
10 position to obligate them to do that here today.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Terry, correct me if I'm
13 wrong on this. On everything except the park land, you
14 can trap under a State license, and under State
15 regulations you're not required to have sealing. So if
16 you were trapping on anything except the Park land, in
17 Unit 13(E), you would not be required to have sealing,
18 because the State doesn't have sealing, and you would
19 just say you're trapping under a State license?

20

21 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I think you're
22 correct. The only -- the National Park lands in Unit
23 13(E) are really the distinct lands in all of Unit 13 in
24 terms of the discussions you're having.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right. So basically
27 anybody that wanted to would not have to seal if they
28 weren't trapping on National Park lands. So we can
29 either make the sealing a requirement for 13(E), we can
30 drop the sealing, or we can make the sealing a
31 requirement for 13 and nobody will have to obey it.
32 Fred.

33

34 MR. ELVSAAS: Mr. Chairman, thanks. The
35 amendment was to just drop the portion that required the
36 sealing within proposal. We should just act on that and
37 forget about the rest because it's taken care of already.
38 There's no need to get into a long discussion of which
39 area should be sealed and which should not. I think what
40 Gilbert proposed was to drop the portion requiring that
41 sealing within this proposal.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, Fred. What Gilbert
44 proposed was to drop the requirement dropping the
45 requirement for sealing. So to retain sealing.

46

47 MR. ELVSAAS: Okay. I stand corrected on
48 that. But his intent is to get rid of this portion of
49 that proposal. Not to add any other areas of anything
50 else, whether in they're 13 or not.

00234

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Okay. So if we
2 have Gilbert's in front of us, which basically removes
3 the removal of the sealing requirement, what we have left
4 is lengthening the trapping season.

5
6 MS. STICKWAN: I have a question.

7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.

9
10 MS. STICKWAN: On the other Federal
11 public lands in Unit 13, is there -- what do you guys
12 know about the marten population? Or it's just -- I
13 guess it's stable is what you're saying? How many
14 trappers are there?

15
16 MS. KELLEYHOUSE: I'm sorry, this was
17 supposed to be simple. I wonder if I can ask a question
18 maybe to answer that. Dean, or Harley, do you guys know
19 of anybody trapping along the Gulkana for Marten or down
20 the Tiekel Block?

21
22 MR. McMAHAN: There's a few trappers that
23 go in there occasionally. It's hard to tell by all the
24 snow machine tracks who's trapping and who's just running
25 around, and whether they're trapping marten or not, I
26 don't -- you know, the trappers that I know of in there,
27 probably if there's marten track that crosses their
28 trail, they'd set a trap, try to catch it, but, yeah,
29 that's kind of hard to answer that.

30
31 MR. WILSON: The Tiekel area and a lot of
32 the Federal land really isn't marten area. It isn't the
33 type of area where I'm getting this documentation and
34 these sealing things. I don't think it's going to be
35 very beneficial. In fact, truthfully my experience is if
36 you have -- you're talking 30 to 90 marten taken up out
37 of the (E) area up here, the 13(E). Even those sealed
38 aren't going to give you that good of a representative
39 sample to make decisions on that area. But that's for
40 the Tiekel Block and Durell and some of that area. It's
41 really not at all marten area in there, and as far as I
42 know, there's nobody really trapping marten in there.

43
44 MS. KELLEYHOUSE: All right. I hope that
45 answers Gloria's question, but I had two other comments.
46 I wanted to stress the fact that Ralph had brought up
47 about the current State season. If you guys choose to
48 extend the sealing requirement for other federal lands in
49 Unit 13, trappers will still be able to claim their
50 harvest under State regulations, and they will not seal

00235

1 their marten, and hence I think that would kind of be a
2 waste of time. However, Gloria, if you feel that it's
3 important to have the sealing information from Unit 13,
4 definitely put in a proposal to the State Board. We have
5 a meeting in March of next year for Southcentral, so you
6 could definitely do it at that time.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.

9

10 MS. STICKWAN: After listening to those
11 guys, I don't see that it has to be for all of Unit 13.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. James.

14

15 MR. SHOWALTER: Yes. We're talking about
16 Unit 13(E) and requested here is removing the sealing of
17 it. Sealing of the hides. Okay. With the remainder of
18 13, do I understand they are not sealed either, so I
19 think I'm going to have to vote against the amendment and
20 go the proposal as written to go along with the rest of
21 the Unit 13.

22

23 Thank you.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Okay. Any
26 other discussion or comments on it. We are on the
27 amendment right now to remove the removal of the sealing
28 requirement.

29

30 MR. CHURCHILL: Just to clarify then,
31 what we're really saying is we're voting to -- whether or
32 not to retain the sealing requirement in 13(E).

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right.

35

36 MR. CHURCHILL: I call the question.

37

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

40

41 MR. CHURCHILL: Aye.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: One aye

44

45 MR. DEMENTI: No, I'll vote yes on the
46 issue.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Two. All opposed
49 signify by saying nay.

50

00236

1 IN UNISON: Nay.

2

3

4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The nays have it. So
5 now we're back to lengthen the trapping season and remove
6 the sealing requirement for Unit 13 marten. Any more
7 discussion on the motion.

7

8

(No comments)

9

10

MR. CHURCHILL: Call the question.

11

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question's been
14 called. All in favor signify by saying ayes.

14

15

IN UNISON: Aye.

16

17

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

19

20

(No opposing votes)

21

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The ayes have it. The
24 motion carries. What are we looking at for time? We've
25 got No. 38 done.

25

26

27 MR. CHURCHILL: I've got 11:20. We can
28 probably.....

28

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We can probably do WP04-
31 39.

31

32

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What happened to 38?

33

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: 38 we've already taken
36 care of. Okay. Lengthens the trapping season in Unit 13
37 for muskrat. Submitted by the Alaska Department of Fish
38 and Game. Question's in order. I mean, Chuck, would you
39 present.

39

40

41 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I vote support it,
42 how's.....

42

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, you know, if we
45 were the Board, we would take this by consent, because it
46 says, support, support, all written comments are support.
47 It's unanimous support, so, unless some Council member
48 would want to put it on the table and argue with it, you
49 know, we would do it by unanimous consent if we were the
50 Board. But we're not, so we'll go through it.

50

00237

1 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair, Counsel
2 members, WP04-39 was submitted by the State of Alaska,
3 and requests the Federal harvest dates for muskrat
4 trapping in Unit 13 be extended by 61 days. The harvest
5 season would be changed from 10 November through June
6 10th, excuse me, to 25 September through June 10th.

7
8 The proponent requests that the harvest
9 regulations for muskrat trapping be aligned with the
10 existing State regulations. This would allow additional
11 trapping opportunity in open water. The status of the
12 muskrat population in 13 is not fully known, but based on
13 trapper questionnaires, studying of muskrat pushups by
14 area biologists, the muskrat populations in the unit
15 appear to be healthy. Recently more pushups are being
16 observed and trappers have indicated that muskrat numbers
17 may be rebounding. The winter of 2002/2003 had the
18 highest muskrat population in over 20 years based on the
19 number of houses and pushups in many lakes and marshes.
20 Currently the muskrat population is considered stable and
21 the current harvest is considered sustainable.

22
23 This proposed change would reduce
24 confusion. It would allow additional opportunities for
25 Federally qualified subsistence users, lengthening the
26 season in the portion of Denali Park open to subsistence
27 activities since State regulations do not apply there.
28 The proposal would have minimal affects on the muskrat
29 population as the population is considered stable, and
30 the current harvest is considered sustainable.

31
32 Our preliminary conclusion would be to
33 support this proposal.

34
35 Are there any questions.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Chuck.

38
39 (No comments)

40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none, Alaska
42 Department of Fish and Game.

43
44 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
45 This is another Department proposal intended to align the
46 State and Federal seasons, provide additional opportunity
47 for Federally qualified subsistence users and reduce
48 confusion. So we encourage you to support this proposal.

49
50 Thank you.

00238

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Terry.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Other Federal, State and
6 tribal agencies. Justin.

7

8 MR. JUSTIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
9 Wilson Justin of Mount Stanford Tribal Consortium. I
10 just have a couple of comments. Mount Stanford would
11 support the proposal.

12

13 And my comments is that we'd like it to
14 be known that a lot of the muskrat population questions
15 are directly related to the population and movement of
16 caribou. Caribou in the springtime have a tendency to
17 eat muskrat houses and freeze the entrance to the feed
18 and kill the muskrat. So when your caribou population
19 goes down, it stabilizes muskrat populations for spring
20 birth. And we just wanted that on the record, so that in
21 the future when these discussions come up, maybe that
22 will be remember. We haven't seen much change in the
23 muskrat population after the crash in the 80s when the
24 caribou population really came trough big time. But
25 lately it seems like more of the smaller lakes have more
26 houses.

27

28 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. That was a
31 good piece of information right there. Inter-Agency
32 Staff Committee comments.

33

34 MR. KESSLER: There are none on this
35 proposal.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Fish and Game
38 Advisory Committee comments.

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Summary of written
43 public comments.

44

45 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. There
46 were three written public comments received all in
47 support of the proposal.

48

49 The Denali Commission unanimously
50 supported this proposal to lengthen the trapping season

00239

1 for Unit 13 muskrat by 61 days. The Commission concurs
2 with the Staff analysis preliminary conclusion for the
3 reasons stated in the justification.

4

5 The AHTNA, Incorporated supports the
6 proposal to lengthen the season for muskrat trapping from
7 November 10th to June 10th to September 25 to June 10th
8 so that fellow subsistence users will be able to trap
9 muskrats in a longer season date.

10

11 The Wrangell-St. Elias National Park
12 Subsistence Regional Commission supports the proposal as
13 written.

14

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any requests
17 for public testimony?

18

19 MR. MIKE: No requests.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No requests for public
22 testimony. With that, a motion to put WP04-39 on the
23 table.

24

25 MR. CHURCHILL: I move that we adopt
26 WP04-39.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second.

29

30 MR. CARPENTER: Second.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
33 seconded that we adopt WP04-39. Discussion, Council
34 Members. Comments. Bob.

35

36 MR. CHURCHILL: This has broad public
37 support. There doesn't appear to be any conservation
38 issue. I would call the question.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
41 called. All in favor of WP04-39 signify by saying aye.

42

43 IN UNISON: Aye.

44

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

47

48 (No opposing votes)

49

50

00240

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. We are
2 going to take a break for lunch. Let's give ourselves an
3 hour and a half, but we've got a lot to do yet this
4 afternoon if I look at what we've got left. Two more
5 proposals and reports and a few things like that. Let's
6 try to be back at about 1:20.

7

8 (Off record)

9

10 (On record)

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Call this spring meeting
13 of the Southcentral Regional Subsistence Advisory Council
14 back in session. We're on Proposal WP04-87. Chuck.

15

16 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair, Council
17 Members. Proposal WP04-87 was submitted by Jim Cruise
18 (ph) and requests that the moose season in Unit 15 be
19 shortened by 10 days to August 20th through September
20 20th. The original season is 10 August to September
21 20th.

22

23 The proponent wants to change the season
24 dates for moose in Unit 15. He feels that the people
25 utilizing this season are not true rural residents. Many
26 are part-time residents, have no history of subsistence
27 hunting and that their only qualification is having a
28 P.O. box in the Ninilchik area.

29

30 There's a very long regulatory history
31 and a lot of lawsuits surrounding this hunt and they're
32 listed on Page 164 and 165. I won't go into all the
33 detail, but I'll cover the most recent regulatory history
34 in 2001. Proposal WP01-50 was submitted by the Office of
35 Subsistence Management requesting moose harvest season
36 dates for Unit 15(A) be changed from August 18 through
37 September 20 to August 10 through September 20.

38

39 This change was adopted by the Board in
40 May of 2001 and provides a total of 10 days priority to
41 Federally-qualified subsistence users before the State
42 general season starts. That change was based on a
43 lawsuit and the court basically said we needed to give
44 some preference to subsistence users prior to the State
45 hunt.

46

47 Some biological background. Unit 15(A),
48 the last reported aerial moose survey in 2003, which
49 excluded the Skilak Loop Wildlife Management Area,
50 revealed a bull/cow ratio of 24 to 100 with a calf/cow

00241

1 ratio of 26 to 100. Calves composed 18 percent of the
2 moose observed. This fall sex and age composition survey
3 included a total of 760 moose observed.

4

5 Some Federal subsistence harvest results
6 for the years since the season was established indicate
7 that there has been very little participation in the
8 harvest by residents of the four communities that
9 currently have customary and traditional use
10 determinations in Unit 15(A). There's one hunter in Unit
11 15(A) during 1998 with no success. Three hunters
12 reported hunting in 15(A) during 1999 with no success.
13 In 2000, no moose were harvested in 15(A). And in 2001,
14 one moose was harvested and no moose in 2002 were
15 harvested in 15(A).

16

17 I'll go to 15(B). In 2001, a census of
18 650 square miles of suitable moose habitat estimated the
19 moose population of approximately 958 moose. Because the
20 census was conducted in February after most bulls shed
21 their antlers, a composition by sex was not determined.
22 However, it was determined that the calves comprised
23 approximately 20.6 percent of the population. Between
24 1995 and 2000, Federal subsistence hunts in Unit 15(B),
25 nine moose were harvested during the period of August
26 10th through August 20th, which was 75 percent of the
27 total moose harvested in that unit.

28

29 I'll skip down to 15(C). I don't have
30 any really good moose numbers for 15(C) as a total number
31 of moose in the area. I can talk about some harvest.
32 Between 1995 and 2000, Federal subsistence hunters in
33 Unit 15(C) harvested 10 moose during the period of August
34 10th through August 20th, which is 55 percent of the
35 total Federal harvest in that unit for that year.

36

37 I'll go into effects. If this proposal
38 was adopted, it would align the starting dates for the
39 Federal subsistence season and the State general season.
40 This could cause conflicts between different user groups,
41 which is the reason the Federal harvest dates were
42 changed in 2001.

43

44 This proposal would eliminate the
45 priority granted to Federally-qualified subsistence users
46 in Unit 15, thus eliminating the advantage that
47 subsistence users have over those participating in the
48 general moose hunt managed by the State. Removing this
49 advantage provided to subsistence users would be contrary
50 to the court decision that required subsistence priority

00242

1 for Federally-qualified users hunting moose in Unit 15.

2

3

4 There are few moose harvested by Federal
5 subsistence users in Unit 15; however, the early portion
6 of the season, August 10th through August 20th, which
7 they want to eliminate, is important. This is when the
8 majority of the Federal harvests have occurred.
9 Eliminating this portion of the season would have a large
10 impact on subsistence users in Unit 15.

10

11

12 If this proposal is adopted, it would
13 have minimal effect on the moose population. Preliminary
14 conclusion would be to oppose this proposal. Are there
15 any questions?

15

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Chuck.
18 Bob.

18

19

20 MR. CHURCHILL: This may be something
21 actually that legal counsel needs to address, but it
22 seems to me given the history of this whole thing, this
23 would throw us right back into what put us into court
24 before.

24

25

26 MR. ARDIZZONE: I don't disagree. We
27 talked to legal counsel and they said we need to at least
28 bring it up to the regional.....

28

29

30 MR. CHURCHILL: It's like standing there
31 yelling throw the hand grenade to me, throw it to me.
32 Yeah, okay. Thank you.

32

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
35 Chuck.

35

36

37 (No comments)

37

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Alaska Department
40 of Fish and Game.

40

41

42 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, the
43 department's comments are on Page 171. We're taking a
44 neutral position on this proposal. The net effect of
45 adopting this proposal might not accomplish what the
46 proposer is interested in doing because the State
47 regulations authorize bow hunting in this area August 10
48 to 17, so closing the Federal season would not close the
49 season altogether.

49

50

The only thing we might encourage some

00243

1 discussion of, one of the concerns of the proponent
2 raised in his proposal is he believes that some of the
3 people applying for this hunt are not truly Ninilchik
4 residents. Nothing is discussed about that in this
5 analysis. We don't know that to be a problem, but at
6 least the proponent does and it might be useful to see if
7 there's some way of determining whether or not the
8 Federal permitting process is screening people to ensure
9 that they are Federally-qualified subsistence users. And
10 if this is being done, then part of the rationale behind
11 the proposal would not seem to hold.

12

13 Thank you.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Terry. Any
16 questions for Terry. Doug.

17

18 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chair. You stole my
19 thunder. I had the book laying open here so everybody
20 could see you have a bow hunt from the 10th of August to
21 the 17th. Why would you want to close subsistence
22 hunting when you have bow hunting.

23

24 MR. HAYNES: I apologize for stealing
25 your thunder.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
28 Terry. Terry, can I just ask one question. Has there
29 been any complaints about conflict between any -- you
30 know, complaints about conflict between the bow hunters
31 and subsistence hunters in either direction?

32

33 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I've not
34 gotten any information to that effect from our Staff in
35 the Soldotna/Kenai area. As you see from the Staff
36 analysis, there aren't a lot of Federally-qualified
37 subsistence hunters that participate in that hunt, so the
38 likelihood of conflicts would seem to be pretty small.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

41

42 MR. CHURCHILL: Just to address your
43 comment, we have a very large number of bow hunters that
44 testify in front of our Fish and Game Advisory Committee
45 and this subject has never been broached, there's been no
46 testimony, evidence or casual conversation about any
47 conflict whatsoever in this hunt between bow hunters and
48 subsistence users.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: James.

00244

1 MR. SHOWALTER: Yes, within this 15(A)
2 subsistence hunt, that's on the Skilak Lake Road area and
3 I don't think that is open to bow hunting, is it?
4 Correct me if I'm wrong.

5
6 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, in the State
7 regulations, the Skilak Loop Management Area is closed
8 altogether. No moose hunting there.

9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But in Federal
11 regulations it's available. Okay. So the proposal in
12 front of us would close the Skilak Loop Wildlife
13 Management Area if I'm reading right. The proposed
14 regulation that's in front of us would close the Skilak
15 Loop Management Area. It says proposed regulation 15(A)
16 Skilak Loop Wildlife Management Area, no open season.
17 Terry.

18
19 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, that's already
20 closed. That's showing the existing regulation.

21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Of the State.

23
24 MR. HAYNES: Skilak Loop Wildlife
25 Management Area is in the Federal regulation and there's
26 no open season there.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: In the Federal
29 regulations.

30
31 MR. HAYNES: Correct.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So there is no open
34 season in the Skilak Loop Wildlife Management area. Bob.

35
36 MR. CHURCHILL: It's a drawing hunt.
37 That area, it says, is closed to hunting and trapping
38 except that small game may be taken October 1st through
39 March 1st by bow and arrow and a moose by permit only.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So then we would
42 align. Yes, Doug.

43
44 MR. BLOSSOM: I might add to what you
45 just asked. I sit on Central Peninsula Advisory
46 Committee and we've never had any problem and that's
47 based on Ninilchik, which is in the subsistence area of
48 which this person is a -- he lives not that far from
49 town.

50

00245

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
2 Terry.

3
4 (No comments)

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Terry. Other
7 Federal, State or Tribal Agency comments.

8
9 (No comments)

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none. Inter-
12 Agency Staff Committee comments.

13
14 MR. KESSLER: Mr. Chair, there are no
15 comments.

16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none. Fish and
18 Game Advisory Committee comments.

19
20 (No comments)

21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: None. Summary of
23 written public comments. Donald.

24
25 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair, there are no
26 written public comments received, although there's a
27 comment from the Kenai Fish and Game Advisory Committee
28 and did not address any particular proposals that this
29 Council is addressing, but it sounds like a comment
30 related to the Kenai River fisheries. But I'll just go
31 ahead and read it into the record.

32
33 The Kenai/Soldotna Fish and Game Advisory
34 Committee proposes no change to the current Federal
35 subsistence regulations in effect on the Kenai River. We
36 would further request that the Board reject any proposals
37 that would increase eligibility, seasons or bag limits
38 regarding Kenai River subsistence regulations. It is our
39 belief that current subsistence use is combined with our
40 in-river personal use and sport fisheries are combatable
41 and favored by the vast majority of citizens in our area.
42 Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

43
44 Again, Mr. Chair, this comment did not
45 address any particular proposals. Thank you.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Okay. No
48 public testimony

49
50 MR. MIKE: None.

00246

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: None.

2

3 MR. CHURCHILL: I move we adopt WP04-87.

4

5 MS. WELLS: Second.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
8 seconded that we adopt WP04-87. Discussion, comments,
9 especially from those of you that know that area. Doug.

10

11 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman, I will be
12 opposed to this. The present season is fine. I just
13 mentioned earlier we have a bow season that starts early.
14 If you can have a bow season, you can surely have a
15 subsistence season and we have received zero complaints
16 at our local advisory committee and I think that's good
17 enough for me.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Greg.

20

21 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm also
22 opposed to this proposal. It's an extremely important
23 hunt locally, subsistence. Even though the success rate
24 may not be as high, it's well received and used and I
25 personally hunt it myself. If there is a problem of non-
26 residents taking advantage of this, they need to be
27 rooted out in another manner. This has been a hard-
28 fought battle for this and it's a real benefit to the
29 community.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Bob.

32

33 MR. CHURCHILL: Just weighing in for the
34 Anchorage Fish and Game Advisory Committee. For the
35 reasons previously stated, I'm voting against this. The
36 record of take certainly speaks against the fact that
37 people outside are taking huge advantage of this and
38 everything we've learned here it would just throw us in
39 an untenable legal position and for all those reasons I'm
40 going to vote against it.

41

42 MR. CHURCHILL: Call the question.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
45 called. Did you want to speak?

46

47 MR. ELVSAAS: Only wish to speak briefly.
48 I'm one of the affected people and I'm opposed to it, so
49 I'm going to abstain from the vote. I don't have
50 financial interest in it, but I am affected by this

00247

1 proposal.

2

3

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Tom.

4

5

MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman, as I stated at the start of this meeting, I also can participate in this, so should I also abstain?

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. ELVSAAS: Then I'll vote.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We'll call the question. WP04-87, all in favor signify by saying aye.

(No votes)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All those opposed signify by saying nay.

IN UNISON: Nay.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion fails. With that we go on to the last proposal, which is WP04-80. Establishes an elder hunt in Unit 12. This is a cross-over proposal.

MS. PETRIVELLI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Proposal 80 is submitted by Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission and they're requesting a late season sheep hunt in Unit 12 for persons 60 years of age or older and this late season hunt would parallel -- it's setting up exactly the same conditions that there is for the Unit 11 sheep hunt. The proponents state that some Chistochina residents are aware of the Unit 11 hunt; however, they find access to sheep hunting areas in Unit 11 difficult and would prefer to have this late season elder hunt opportunity also in Unit 12. The proposed regulation is on -- there's no page number in my book, but I guess it would be 173. It's the last analysis in the section.

It's only for the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park lands in Unit 12. Even though there are other Federal lands, this regulation would only apply to

00248

1 the park lands or the proposed regulation. Communities
2 and areas that have C&T use determination for sheep in
3 Unit 12 are residents of Unit 12 and then the communities
4 and areas of Chistochina, Mentasta Lake, Dot Lake and
5 Healy Lake.

6
7 As far as the regulatory history goes,
8 late season elder hunt for 11 was adopted in 1998. I
9 think we discussed the reasons for that yesterday in
10 Proposal 24. Just for the idea of harvest history, just
11 so everyone would have an idea of the level of
12 participation in Unit 11, just to know how that might
13 parallel for Unit 12, I've included the harvest history
14 for the Unit 11 elder hunt. So 37 permits were issued
15 since 1998, 14 of those were hunted and four sheep were
16 harvested in Unit 12.

17
18 Overall, for the harvest of sheep just by
19 residents of Unit 12, that's in Table 1, for a five-year
20 period from '96 to 2000, 37 sheep have been harvested by
21 residents of Unit 12, so I wouldn't know how many of
22 those would be over 60 that would be participating in
23 this hunt. But for a five-year period, Unit 12 residents
24 have harvested 37 sheep.

25
26 As far as the C&T practices, the '98
27 proposal analysis documented the difficulties encountered
28 by elders in climbing mountains to take sheep and then,
29 of course, the reason was to have the later season when
30 the sheep are down low in the mountain. Then it
31 acknowledge there are special allowances for elders and
32 we've added two special allowances that have been noted
33 and that's the ones documented in relation to trapping
34 activities in the Upper Tanana area where they show
35 deference first to let elders use the trap lines near the
36 village and then the second example is where younger men
37 did not hunt in the areas surrounding the village,
38 leaving the territory to the older people who were unable
39 to stand the rigors of the long journeys with dog teams
40 along trap lines.

41
42 Then in State regulations there are
43 examples of showing deference to persons over a certain
44 age through an issuance of a permanent identification
45 card to residence hunters 60 years or older. So there is
46 some precedence in giving deference to age.

47
48 The effects of this proposal. If the
49 proposal is passed, it would add the late season hunt for
50 sheep for persons 60 years of age or older in Unit 12,

00249

1 paralleling the Unit 11 opportunity. It would provide
2 the opportunity for elders to take sheep in a more
3 accessible location. It is estimated there might be a
4 slight increase in sheep harvest, but would have minimal
5 impact on the population.

6

7 So the preliminary conclusion is to
8 support the proposal. If you have any questions.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Pat. Any
11 questions for Pat. Gloria.

12

13 MS. STICKWAN: Was this full-curl ram and
14 the other one is one sheep?

15

16 MS. PETRIVELLI: The proposal was just
17 changing the season dates and I just supported the
18 proposal as written with the ram with the full curl. I
19 know the Wrangell Subsistence Resource Commission made a
20 modification and so I don't know if I should address that
21 now or proposing to change it to a sheep. I'm not sure.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Is the Wrangell-St.
24 Elias Commission going to have that in theirs?

25

26 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's in the
27 written comments.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You don't need to change
30 it now. You can just leave the proposal as you have it
31 there and we can work on it from there.

32

33 MS. STICKWAN: But that was what they
34 brought up to change. Is that what you're saying?

35

36 MS. PETRIVELLI: The Subsistence Resource
37 Commission did, but the proposal they submitted just
38 changed the season dates and made the later season and
39 that's what I addressed in the proposal. Before the book
40 was printed, I didn't have the recommendations of the
41 commission to modify their proposal, but you could change
42 it later.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: With that, Bob.

45

46 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, I just had a few
47 questions. At least in my limited experience, this is
48 the first time I've seen a study that talks about
49 creating a system where elders -- I think you used
50 insurance, to create hunts or trapping opportunities that

00250

1 ensured they were able to continue these activities into
2 old age and it cites Goldschmidt 1946. Could you tell us
3 a little bit about that?

4

5 MS. PETRIVELLI: Well, Goldschmidt just
6 wrote this report describing activities in the villages
7 of Tetlin, Tanacross and Northway. Actually, Barbara
8 Cellarius provided me with the information. I did read
9 like that paragraph. But the idea of giving deference to
10 elders, I think it's just a common practice amongst
11 Alaska Native people.

12

13 MR. CHURCHILL: I'm certainly aware that
14 the deference is given, but what I'm saying is that
15 Goldschmidt in this paragraph seems to be putting a
16 completely different spin on it in terms of creating
17 hunting and trapping opportunities that will allow elders
18 to continue that activity. I don't know anything about
19 Goldschmidt. I've never read anything. I guess what I'm
20 saying is you were given a paragraph, you read the
21 paragraph and it seemed to support it and we don't know
22 anything more than that.

23

24 MS. PETRIVELLI: I think when certain
25 observations are made by different people and we were
26 just lucky that Goldschmidt documented it, but I could
27 document it from my own experiences in other villages,
28 but I haven't written it down and published it, but
29 Goldschmidt did publish it and I bet some other people
30 probably could document it for their common experience.

31

32 MR. CHURCHILL: Follow up.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, Bob.

35

36 MR. CHURCHILL: I guess the other thing
37 I'm wanting to understand is what we have in place in 11,
38 the idea or the premise behind this was for the elders to
39 take younger hunters and teach them hunting techniques
40 and harvesting techniques, food care techniques and that
41 sort of thing. Is this the same thrust?

42

43 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes, I think so because
44 the people who propose it are aware of why the Unit 11
45 elder sheep harvest was proposed and I think they just
46 wanted a similar one. Of course, the Subsistence
47 Resource Commission might provide more suggestions about
48 this hunt.

49

50 MR. CHURCHILL: Did you have any sense

00251

1 with the population that would access this hunt comparing
2 size-wise Unit 11 versus 12 in terms of number of people?
3

4 MS. PETRIVELLI: I think it will be
5 similar or smaller because C&T determinations for 11
6 includes a lot of Unit 13 communities, but if you want
7 exact numbers.....

8
9 MR. CHURCHILL: If you're saying
10 basically the same or smaller, that's really all I needed
11 to know.

12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.

14
15 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah, Pat, the Wrangell-
16 St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission put this
17 proposal in and I guess the question I have is did they
18 write the proposal and then submit it and then after they
19 submitted it decide that the way they wrote it included a
20 full curl only and they wanted any sheep? Do you see
21 what I'm getting at? A support with modification from
22 the same people that submitted the proposal. Is that
23 what happened?

24
25 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes, I think they had
26 made the original proposal and sometimes you hear --
27 because they have their own public hearings also and so I
28 think people went to their commission and talked to them
29 about the actual use and had just suggested a
30 modification. In the course of their consideration of
31 the proposal, I think community members testified to
32 them.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Pat. ADF&G.

35
36 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
37 The department's comments on this proposal appear right
38 before Tab D. We support the concept of the original
39 proposal. That is, we don't oppose a limited number of
40 full-curl rams being harvested in that portion of
41 Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve located in
42 Unit 12 being allocated for harvest by eligible rural
43 residents over the age of 60. However, because this
44 proposed hunt is specifically designed to facilitate
45 hunting by elders, our support of this proposal is
46 contingent upon the proposed hunt being excluded from
47 designated hunter provisions.

48
49 Speaking to the modifications that are
50 proposed by Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource

00252

1 Commission, at this time we cannot support a proposal to
2 allow the hunt of any sheep in that area. If you look at
3 a map of Unit 12, a substantial area of that is preserved
4 lands that would be open to all of the Federally-
5 qualified users for Unit 12, which would be a much larger
6 group than would likely be hunting in the park areas of
7 Unit 12. f

8

9 This hunt and the hunt in Unit 11 were
10 designed specifically to accommodate older people, to
11 give them an opportunity to hunt when sheep were more
12 accessible. So we would like to see the hunt
13 administered in that fashion if it is implemented.

14

15 We may be receptive to looking at a bag
16 limit other than a full-curl ram, but only after there is
17 much more analysis of biological implications and
18 biological data that are available. I should point out
19 that before embarking on hunts like this you need to feel
20 comfortable that you have a good understanding of the
21 existing situation and the department's information on
22 sheep in Unit 12 is limited. We haven't had a lot of
23 funding to do survey work there, so our level of comfort
24 with a hunt being implemented that would allow the
25 harvest of any sheep is very low at this time.

26

27 That's all we have to say at this time.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Terry.
30 I just have a couple questions when I'm looking at the
31 map right here. The only place that this area is road
32 accessible is by the Nabesna Road. Am I correct?

33

34 MR. HAYNES: That is the only area where
35 it's road accessible, yes.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: How far out on the
38 flats, if that is a flats, towards Northway do the sheep
39 go?

40

41 MS. KELLEYHOUSE: Mr. Chair, Becky
42 Kelleyhouse, Fish and Game. I don't think we need to
43 discuss much of sheep hunting opportunity on the flats.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. That's what I
46 thought.

47

48 MS. KELLEYHOUSE: The majority of the
49 sheep taken in that area are taken by people that boat of
50 the Chisana and Nabesna Rivers and it's about a three to

00253

1 four hour boat ride. It's not a difficult way to get to
2 an area, so though a large portion of this area is not
3 road accessible, it is fairly easy to hunt and the
4 preserve area does get a lot of hunting pressure.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's the question I
7 was trying to get at. So we have access from the Chisana
8 River at one side, from the Nabesna Road the other side.

9
10 MS. KELLEYHOUSE: And the Nabesna River.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, and the Nabesna
13 River. Okay. Any other questions for Terry or Becky.

14
15 (No comments)

16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Let's go on
18 to other Federal, State and Tribal Agency comments.
19 Barbara.

20
21 MS. CELLARIUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
22 just want to provide a little bit of explanation for a
23 couple questions that came up during the analysis and one
24 is the quote from Goldschmidt. That was from a BIA
25 report about land use in those villages. It was 1946, so
26 I think this would have occurred shortly after the
27 highway was built. And this is about the time they were
28 looking at what villages used what land, so that was the
29 context for this report. Goldschmidt is a very well-
30 known applied anthropologist and he did reports in other
31 parts of Alaska as well.

32
33 The second question concerned what the
34 harvest limit was for the original proposal. I wrote
35 that original proposal at the request of the SRC. They
36 said nothing in the discussion about what their vision of
37 the harvest limit was, so I just copied in the original
38 proposal the existing harvest limit in that unit. Then
39 at the SRC meeting they requested a modification. After
40 you read what their modification was, if you have any
41 questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Barbara. Any
44 questions for Barbara. Bob.

45
46 MR. CHURCHILL: How could I get the full
47 context of Goldschmidt's report as it bears on this?

48
49 MS. CELLARIUS: The context of the
50 report?

00254

1 MR. CHURCHILL: How could I get a copy of
2 the report so that I could put the reference in context
3 for myself?

4
5 MS. CELLARIUS: I suspect that it may be
6 available from some libraries. We have a copy in our
7 office. There are copies of it around.

8
9 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gilbert.

12
13 MR. DEMENTI: Yeah, did Eastern Interior
14 already decide on this?

15
16 MS. CELLARIUS: Eastern Interior held
17 their meeting about a week and a half ago and they
18 supported the original proposal. They did not support
19 the modification.

20
21 MR. DEMENTI: Thank you.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.

24
25 MR. CARPENTER: I'm not sure if you can
26 answer this, but I was just looking through the
27 subsistence regs and I'm curious as to Unit 11 where the
28 subsistence harvest is one sheep and Unit 12 the current
29 regulation is one ram full curl or larger. Is there that
30 much difference in the area, the amount of sheep that are
31 in these areas? Is that why it's full curl on one side
32 of the park and one sheep on the other? Do you have any
33 ideas?

34
35 MS. CELLARIUS: I would have to ask the
36 biologist. They might have a better idea than I do.

37
38 MS. KELLEYHOUSE: Mr. Chair, I guess
39 basically one of the reasons why the department decided
40 that we weren't necessarily comfortable going with any
41 sheep at this time on the Unit 12 hunt was the fact that
42 the Unit 12 area has always been a full curl regulation
43 and it's been that way and the harvest is fairly constant
44 and we're fairly comfortable with those harvest levels.

45
46 Unit 11 had a different history. It had
47 a more liberal sheep season for a long time. The
48 preserve in Unit 11 is the only place that has three-
49 quarter curl regulation for general hunting. It's had a
50 longer history and we're more comfortable with the

00255

1 harvest in Unit 11 with the more liberal regulations and
2 we have a better handle on that. At this time, and the
3 fact that the Eastern Regional Council supported the full
4 curl regulation, that we felt we'd go without it at this
5 time. In a couple years, if one or two rams got
6 harvested and people came back with a more liberal
7 proposal, then we could access it later.

8

9 MR. CARPENTER: Okay. Thank you.

10

11 MS. STICKWAN: I have a question for you.
12 Do you think this will impact the sheep population in
13 Unit 12?

14

15 MS. CELLARIUS: I would defer to a
16 biologist on that.

17

18 MS. KELLEYHOUSE: Well, Gloria, I guess
19 this is not my area, this is managed out of the Tok
20 office, but I have personal experience there. I have
21 hunted there. It's quite an easy place to get to. The
22 harvest in the preserve is already quite high. I
23 honestly don't know what effect this is going to have. I
24 know off the top of my head four or five people that will
25 qualify for this hunt probably will hunt it. Based on
26 the Unit 11 hunt, the harvest is not very high, so this
27 may not have a large effect, but it doesn't seem
28 necessary to go to an any sheep regulation considering
29 nobody in the local area asked for that.

30

31 MS. STICKWAN: Why didn't the commission
32 ask for a designated hunter?

33

34 MS. KELLEYHOUSE: So, as I originally
35 wrote this proposal on behalf of the SRC, as I said, I
36 wrote it for just creating the elder season, then at our
37 SRC meeting in Slana last month we had a lot of public
38 participation. There was discussion of whether it ought
39 to be a full curl or whether they wanted to give the
40 elders who did go out the opportunity to not have to find
41 a full curl ram after they made the effort to go out
42 hunting, so that was a conscious decision and request
43 from the SRC for the any sheep rather than the full curl
44 ram.

45

46 MS. STICKWAN: My question was they
47 didn't ask for a designated hunter in this one?

48

49 MS. CELLARIUS: The initial request, as I
50 understood it, was simply to create an elder season, but

00256

1 they came back, as I said, after the discussion with the
2 community members and asked for a provision similar to
3 the one that they asked for with their modification in
4 the proposal for Unit 11, which would allow someone to go
5 out hunting with them. I know Wilson is here and he was
6 involved in that discussion, so maybe it would be good to
7 hear what he has to say at some point.

8

9

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Wilson.

10

11

MR. JUSTIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and
12 Council Members. I'm going to provide a little bit of
13 background if that's okay with the Chair to try to deal
14 with some of the questions that arises through this
15 proposal. I work for Mount Sanford Tribal Consortium
16 that represents the villages in the upper region, but
17 this particular proposal is a direct offshoot of the
18 government-to-government relationship that Chisana Tribal
19 Council has with the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park.

20

21

Now, Chisana is in Chistochina. It's one
22 of our tribal villages. The issue of a hunt for the
23 elders has been around for a long time. We've never
24 brought it before the Resources Council because some of
25 the questions you asked were also questions we asked
26 internally about whether or not it was an idea that could
27 lead to abuse and other activities within the context of
28 the hunt.

29

30

So I'll back up a moment and I'll state
31 that when we first spoke to the elders about what kind of
32 a hunt they had in mind, and I'm going to introduce a
33 term that you haven't heard before, which is strictly
34 Athabascan and I'll explain the meaning of the term, what
35 the elders said is what we want is to be able to go out
36 with family members, particularly grandsons, and conduct
37 a hunt in the old way, in the way that we grew up to
38 hunt, which is go out and participate in something called
39 a gusga (ph). Now, a gusga, if you translate it strictly
40 into English, means kill site. It's where the animal is
41 killed. But it's termed gusga because of other reasons.

42

43

44

The other reasons are there are only
45 three ways that we teach our kids in the Indian or
46 Athabascan community. The first one is on the trail,
47 when you're on the trail with them from point to point.
48 The second one is in the steam bath. Aunts taught
49 nieces, uncles taught nephews, grandparents taught
50 grandkids.

1 The third place is in gusga, in the kill
2 site arena. What the elders mean when they say gusga is
3 they say they want to go out there with their grandkids
4 and teach them the cultural values related to
5 conservation of game, the values related to hunting
6 within a context of the old traditions.

7
8 Finally, in the strictest meaning of the
9 term gusga, it means a sacred place where you kill, where
10 a human being kill is remembered forever because you took
11 a life. In that arena, wherever that site is, it becomes
12 sacred and remembered. That's why when we have potlatch
13 and we have kids come up to be recognized, they can only
14 do that after they've been to a kill site as a member of
15 that group who was in that killing zone. In our way, you
16 cannot kill without honoring the animal that you killed.

17
18 So when the elders came to us and said we
19 want to go out there and do this, they imposed a tough
20 burden on us and I say tough because it's relatively easy
21 to translate Athabascan to English, but it's
22 extraordinarily difficult to translate English back to
23 Athabascan.

24
25 This is what this proposal is really all
26 about. It's not about killing sheep. It's actually
27 trying to put into the system, within the Federal system,
28 the cultural concept that's been around with us forever
29 in a way that doesn't harm the game population, that
30 doesn't allow for abuses and doesn't allow for the
31 potential for abuses.

32
33 So my being here, I support the original
34 concept, but I also say that if we really want to do what
35 the elders want, the modification for designated hunter,
36 is the better way. When this proposal was brought to
37 Wrangell-St. Elias National Park personnel, it was from
38 Chisana Tribal Council and they simply stated we want an
39 elder hunt because that's what the elders asked for. The
40 discussion that came up as a result of the proposal being
41 forwarded to SRC then led to the discussions of
42 modification, then a discussion of the full curl
43 stipulations and what have you.

44
45 So my being here today is simply to tell
46 you there was a strong cultural component to the original
47 proposal that came directly from the tribal council
48 within the context of a government-to-government working
49 relationship with the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park.
50

00258

1 I know Unit 12 probably better than
2 anyone in that area. I was born in Nabesna, I conducted
3 a guiding business in Unit 12, particularly in the
4 Nabesna area from 1969 to 1988, and my Aunt Lena Charly,
5 my Uncle Johnny Nicholai, my diseased Uncle Paul Simeone
6 and my father and a number of others in the family were
7 all first generation guides starting to work in that area
8 in the '40s.

9
10 The reason why we asked for late season
11 hunt is because there's too much hunting pressure in the
12 earlier season. There's a lot of plane activities,
13 there's a lot of boat activities, there's a tremendous
14 amount of activities and pressure. The elders just did
15 not feel comfortable competing with people in a setting
16 that they thought was all about teaching kids the
17 original values of our traditions.

18
19 So this is not an easy proposal to
20 assimilate in English for the purpose of what your
21 council is all about, but it's an easy proposal for me to
22 offer and to defend and to articulate for you. I think
23 that's it. Thank you.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for
26 Wilson. Bob.

27
28 MR. CHURCHILL: Wilson, thank you very
29 much. Could you just expand a little bit on what the
30 actual role the elder played in these hunts.

31
32 MR. JUSTIN: There's my father's clan and
33 my mother's clan. The Otsutnai (ph) were more related to
34 sheep as a staple in the region. They were from that
35 particular area. Elders, when they begin teaching kids
36 in the context of killing, they wanted to make sure that
37 children or youth understood that all killing was a
38 violation of the relationship with the creator. It
39 doesn't matter whether it's an animal. We even have
40 taboos about spiders. But it's absolutely necessary that
41 you kill in order to eat and survive. The critical
42 balance between killing to survive and killing to kill is
43 what the elders wanted to teach in the context of the
44 traditions today and that's why there was such a
45 discussion in our tribe about the meaning and intent of
46 this particular proposal.

47
48 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you. I appreciate
49 that information. I guess I'm asking something a little
50 more direct. Did the elder take the grandchild and do

00259

1 they hunt together so the elder was the one hunting with
2 the grandchild at the time the animal was harvested?
3 More along those lines.

4

5 MR. JUSTIN: Now I got you. I'll take a
6 step back. In our traditions, mothers and fathers
7 weren't allowed to teach their kids. They could love
8 them and provide, but they weren't allowed to teach any
9 responsibilities. The teaching responsibilities fell on
10 uncles and aunts and grandparents. The teaching of how
11 to relate to killing of any animal or what have you in
12 the way of living fell only to the grandparents. Uncles
13 and aunts didn't deal with that issue in terms of
14 teaching kids, so it was the sole responsibility of
15 grandparents to sit down with youths and say this is how
16 you kill and this is why you kill and this is what you do
17 when you do kill.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

20

21 MR. CHURCHILL: So, I guess, point blank,
22 was it a situation where the grandparent and the
23 grandchild hunted together, the grandparent assisted the
24 grandchild in actually taking the shot or however method
25 they chose to harvest the animal, so the two were
26 essentially a hunting team together, is that what we're
27 talking about?

28

29 MR. JUSTIN: In most cases. The hunting
30 was shared between the uncle and the grandparent. The
31 teaching of the child to hunt most often fell to the
32 uncle, but when it came time for the kill, the act of
33 pulling the trigger or the snare or what have you, in our
34 way, we most often wanted the grandparent to be there,
35 the grandfather.

36

37 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Wilson, I think what Bob
40 was getting at is would that be met with the kind of
41 elder hunt we have in Unit 11 or was the grandparent the
42 one doing the killing or was the child doing the killing?

43

44 MR. JUSTIN: The child. I'm sorry I
45 wasn't here for the Unit 11 discussion yesterday because
46 I would have said at that time that Unit 11 proposal was
47 brought up prior and we did not have the chance to
48 explain how we wanted the Unit 11 proposal to fit the
49 grandparent/grandchild relation.

50

00260

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Can the Unit 11 proposal
2 be used to meet the requirements you're talking about?

3

4 MR. JUSTIN: In a lot of the cases, yes,
5 but the actual taking of the youngster up on the mountain
6 or sending the youngster up on the mountain to shoot the
7 ram or the sheep, that part couldn't be done with the
8 Unit 11 proposal. Unit 11 is a harder unit to hunt in
9 terms of actual climbing and getting to animals.

10

11 MR. WILSON: What's your feeling on how
12 much it will get used as far as the elder hunt if it was
13 implemented? Do you see a lot of use or do you see kind
14 of similar to what has been used in Unit 11 right now,
15 only four kills out of in the teens for permits going
16 out?

17

18 MR. JUSTIN: I don't foresee a lot of
19 use. You have to remember that the bearers of our
20 traditions are vanishing at a very rapid rate and this is
21 a nod to their final goodbyes. They've never had the
22 opportunity to participate in the process where a
23 cultural tradition can be given the opportunity to evolve
24 into a proposal in a regulation. Before it's never been
25 even considered by the Fish and Game. Matter of fact, we
26 spoke about this with Fish and Game a lot before, but
27 this is the first time we really felt we could have a
28 serious run at putting a tradition on the table and we
29 know in advance the ultimate question that the tradition
30 we're talking about will have to also include all the
31 qualified Federal users within the system and that took a
32 considerable amount of discussion. But to get our
33 activity on the table, as you might say, the expansion of
34 the regulations and the proposals to include other
35 qualified users doesn't bother us.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

38

39 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, a couple questions.
40 As you described that tradition, it could be accommodated
41 now under the regulations. I'm not saying that to defer
42 action on this at all. Is that currently ongoing? Are
43 there instances where that's happening now?

44

45 MR. JUSTIN: No. There's a couple things
46 that keep elders from hunting. Number one, they can't
47 read regulations and they don't understand designations.
48 Very few of them will be able to go out there and tell
49 you where Unit 12 boundaries are or Unit 11. My mother,
50 who testified, Laura Hancock, at the SRC meeting in

00261

1 Slana, when she spoke about her sheep hunting days, she
2 spoke about going all the way up the Tanada over to the
3 head of Nabesna and over towards Chisana and down towards
4 the Tetlin reservation boundaries. It was kind of a
5 circle. But she wouldn't know Unit 11 or Unit 12. So
6 there is that fear with the elders that they would be
7 transgressing park regulations or other laws in terms of
8 reading the booklet or what have you.

9

10 MR. CHURCHILL: A follow up. What age
11 was this hunt usually done between the grandparent and
12 the grandchild?

13

14 MR. JUSTIN: Actually, I don't know how
15 much time I have, but it's not actually -- here's the
16 best way to put it. This term I used, gusga (ph), the
17 sacred circle, the kill site, it happens in the context
18 of the tribe seasons. You have the berry picking season,
19 the fishing season and then the hunting season. When you
20 say gusga in our way, you're talking about a place on a
21 trail or a place that's related to a kill site. It
22 doesn't necessarily mean that it's a sheep or a moose.
23 It's just a site where you take an animal for the purpose
24 of your health and welfare.

25

26 If you look at the history of the way we
27 hunted, kids started with small game first. Grandparents
28 and kids and rabbits were pretty well known phenomenon
29 when I was young. In the last 30 or 40 years, game was
30 so scarce that it was left up to the best hunters to go
31 out and secure game. You didn't take a chance on not
32 getting game and this included sheep. We used to snare
33 sheep. We snared them by the foot and it was the job of
34 the grandparents, the youngster, the kid, to watch the
35 snaring place because it was important to dispose of the
36 sheep right away before another predator, like a bear or
37 a wolverine or a coyote or a wolf get to it. So it was
38 not like the kind of hunting we're familiar with today
39 that this tradition came up out of. That's why it's so
40 difficult to translate back from English to Indian for
41 the benefit of our culture what we're proposing here.

42

43 So, when you say was there a time and
44 place in our traditions for the grandparents and the kids
45 to go out and hunt, that's a hard question to answer, but
46 I can say it happened in several other contexts like
47 snaring of sheep, snaring of rabbit, what have you.

48

49 MR. CHURCHILL: I may not have been
50 clear. I'm just asking generally. When I was raised,

00262

1 our first big game hunt came when we were 10 or 11 years
2 old and we started as you describe, with small game.
3 That's where we learned to stalk, that's where we learned
4 habits, how to watch, those sorts of things. But
5 generally at what age would this hunt that we're talking
6 about occur? How old was the grandchild?

7
8 MR. JUSTIN: In my background, I was 12.
9 Interestingly enough, my uncles and aunt taught me how to
10 hunt first, but before I took my first caribou kill I had
11 to sit down and talk over what killing means with the
12 grandfather before I was allowed to go out and shoot.

13
14 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you very much.

15
16 MS. WELLS: Have you read the
17 modifications from the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence
18 Resource Commission?

19
20 MR. JUSTIN: Yes.

21
22 MS. WELLS: And, as worded, this is
23 sufficient to cover the needs of the tradition?

24
25 MR. JUSTIN: As far as we're concerned,
26 yes. Horns were only used to make spoons and there's not
27 that many people left who know how to make spoons, so
28 it's not that important as far as the tradition.

29
30 MR. WILSON: So just to be clear then,
31 the difference between the initial proposal and the
32 amendment is one sheep on the amendment versus one full
33 curl. I wasn't real clear there. What's your feeling
34 between the two?

35
36 MR. JUSTIN: I would support any sheep.
37 I was the one who originally offered the full curl. Not
38 because of any particular cultural connotations or what
39 have you but because I always felt the area that the hunt
40 is going to take place had been traditionally a full curl
41 and I just went along with that and I thought there would
42 be conservation measures we wanted to think about. But
43 to fit with what we're trying to do here, any sheep will
44 do.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.

47
48 MS. STICKWAN: The second part of
49 Wrangell-St. Elias, there statement here, you would
50 support that too?

00263

1 MR. JUSTIN: The any sheep statement?

2

3 MS. STICKWAN: No. They're asking for a
4 designated hunter, I think.

5

6 MR. JUSTIN: The designated hunter, yes.
7 That's part and parcel of what we think will be
8 effective. I understand the State's concerns. I would
9 have expected them to voice a concern as far as the
10 designated hunter. We feel in this park and in this
11 preserve we have the capability of having a proposal in a
12 hunt of this type without abuse.

13

14 MS. WELLS: So the Eastern Interior, when
15 they discussed this proposal, the one that they supported
16 was the original then?

17

18 MR. JUSTIN: Yes. I might add that I
19 think a lot of the discussion about the proposal at the
20 local level produces general sentiment but a lot of fine-
21 tuning is necessary or word-smithing. That seems to be
22 the feedback I got from people who asked what our
23 intentions were and what we saw the benefits were.

24

25 MS. WELLS: I guess one more. I'm trying
26 to get a feel for this. This area is outside our region
27 and I feel like I could support the proposal as modified,
28 but if the Eastern Interior already voted in support of
29 the original, am I going to be stepping on their toes by
30 modifying it in this manner? I don't know if it would be
31 right for us to do that.

32

33 MR. JUSTIN: I can't speak for Eastern
34 Interior. I know those folks over there and I know a lot
35 of people who worked with them. I wouldn't be able to
36 speak on their behalf for or against their statement, but
37 I think it's a fair question that you could easily ask
38 them.

39

40 MS. STICKWAN: I was just going to say in
41 the other proposal we didn't support a designated hunter.
42 We thought whoever was going hunting with the elder could
43 help carry the meat out.

44

45 MR. JUSTIN: This proposal we envisioned
46 was a family proposal, strictly within the family. A lot
47 of the discussion that came up questioned whether or not
48 that would be discriminatory against other potential
49 users or qualified users, so we kind of left it open at
50 that point. I don't know if that answered the question.

00264

1 We do support completely the designated hunter part and
2 also the modification of any sheep.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Wilson. I
5 really wish you would have had the part about the family
6 in there myself because that was one of the ideas I came
7 up with on the other one, but we were kind of told that
8 is discriminatory against people who don't have families,
9 so we were stuck.

10

11 MR. JUSTIN: I understand. It's not easy
12 to walk the line between culture, traditions and the
13 Western way of doing things. I've had to do it all my
14 life. It's easy for me, but it's not easy, I know, for a
15 process like this where it's only several years old.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
18 Wilson?

19

20 (No comments)

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Wilson.
23 Okay. I saw a hand up back there from a biologist in
24 Wrangell-St. Elias.

25

26 MR. REED: Mason Reed, Wrangell-St.
27 Elias. Looking at the existing regulations and what
28 Wilson has just elucidated, I see a disconnect between
29 what the current regulations are and the desires
30 expressed by Wilson.

31

32 In Unit 11, the elder sheep hunt is a
33 late season hunt possessed by a person 60 years of age or
34 older. With existing regulations, that requires that
35 person to actually pull the trigger on the sheep. Now,
36 that is inconsistent with what Wilson just mentioned
37 about the idea of an elder accompanying a grandchild
38 where the grandchild actually does the killing. So,
39 technically, if Wilson tried to do that in the current
40 scenario, the elder sheep hunt, he would be liable for
41 prosecution because under the current elder sheep hunt
42 the younger person could not do the actual killing.

43

44 So I think there are ways of getting
45 around this. My concern is with the earlier elder sheep
46 hunts there was an interest in actually the elders
47 getting out and taking their own animals. If that's the
48 case, the current Unit 11 regulations which are -- the
49 Unit 12 proposal right now is to echo the Unit 11
50 regulations and that would suffice, but when you add a

00265

1 grandchild, then that regulation does not adequately
2 address that.

3

4 One way of doing that is if the desire is
5 to allow an elder to get into sheep country with a
6 grandchild, you could have a later hunt where the sheep
7 are more accessible for the elder to participate in the
8 hunt but have the actual permit associated with the
9 grandchild and that would allow it to be legal. That's
10 the only way legally you can have the grandchild pull the
11 trigger. That person has to have the permit in hand.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mason, can you imagine
14 what the political difficulties would be if you said the
15 requirement for this permit is that you are a grandchild?

16

17 MR. REED: Well, sort of what I was
18 thinking. You know, one way of doing it, and I'm
19 thinking of this sort of as I'm sitting here, but during
20 this extra hunt you could have say a limited number of
21 permits given to anybody that applies but who has to be
22 associated with their grandparent of age 60 or over.
23 That's consistent with the desire, I think, and it can
24 get complex, but I think there's a disconnect between the
25 existing regulations and the desires expressed by Wilson.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Could there be a
28 proposal put in that this permit -- I mean we have hunts
29 on buffalo where a couple people can put in for one
30 permit. Could you put in and make a stipulation to this
31 hunt the only ones that are qualified for this are
32 somebody over 60 accompanied by a grandchild? Could you
33 do something like that? I'm seeing Bill. He's not quite
34 shaking his head yet. I know how much we've had with
35 just trying to do things in this state when we say
36 somebody making the requirement being that you're over 60
37 you run into legal challenges and things like that. I
38 mean this proposal won't do what we're after the way it
39 is.

40

41 The other problem we have with this
42 proposal is this proposal is actually now in another
43 area. As a Council, we've always deferred to the wishes
44 of the area that had the proposal in. But in the future
45 if somebody wants to put a proposal in, would it be
46 possible to sit down and work with them to come up with a
47 proposal that comes up with a permit that deals exactly
48 with this situation?

49

50 This proposal, like Justin said, opens

00266

1 the doors for anybody over 60. If we make designated
2 hunter, then it opens the doors for anybody over 60 to
3 have a designated hunter. It doesn't accomplish what
4 he's trying to do. But could a proposal be written where
5 the requirement for the permit is two people and one of
6 them has to be over 60 and one has to be a grandchild?
7 Could you write a proposal like that and meet legal
8 challenges, Bill?

9

10 MR. KNAUER: The State currently has a
11 program called bring a child hunting and they have
12 permits for child/adult pairs that are for moose in Unit
13 20(B) for four consecutive days. The permits are issued
14 to a child age eight to 17 accompanied by a licensed
15 person 21 or older. Only the child may shoot the moose.

16

17 I would think it would be possible to
18 draft a proposal for a late season. I'm not sure about
19 those ages, but we'll say age 10 to 16 must be
20 accompanied by a family member over 60 years of age and
21 only the child may shoot the sheep. I don't know how the
22 Board will respond to that. I think it's possible to
23 have a proposal like that.

24

25 I think it would not be appropriate to
26 amend this proposal because that is so different.
27 Something like that might defeat the purpose and desires.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's what I was
30 thinking. That sounds like that would meet what we're
31 talking about here more than what we're trying to do if
32 we modify the proposal in front of us. I guess, from my
33 standpoint, I would suggest that that be kind of a
34 proposal that comes in in the future while we deal with
35 this one right here in front of us which comes from Unit
36 12.

37

38 Fred.

39

40 MR. ELVSAAS: Mr. Chairman, we've had a
41 long discussion on this issue. We're talking about
42 something outside of our area and apparently the Eastern
43 Interior people have already acted on this. I think the
44 best thing we could do is just support their action.
45 It's their area, it's their decision. For us to craft
46 anything that's not identical to theirs is interfering.
47 I think I would resent it if they did that to us and we
48 were trying to do something for the people within our
49 area. So I suggest that we just act in support of their
50 actions and let it go.

00267

1 Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

4

5 MR. CHURCHILL: Took the words right out
6 of my mouth.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.

9

10 MS. STICKWAN: Your question was for a
11 limited number of permits. Is that agreeable? Would
12 that work? His question was for a limited number of
13 permits for elders. Would that be okay?

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That would be another
16 proposal.

17

18 MS. STICKWAN: Yeah, I know. I'm just
19 asking is it okay, a limited number of permits and not to
20 the whole public is what I'm asking. Would that be okay
21 if the proposal is written like that? That could be
22 done?

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Terry.

25

26 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, what Mr.
27 Justin is wanting to accomplish is very important. The
28 State is very willing to sit down with him and others and
29 see if we can work out something that would accomplish
30 the mission's purpose. It sounds like this may not be
31 the vehicle for doing that. I want to make it very clear
32 that the opposition to the modified proposal is not
33 because we oppose what he wants to accomplish. We have
34 some biological concerns, but we believe that we can sit
35 down and find something that would satisfy everyone's
36 needs here.

37

38 I really appreciate him explaining to you
39 in more detail. I lived in the Upper Tanana region for a
40 number of years. I know the people there. I struggle to
41 understand some of the concepts because it is real
42 difficult for us white folks to understand some of the
43 Athabascan principles and concepts. What he wants to
44 accomplish is something I think we can all agree is
45 important and commendable, so I would commit the State's
46 resources to working on this and seeing what we can do.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Terry.

49

50 MR. CHURCHILL: I'd like to move that we

00268

1 defer any action on our Regional Advisory Council to the
2 action taken by the Eastern in respect to their knowledge
3 and tradition.

4

5 MR. CARPENTER: Second.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
8 seconded that we defer our decision to the decision of
9 the Eastern Interior. Any discussion.

10

11 MS. WELLS: So your motion was to defer
12 -- say that again.

13

14 MR. CHURCHILL: My motion was basically
15 to defer any action on our behalf in deference to the
16 action already taken by the Eastern Interior.

17

18 MS. WELLS: Could we word it in support
19 of their action?

20

21 MR. CHURCHILL: My meaning is the same,
22 but we have it on the record. Thank you.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.

25

26 MS. STICKWAN: Could the Federal agency
27 work with Chistochina, I guess is the one that brought
28 this up, to make a new proposal to try and make it work
29 for them?

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think that's what will
32 happen. It sounds like they and the State will even work
33 with them. But for what we have in front of us right
34 now, the motion is that we'll go along with what the
35 Eastern Interior decided. We'll support their decision.
36 Was there a second?

37

38 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, Tom seconded it.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom seconded it.

41

42 MR. CHURCHILL: Call the question.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
45 called. All in favor of deferring any action on our part
46 to the decision made by the Eastern Interior signify by
47 saying aye.

48

49 IN UNISON: Aye.

50

00269

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
2 saying nay.

3
4 (No opposing votes)

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. Okay.
7 With that we're on to call for proposals to change
8 Federal subsistence fisheries regulations. Do we have
9 any proposals? We're making a call for proposals. If
10 you have any, come to Donald Mike and he'll help you fill
11 out the forms.

12
13 With that, we're going to go on to
14 Fisheries Resource Monitoring. Donald.

15
16 MR. MIKE: I just wanted to add that the
17 fisheries proposal forms are in the Federal fisheries
18 regulations book if anybody is curious.

19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: With that, we're going
21 to go on to Number 11, Fisheries Resource Monitoring
22 Report. Before we do that, let's take a break.

23
24 (Off record)

25
26 (On record)

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:

29
30 MR. MCBRIDE: Back side of the table that
31 looks like this. This is just a summary of all the
32 programs we've funded since 2000, which was the inception
33 of the program. The way you read this table, on the far
34 left are just the project numbers we assign to the
35 projects. The next column is data type. As we talked
36 about on Tuesday, we addressed two data types in our
37 program, stock status and trends and harvest monitoring
38 and TEK.

39
40 The next column are the actual project
41 names and I've grouped those by major subject matter, so
42 what you'll see at the top is Copper River salmon. Those
43 are all the projects we've funded that address Copper
44 River salmon. Then we've funded some projects in Prince
45 William Sound and a couple projects in Cook Inlet.

46
47 As you move across the table to the
48 right, the next column are the investigators associated
49 with each project. All those numbers to the right is the
50 amount of money that went into that project by year. So

00270

1 you can see not only how much the project cost but the
2 duration of the project.

3

4 There are a couple things I'd like to
5 give you as an overview. I think it's very obvious that
6 most of this program has been focused on Copper River
7 salmon. This program is all about providing information
8 for Federal subsistence management and that's where the
9 issues primarily are in the fisheries for Southcentral,
10 so not surprisingly that's where the thrust of the
11 program has been.

12

13 You can also see there that we started a
14 lot of project obviously in 2001 that went through 2003.
15 There were also some harvest assessment projects that
16 were done during that same time frame. All of those
17 programs, with the exception of the radio telemetry
18 program, ended in 2003 because we allow programs up to
19 three years in duration.

20

21 If you look at the numbers in the far
22 right-hand side of the table, those are the programs in
23 2004 that we just authorized or approved if you will in
24 December. That was the 2004 monitoring plan. You
25 reviewed that and offered recommendations to us last
26 fall, so all those numbers on the far right in the middle
27 part of that upper part of the table.

28

29 Those projects are Long Lake sockeye
30 escapement, we reauthorized Tanada Creek, the Copper
31 River chinook abundance estimate, we started a program
32 for Copper River chinook genetics and then we also
33 started a three-year program traditional knowledge of
34 long term changes in Copper River salmon runs. So those
35 are all the programs that were just approved in 2004.
36 We're writing cooperative agreements right now and those
37 programs will start basically this summer.

38

39 In a nutshell, that's the Copper River
40 Salmon Program. I think, in general, to just summarize
41 where we're at on that, really, with hardly any
42 exceptions, these programs have been implemented as
43 they've been designed.

44

45 In a little bit here, under item number
46 three on the agenda, the stock assessment program for
47 Copper River chinook salmon, you're going to have two of
48 the investigators come up, Rion Schmidt from the Native
49 Village of Eyak and then Matt Evenson from Alaska
50 Department of Fish and Game, and they're going to give

00271

1 you an overview of the assessment work that we've funded
2 for Copper River chinook salmon. A lot of this
3 information has been provided by the Native Village of
4 Eyak. This is providing opportunities for non-government
5 organizations to participate in resource management and
6 assessment. This program is exactly what we're talking
7 about. You'll get that presentation in just a minute.

8

9 Just to briefly go through just an
10 overview of the rest of the program. The next grouping
11 of projects, Copper River steelhead and non-salmon, you
12 can see that we funded several studies on Copper River
13 steelhead. Those are coming to successful conclusion
14 right now. They're being implemented exactly as they
15 were designed to do.

16

17 We also did a small project looking at
18 Eulachon subsistence harvest down on the Copper River
19 flats. Then we also did some work on increasing GIS or
20 mapping capabilities in the Upper Copper River. I think
21 the important thing to see there is we did some work,
22 it's basically ending now, but we're not doing any more
23 work in that area. I think what that speaks to is the
24 limited funds in trying to strategically focus the
25 program on where we think the highest priorities are.

26

27 The next category down is really a
28 smaller category, Prince William Sound. We've only
29 funded three studies there. We had a short study looking
30 at coho in the Coghill. We've done a little bit of
31 mapping work that has one more year to go, the Chugach
32 Region TEK mapping. Then we also funded the stock
33 assessment in Billy's Hole. We've done one year and
34 we're doing the second and final year this coming year.
35 Except for the 2004 monitoring plan that was just
36 approved, we're not doing any more work in Prince William
37 Sound.

38

39 The final area is in Cook Inlet. We did
40 just a couple projects very early in the program looking
41 at Dolly Varden and eulachon in Turnagain Arm. Then we
42 did one other project, Cook Inlet subsistence fishery
43 harvest assessment program. Pat Petrivelli is going to
44 give you an update on that. The importance of that is
45 right now in Southcentral we're not accepting any funding
46 proposals for Cook Inlet because of what's going on on
47 the regulatory side. Right now the Cook Inlet
48 subsistence fishery regulations mirror sportfishing
49 regulations in that area as an interim measure. What
50 we're waiting for are the results of this study. Pat

00272

1 will talk to you about where we're at in that process.

2

3

4 With that, I'll ask if there's any
5 questions about the overview and then, following that,
6 Pat Petrivelli will talk about that Cook Inlet
7 subsistence harvest use study, then you'll have the two
8 presenters on the Copper River chinook program, then you
9 get to listen to me again very briefly talk about the
10 updated process for issues and information needs that we
11 previously discussed on Tuesday.

11

12

13 Finally, the one partner position in this
14 area is Erica McCall from the Native Village of Eyak will
15 cover that. That's item number five. With that, I'd ask
16 if there are any questions on what I've presented.

16

17

(No comments)

18

19

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Doug.

20

21

22 MS. PETRIVELLI: I'm just doing an update
23 on the Cook Inlet subsistence fisheries assessment study.
24 In the year 2001, the Board had proposals before it to
25 make a C&T determination for the Cook Inlet area and this
26 Council did make a recommendation to the Board, but the
27 Board decided to defer action to get more data, so we
28 have an agreement with ADF&G Subsistence Division and I
29 got the preliminary draft yesterday. They hand-delivered
30 it and it's going to go through a few more reviews, but
31 in a few weeks it will be a draft.

31

32

33 Their deadline was March 31st. The
34 deadline for regulatory proposals is March 26. We had
35 said we wouldn't accept any fishery regulatory proposals
36 until we had the results of the study. That's just to
37 let you know. For new members, this study will provide
38 information about past, present and potential
39 non-commercial harvest and use of fish in waters of the
40 Cook Inlet management area that are under the
41 jurisdiction of the Federal Subsistence Board.

41

42

43 The first phase had a literature review.
44 There were key respondent interviews and we held four
45 meetings on the Kenai Peninsula and Anchorage. The
46 second phase had a survey of 355 households in five study
47 communities. It collected information about
48 demographics, fish harvest and uses for the years 2002
49 and 2003. Then we reviewed those survey results and Liz
50 Williams made a presentation to the Council last fall
51 about some of the preliminary studies.

00273

1 We're going to distribute it on the Kenai
2 Peninsula in the libraries and we're going to mail
3 executive summaries to all the Fish and Game Advisory
4 Committee Members and try to make the results available
5 as soon as possible. Are there any questions about the
6 study?

7
8 MR. CHURCHILL: Can we get a copy of the
9 draft when you're done?

10
11 MS. PETRIVELLI: When it's a draft, but
12 it's not a draft yet. It's a preliminary draft. It's
13 not available.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
16 Pat.

17
18 MS. WELLS: Then maybe I should ask, you
19 will be sending us a draft then?

20
21 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes, the draft report
22 will be available for review before it's final.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions.

25
26 (No comments)

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Pat. Next
29 presenter.

30
31 MR. SCHMIDT: I'm Rion Schmidt, a tribal
32 member with the Native Village of Eyak based out of
33 Cordova, Alaska. I just recently started as their
34 environmental coordinator. I'm going to be presenting
35 the chinook monitoring project that we've been doing for
36 the last couple years. Also with us today are Bruce
37 Cain, the executive director of the Native Village of
38 Eyak and Erica McCall, our regional social scientist.

39
40 I was a fish tech with the sonar project
41 on the Lower Copper River for a little while and I'll
42 possibly be helping out with that in the future. I'm a
43 life-long subsistence user, so I rely on these salmon as
44 well. This is a project between Native Village of Eyak
45 and Alaska Department of Fish and Game and LGL. The full
46 name of the study is the feasibility of using fish wheels
47 for long-term monitoring of chinook salmon escapement.

48
49 In this presentation, I'm going to go
50 over our objectives and methods, talk a little bit about

00274

1 the results and briefly highlight a few changes for this
2 coming year's project.

3

4 The project objectives are to evaluate
5 the ability of fish wheels to capture chinook salmon on
6 the Copper River, generate system wide escapement
7 estimates using two sample mark-recapture methods and
8 to develop a long-term monitoring program to be operated
9 by the Native Village of Eyak.

10

11 This map shows the project area and it
12 indicates where the tags are applied. As the fish travel
13 up river, they are potentially recaptured and examined.
14 Here's an aerial photo of the cabinet and an
15 unconstructed fish wheel out front. These aluminum fish
16 wheels are assembled and pushed into the river where the
17 rest of the parts are put in place and they're moved to
18 the sample location that's been chosen based on water
19 levels, local knowledge and experience.

20

21 Here's an operational fish wheel. These
22 particular models are constructed of light-weight welded
23 aluminum and they're some of the largest in the state
24 that are in operation. So, for those of you who have
25 never seen a fish wheel in operation, probably not many
26 of you here, but they work by the current forcing paddles
27 and attached baskets through the water and scooping up
28 the fish that swim under the fish wheel and deposit them
29 into a trough where technicians wait to sample them.

30

31 Fish are scooped up and dropped into a
32 holding tank with plenty of circulation and then
33 carefully dipped out by waiting technicians, usually
34 tribal members working for us. Fish are transferred to a
35 V-shaped water trough, counted, sexed, measured for
36 length and examined for injuries and other marks.

37

38 Here we have Johnny Goodlataw who was
39 hired from an upriver tribe for his experience with
40 building the smaller subsistence-style fish wheels. This
41 is a good example of Native knowledge being put to work.
42 He also had some really helpful ideas on placement of the
43 fish wheel for the optimum catching of salmon.

44

45 The numbers show that during the peak of
46 the season this wheel caught 87 fish and a total of 1,292
47 for the whole season. As this slide indicates, these are
48 two different sites where fish wheels were deployed. In
49 2003, fish wheel three caught 397 fish at this site and
50 in 2002 676 fish were caught.

00275

1 This slide shows the number of kings
2 caught by year and the two main locations. There's a
3 break-down for Baird Canyon of how many fish were caught,
4 tagged and the number that was available for recapture.
5 Here are recapture numbers for fish tagged at Baird
6 Canyon and then recaptured at Canyon Creek. So this is
7 just a preliminary estimate of the total number of kings
8 based on the statistics of the fish tagged as compared to
9 the recapture number. Again, these are just preliminary
10 numbers.

11
12 Here are our plans for 2004 and I would
13 just add to this that we're going to build another of the
14 hybrid fish wheels because they just worked so well. So
15 that concludes my presentation. If anybody has any
16 questions I'll try to answer.

17
18 MR. BLOSSOM: How many total fish wheels
19 did you have?

20
21 MR. SCHMIDT: We had four. That's
22 including the one we had help with building.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What's the degree of
25 confidence in the numbers that come out on the catch and
26 recapture to come up with the estimate of the total?

27
28 MR. SCHMIDT: I'm not sure of that
29 number.

30
31 MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman. When you
32 look at the three years that we've done, the project is
33 called feasibility. The first year the objective was can
34 they even capture enough chinook down at Bear Canyon to
35 even have the hope of doing this. There was a lot of
36 questions about that. I was the reviewer of this
37 investigation plan. I insisted that they have a back-up
38 plan because I didn't think it was do-able. I was wrong.
39 They caught over 1,000 chinook that first year. The
40 Baird site was fully operational in the second year.
41 They got those fish wheels in the water the day after the
42 ice went out.

43
44 In year two of the program, then they had
45 to develop the upriver site, the recapture site. That's
46 at Canyon Creek. They developed that. In the first year
47 we found they weren't capturing enough fish. I think the
48 number of recaptures was 16 or something like that. So
49 this hybrid fish wheel that Rion was talking about, they
50 looked at what they were doing at Canyon Creek and they

00276

1 had to basically up their catches substantially, so
2 that's when they brought in John Goodlataw from the upper
3 river. Their catches went up substantially. This last
4 year, the number of recaptures I believe was about 100.

5
6 It's not just the total numbers gained,
7 it's how they're distributed, so what they're doing is
8 they're going in the day after the ice gets out, they're
9 putting tags on throughout the chinook migration, up to
10 about 1,500 and then they're recapturing throughout the
11 migration as it goes past Canyon Creek and those tags are
12 very evenly distributed over the run. I would say both
13 of those sites are fully developed.

14
15 I'm sorry. That was a long-winded
16 answer.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think Bruce has his
19 hand up. Maybe he's got a comment on that.

20
21 MR. CAIN: The short answer is 95
22 percent.

23
24 (Laughter)

25
26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Bruce. Tom.

27
28 MR. CARPENTER: I'd just like to make a
29 comment. I believe I said this the other day to Doug.
30 This project on the Copper River has been the best thing
31 for assessing stocks that we've ever had. The aerial
32 surveys and the abundance estimations that were done in
33 the rivers and the spawning grounds in the past were so
34 far less superior to this study. I'd just like to thank
35 everybody on the Council that has supported this in the
36 past and OSM, along with the Native village because
37 they've done incredible work in making this project
38 function like it has. I don't think the numbers that the
39 river has shown, that they really had the confidence in
40 estimating salmon runs on the Copper River that they do
41 now. I'd just like to say thanks for that.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions.
44 Doug.

45
46 MR. BLOSSOM: So the 45,000 figure that I
47 saw, how accurate is that?

48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think he said 95
50 percent.

00277

1 MR. BLOSSOM: Okay. Well, they laughed,
2 so I wondered if it was true.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: They were laughing at
5 the fact that he gave a 10-minute answer to what Bruce
6 said in a percentage.

7

8 MS. McCALL: One of the things that's
9 important to stress with that number is that it is a
10 preliminary number. The numbers are still being looked
11 at, so that can change, but the confidence that the
12 number is there is high.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What you're saying is
15 don't quote the number.

16

17 MS. McCALL: Exactly.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But use it as a range.
20 Dean.

21

22 MR. WILSON: I'm kind of curious, the
23 size of that fish wheel. That's like a Yukon River size
24 fish wheel. Do you have any problems with trees running
25 through that during high water flow or anything that
26 shuts you down for any length of time?

27

28 MR. SCHMIDT: I wasn't actually on the
29 fish wheel, so I can't answer that, but I haven't heard
30 of anything like that. Maybe Bruce could better answer
31 that.

32

33 MS. McCALL: I can actually answer that
34 question. I oversaw these projects this last summer.
35 There's definitely a large amount of debris that does
36 come down the river and it does run into the fish wheel.
37 We've had the webbing ripped out, we've had aluminum
38 bent, having to have baskets rebuilt.

39

40 MR. WILSON: So the down time was
41 relatively minimal.

42

43 MS. McCALL: Yeah, we do have some down
44 time, but it's minimal. Actually, I think in 2002 it was
45 just maybe a couple hours that the fish wheels were down,
46 but this last year there was a larger amount of debris
47 coming down, so there were some wheels that weren't
48 fishing for maybe three to four days, but that didn't
49 have a significant impact on the project.

50

00278

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Dean.

2

3 MR. WILSON: One last question. When
4 Tazlina Lake went out this year for about a week and a
5 half, were you guys taking samples the entire time during
6 that?

7

8 MS. McCALL: Yes, the fish wheels were in
9 and that's actually one of the instances that so much
10 debris came down the river and was ripping the webbing
11 and bending aluminum.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions.

14

15 (No comments)

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

18

19 MS. McCALL: For the record, my name is
20 Erica McCall and I'm the Southcentral Region social
21 scientist.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

24

25 MR. EVENSON: Mr. Chairman, thanks for
26 having me here today. I recognize a few of you folks but
27 don't know all of you. It's nice to be able to put faces
28 to the names here. I know you've got a lot on your
29 agenda, so I'm going to give you a fairly quick overview.
30 Hopefully not too quick, so if you have any questions
31 after it's over, let me know.

32

33 Anyway, I'm here today to talk about sort
34 of a companion part of the project that Rion just spoke
35 about and it has to do more with the spawning
36 distribution in the run time of chinook salmon. It's
37 sort of the sister project with the one he just talked
38 about and it involved the use of radio telemetry.

39

40 This portion of the study had two primary
41 objectives, to determine the distribution of the spawning
42 chinook salmon throughout the drainage and then to
43 describe the stock specific migratory timing of the run
44 at different points along the river.

45

46 A little bit of background on this study.
47 This project originally started back in 1999. It was run
48 and funded by the Department exclusively. The capture
49 operation was a little bit different or a little more
50 primitive I guess you'd say. We used dipnets to capture

00279

1 fish and our capture site was located just below the
2 Chitina dipnet fishery near the Canyon Creek site Rion
3 was talking about. Then getting into 2002, the project
4 became a cooperative venture with the Native Village of
5 Eyak and assisted with funding from OSM and was funded
6 for three years starting 2002, so 2004 will be the last
7 season this project is funded. In total, there's been
8 six years of this radio telemetry work that's gone on.

9
10 This study design had two basic elements
11 and the first was to capture and radio tag the chinook in
12 proportion to run strength. To do that, the idea is to
13 try to fish with a consistent amount of effort each day
14 of the run. Essentially, we did fish from the start to
15 completion of the run each year. Then we wanted to put
16 tags out over the whole span of the run and try to put
17 the tags out that's consistent with the daily catches.
18 If you catch 10 fish in one day and you put one tag out,
19 if you catch 20 fish the next day, you'd put two tags
20 out, so we try to keep that tagging fraction similar each
21 day.

22
23 Then the second element or the design is
24 to basically determine where all the fish go after
25 they're radio tagged. We did that a couple different
26 ways. The primary way was through a network of ground-
27 based radio tracking station that I'll describe a little
28 more in detail and then also through aerial tracking
29 surveys on the spawning grounds. Then we also got tag
30 returns from fish that were harvested in the various
31 fisheries.

32
33 So these were the fish wheels that you
34 saw in Rion's presentation and that's what's been used
35 the last two years of the study since 2002 and that will
36 be the plan again for this upcoming field season.
37 Basically, in all years of the study, the objective has
38 been to tag 500 chinook salmon over the course of the
39 run.

40
41 Here's some pictures of the radio tagging
42 operation. There's a total of 11 of these tracking
43 stations that are depicted with that white symbol there.
44 Look down at the bottom of the slide you can see the
45 capture site there. There was a tracking station set up
46 just immediately above the capture site and then one put
47 down at the mouth, a sonar station. We actually have
48 fish that back out after they're tagged, so that lower
49 station recorded all of those fish. There weren't very
50 many, four or five.

00280

1 There was a series of five stations. You
2 see the green circle up around the mouth of the Chitina
3 River. That represents the boundaries of the Chitina
4 dipnet fishery. There were actually five placed around
5 the boundaries of that fishery. One of them was in the
6 lower part of the Chitina River and then moving upstream
7 there was a station on the Tonsina River, one in the
8 Klutina River, then one in the lower Gulkana River and
9 another one in the Gulkana further up river which was
10 also fairly recent, and then the last station is on the
11 mainstem Copper itself upstream of the Gulkana and is
12 kind of used to monitor everything that spawns in the
13 upper part of the drainage.

14
15 Every year we try to do at least three
16 different aerial tracking flights. Shoot for late June,
17 late July and late August. We try to cover as much of
18 the drainage as we can. Usually between 20 to 25 hours
19 of flying time during each of these excursions. We kind
20 of do that to pinpoint where these fish are spawning
21 beyond what the stationary receivers can give us.

22
23 We're shooting for 500 tags each year.
24 Made that easily this year. Last year fell a little
25 short. One of the reasons we sometimes fall short is,
26 like I mentioned, we're trying to shoot for that
27 consistent tagging rate, so that necessitates you have to
28 have some idea of what the run strength is for that year.

29
30 Then every year there's a few tags that
31 are either regurgitated or possibly due to handling
32 mortality, the fish or the tags never make their way
33 upstream. They're either found in the vicinity of the
34 capture site or the few that back out. It shows the
35 number 37 and 47 for the two years that have been
36 harvested in Chitina dipnet fishery. Then there's always
37 a fair number harvested in the Glennallen subdistrict
38 subsistence fishery. Then a fair number harvested in the
39 sport fisheries in the Gulkana and Klutina Rivers as
40 well.

41
42 The total number in the spawning
43 strengths there it reads 306 and 307, so between 60 and
44 70 percent of the total tags that we put out find their
45 way to the spawning grounds. Then there's a handful that
46 we record at one of the upstream stations, so it survived
47 the tagging and handling and started its way upstream,
48 got through the Chitina dipnet fishery and then we never
49 find it in the spawning grounds, so some of those may be
50 harvested and not returned to us or some may have gone to

00281

1 tributaries we didn't search. Then the bottom number
2 illustrates that at least as far as making it a certain
3 distance upstream we're able to account for all of the
4 radio tags.

5
6 So, the first objective of the study was
7 to estimate the spawning distribution and we divided it
8 out by a major tributary. If you look along the bottom
9 axis there, it lists the different major tributaries.
10 We've lumped all the Upper Copper tributaries together,
11 so that would be essentially everything about the Gulkana
12 River. Then along the vertical axis there is the
13 proportion for the total escapement in that year that was
14 represented by that major drainage. So you can see some
15 consistencies. For example, the Upper Copper and the
16 Tazlina and the Tonsina have remained relatively constant
17 over the years in terms of proportion of the escapement,
18 whereas the Gulkana and the Chitina especially are pretty
19 variable from year to year in terms of the proportion of
20 the total escapement they represent.

21
22 The next graph is going to show you some
23 run timing profiles and so what you have on the bottom
24 horizontal axis there is the date past the capture site,
25 and then on the vertical axis is the accumulated
26 percentage of the number of fish for a given stock that
27 went by on that day. If you had a total of 10 tags for
28 the Gulkana River stock that went by over the course of
29 the whole run, the first fish would represent 10 percent
30 of the total run, the fifth fish would represent 50
31 percent and by the time you got to the 10th fish it would
32 be 100 percent of the run. There's going to be some
33 lines that start at zero and then they end up at 100
34 percent.

35
36 So these first two represent the Upper
37 Copper River stocks and the Gulkana River stocks and
38 they're the first ones that enter the river and go by the
39 capture site. They start showing up right away in mid
40 May when the wheels first start fishing and then, for the
41 most part, they are done running past the Baird Canyon
42 site by the 15th of June. So they're the first stop and
43 they have a relatively short run duration.

44
45 Then the next stocks that come up are the
46 Tazlina and Chitina stocks and they're a little prolonged
47 run duration. The last stocks to come by the capture
48 site are the Tonsina and Klutina Rivers and they have an
49 even more prolonged run duration.

50

00282

1 I'm not going to show you all six years
2 of these plots, but just to give you an idea of the
3 consistency of the pattern, here's the same plots for
4 2003, the last year. Again, you can see the Upper Copper
5 and Gulkana coming in first and then the Chitina and
6 Tazlina stocks and then the Klutina and Tonsina stocks.
7 So pretty much that's been the pattern we've observed all
8 six years of the study.

9

10 To conclude, I think this project has
11 been successful in achieving the project objectives over
12 the course of the year and hopefully will be again this
13 summer and 2004 will be the final year of funding for
14 this project.

15

16 I just wanted to point out the Native
17 Village of Eyak has a similar kind of proposal that just
18 got submitted that the OSM Technical Review Committee
19 will probably be reviewing sometime this week and if they
20 approve it for a more detailed plan, you guys will
21 probably be hearing about it in your fall meeting as far
22 as approving it for funding, but essentially it will be
23 doing the same kind of project only with sockeye salmon.

24

25

26 I guess maybe the take-home message for
27 you guys here now is that a lot of the infrastructure
28 that's in place here now was quite expensive to purchase
29 and it's take a while to set up and work all the bugs
30 out, so the time is ripe now to do other radio telemetry
31 studies done on other species. I think they can be done
32 a lot cheaper now that that's all been purchased and in
33 place. These projects do cost a lot of money. I don't
34 know if you looked at the summary Doug passed out.

35

36 Mr. Chairman, that's all I have. I'd be
37 happy to answer a few questions if anybody has any.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug.

40

41 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman, I saw in one
42 of the starting pictures a sonar site. Did you also
43 count these kinds with a sonar or not?

44

45 MR. EVENSON: There is a sonar site at
46 Mile Lake but the sonar counting of chinook salmon wasn't
47 part of this study. I don't know which slide you're
48 talking about.

49

50 MR. BLOSSOM: So you don't count chinook.

00283

1 Okay. I just wanted to make sure.

2

3

4 MR. EVENSON: The sonar that's in place
5 now at Miles Lake doesn't differentiate between sockeye
6 and chinook salmon. They're experimenting with putting
7 one of the new Dittson (ph) sonars there. That probably
8 won't be operational for management purposes for quite a
9 while. They want to compare it to the sonar that's there
10 now and work a lot of the bugs out, but maybe within a
11 few years.

11

12

MR. BLOSSOM: Follow up.

13

14

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. BLOSSOM: I'd love to see this on the
Kenai.

MR. EVENSON: There's nothing money can't
fix, you know.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions. I
just had two little short ones. Do every one of those
radios put out an individual signal?

MR. EVENSON: Actually, the technology
has come a long way in recent years. There's a number of
different codes for a given frequency that you can use to
differentiate individual tags. I guess the short answer
is, yes, each radio tag has an individual frequency and
code combination that allow you to track it back to when
it was tagged. That's how these plots were generated.
We knew the frequency and code and we could trace it back
to the day that it was captured at the capture site.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: How long does the
signals last?

MR. EVENSON: We put a shut-off switch in
these tags to turn off after about four months so they
don't interfere with collared moose and other things
roaming around. It depends on what you want them to do.
You can get tags to last as long as two years if you want
to program them that way. These are high-power output
tags that don't have a long life but don't need to live
that long for salmon purposes.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions.

(No comments)

00284

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you for your
2 presentation.

3
4 MR. EVENSON: Thank you.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug, do we have any
7 more slides coming?

8
9 MR. McBRIDE: No. I was trying to turn
10 this off so you wouldn't be blinded.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. I think we're on
13 update on issues and information, Doug.

14
15 MR. McBRIDE: Right. Mr. Chairman, just
16 one last thing about the monitoring program and there
17 will be a short presentation by Erica McCall on the
18 Partners Program.

19
20 We identify issues and information needs
21 that we send out to potential investigators. As our
22 money is tightening up, one of the things that we want to
23 absolutely ensure is that we do the best job we can to
24 aim our money at the most important questions to address.
25 To that end, what we're going to initiate is what we hope
26 is going to be a more rigorous process to identify
27 priority research objectives.

28
29 In that blue folder is a letter that's
30 addressed to Chairman Lohse from Tom Boyd, who is the
31 assistant regional director for the Office of Subsistence
32 Management. You can read that letter but the gist of it
33 is what we're going to embark on is we're going to
34 initiate a series of regional workshops and invite
35 professionals from the obvious agencies and organizations
36 within that region and task them with three things.

37
38 First we want to very thoroughly scope
39 out the goals and objectives and information needs in
40 total for Federal subsistence fishery management for each
41 subsistence fishery within that region. Number two, then
42 identify gaps in knowledge and I think the way we're
43 going to try to do that is actually inventory all the
44 projects that are done by either Federal agency, State
45 agency, non-government organizations, whoever they are,
46 by all those fisheries and all those information needs
47 that are identified. Then finally prioritize what's
48 needed then. Look at what's being done versus what's
49 needed.

50

00285

1 We're going to start that process
2 actually in a little over a month and we're going to
3 start in this region, in Southcentral. I'm in the process
4 of putting together a work group for Southcentral that
5 we've actually already scheduled some dates in late April
6 and we've invited a series of regional professionals from
7 U.S. Forest Service, National Park Service, Fish and
8 Wildlife Service, Alaska Department of Fish and Game,
9 Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Indian Affairs, also
10 some of the non-government organizations like Native
11 Village of Eyak.

12
13 In addition to that, since our existing
14 issues and information needs were originally generated
15 here, we're also asking each Council to provide two
16 Council Members to be part of this working group or
17 workshop. I'll let you address that part, Mr. Chairman.
18 What we hope to do is generate these three products and
19 then we'll write that up into a report and then we'll
20 bring that back to the full Council at your fall meeting,
21 present that, get review and comment and then we'll
22 address those comments, finalize that report and then use
23 that product to drive our ensuing call for proposals,
24 which will be in November.

25
26 Mr. Chairman, with that, I'll be happy to
27 answer any questions.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I can see what we need
30 to do as a Council is we need to come up with two names
31 of people that are willing to sit on your work group. We
32 need that by when?

33
34 MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, we're focused
35 in right now on April 20th through 22nd as the dates of
36 this workshop, so it would be good if you could do it at
37 this meeting.

38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
40 Doug.

41
42 (No comments)

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We'll have to put
45 that on the agenda real quick. I think we have the
46 Partner Program. Is that coming up next?

47
48 MR. McBRIDE: It is.

49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Welcome.

00286

1 MS. McCALL: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair
2 and Council Members. My name is Erica McCall and I am
3 the regional social scientist here in Southcentral. I
4 know that Doug gave you a brief overview of the Partners
5 Program. The results of my position in Southcentral is
6 directly related to the Regional Advisory Council
7 approving that and supporting it.

8
9 Because of that today I'm going to give
10 you a review of what I've been doing for the last six
11 months. In October, Polly Wheeler gave an update of the
12 Partners Program and activities within Southcentral. The
13 hope is to keep these up on a biannual basis. Since
14 October it's actually been five months, so I have a list
15 of things I've been doing that are directly related to my
16 position and things I thought you would be interested in
17 knowing.

18
19 At the Alaska Forum on the Environment, I
20 presented the Southcentral Region's social scientist
21 position. This was aimed as an outreach to inform the
22 public of the position to get people more interested in
23 knowing that I'm here to be utilized as a position.

24
25 I facilitated a Copper River/Prince
26 William Sound Native Fisherman's Association meeting.
27 The objective of this meeting was to develop ideas for
28 Federal subsistence regulatory proposals. I also
29 contacted all of the Alaska Native tribes within
30 Southcentral to offer my assistance in developing the
31 Federal subsistence regulatory proposals.

32
33 I applied for an American Fisheries
34 Society junior biologist mentorship position and
35 I'm also currently soliciting for and hiring an intern
36 for the social scientist position. That's one of the
37 direct objectives, is to mentor an intern for the summer.

38
39 I helped the Native Village of Eyak
40 solicit for and hire a tribal biologist for the Native
41 Village of Eyak and that position is going to start in
42 mid April, so that individual will be on board for this
43 next season and be able to help out with the fisheries
44 research projects that are being run by the Native
45 Village of Eyak.

46
47 I attended and I presented at the Alaska
48 Chapter of the American Fisheries Society annual meeting
49 in Fairbanks and I presented the use of traditional
50 ecological knowledge in the fish wheel project that Rion

00287

1 presented earlier today. Particularly I presented Johnny
2 Goodlataw coming and helping us build that fish wheel and
3 incorporating his local traditional knowledge into the
4 fish project and how much of a success that was for the
5 fisheries research.

6
7 I attended both the Native American Fish
8 and Wildlife Society annual meetings and the BIA
9 providers annual conference. I assisted the Native
10 Village of Eyak in soliciting for and hiring an
11 environmental coordinator. I attended and manned
12 Partners for Fisheries Monitoring booth at the Alaska
13 Native Health Board's annual Alaska tribal conference on
14 environmental management. Again, that was an outreach to
15 get out to the public that the Partners' positions are
16 here in Alaska and we're willing to help and assist with
17 rural residents.

18
19 I attended a National Wildlife Federation
20 luncheon, which was particularly interesting and good.
21 The focus of the luncheon was to provide an avenue for
22 individuals within the Chugach region to introduce
23 themselves to each other and to provide updates on the
24 projects that each of us are working on. At this
25 meeting, I presented the Partners for Fisheries
26 Monitoring Program and the Fisheries Resource Monitoring
27 Program.

28
29 I participated in and assisted with
30 facilitation of a Vision to Action form in Trapper Creek.
31 A Vision to Action form is a program for participatory
32 planning and it provides an opportunity for communities
33 to come together in a neutral setting and to take stock
34 of where they are, to look at opportunities and threats
35 that they have on the horizon and then develop a common
36 vision of what they want for the community. This is
37 particularly important for Trapper Creek because of the
38 development of the south side of Denali National Park.
39 They are a gateway community to Denali Park, so they're
40 directly impacted by that development.

41
42 I also drafted and assisted others in
43 drafting pre-proposals for the FY05 call for the
44 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program projects. I'm
45 currently supervising three NVE employees that are
46 conducting household surveys for an Exxon Valdez Oil
47 Spill Trustee Council funded project. This project
48 investigates the effects of the oil spill 15 years after
49 it occurred.

50

00288

1 Then, through a variety of means, I've
2 been working on the FY03 and the FY04 chinook escapement
3 monitoring project. The FY03 and FY04 low river test
4 fishery, which is the sonar project run by NVE. Then the
5 FY03 eulachon harvest monitoring project. Then also FY04
6 there's a TEK of salmon runs in the Upper Copper River
7 project that I'm a co-investigator on that with Bill
8 Simeone from ADF&G.

9
10 So those are things I've been doing in
11 the last five months. Projecting into the future for the
12 next six months until we meet again, I will assist in
13 hiring fisheries technicians for the upcoming field
14 season. That's a direct objective that's outlined within
15 the cooperative agreement. Assisting the new biologist
16 in the completion of the successful field season. Hiring
17 a social scientist intern. Completing the Fish and
18 Wildlife Service funded feasibility study on developing a
19 eulachon oil rendering pit and an interpretive site along
20 the Copper River Highway. Assisting tribes and rural
21 residents in developing subsistence fisheries regulatory
22 proposals since that deadline is quickly coming up. Then
23 also participating in the Multi-Agency Technical Review
24 Committee. I've been appointed again this year as the
25 partner position to be on that and that also is a direct
26 objective of the cooperative agreement.

27
28 With that, that's all. Thank you, Mr.
29 Chair and Council, for supporting this position.

30
31 If there's any questions, I'd be happy to
32 answer.

33
34 MS. STICKWAN: Are you supposed to be
35 working with tribes in the Copper River area?

36
37 MS. McCALL: Not just within the Copper
38 River area, but all of Southcentral.

39
40 MS. STICKWAN: Because there's projects
41 in danger of being taken away. I was wondering if you
42 could work with somebody from CRNA to get those projects
43 going.

44
45 MS. McCALL: Yes, that's exactly why this
46 position is here.

47
48 MS. STICKWAN: I think you need to talk
49 to somebody at CRNA maybe.

50

00289

1 MS. McCALL: What would be your
2 suggestion and the best route?

3

4 MS. STICKWAN: Talk to Tonilee Jackson
5 and Linda Tyone because I think something could be worked
6 out between AHTNA and CRNA to do the mapping project.
7 Somebody needs to work with them to get that project
8 going before they lose the money.

9

10 MS. McCALL: I will do that. Thanks for
11 the heads up.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: James.

14

15 MR. SHOWALTER: Yes, back to working with
16 tribes in Southcentral, what is this project on working
17 with tribes and what tribes have you contacted?

18

19 MS. McCALL: When I commenced employment,
20 all of the tribes within Southcentral were notified of my
21 position. They all were given the nine objectives that I
22 have outlined within the cooperative agreement. One of
23 the biggest challenges I've had with my position is
24 actually getting the knowledge out there and people
25 wanting to come and ask for help. As Gloria mentioned,
26 that's why this position is here, to lend technical and
27 professional support to keep those projects going. So if
28 tribes or rural residents or rural organizations have an
29 idea that they want developed, I can assist in doing that
30 in a great variety of ways.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think what you're
33 saying, Erica, is if they've got a project that they need
34 help with, they can come to you and you'll do your best
35 to help them in any way you can.

36

37 MS. McCALL: Exactly.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: How do they contact you,
40 Erica?

41

42 MS. McCALL: Since I'm working with
43 Native Village of Eyak, you can call there in Cordova. I
44 also have e-mail, which I suppose I can give out. It's
45 just my first name, erica@nveyak.org.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So if they come up with
48 a project as a village or community that they feel you
49 could give them a hand with, even if they don't know if
50 you could give them a hand with, they could get in

00290

1 contact with you and you could tell them whether you can
2 help them or not.

3

4 MS. McCALL: Right. Or the other thing
5 that I like with this position too is if I don't know or
6 I can't help, I will help the best that I can to get them
7 in contact with the person or group that can help them
8 out.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
11 Erica.

12

13 (No comments)

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

16

17 MS. McCALL: Thanks.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we take a break or do
20 we go straight into agency organization reports?

21

22 MR. CHURCHILL: What do you want to do?

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I want to finish by
25 5:00.

26

27 MR. CHURCHILL: Then you answered your
28 own question.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Alaska Department of
31 Fish and Game. Do we have a report?

32

33 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, Sherry Wright
34 and Tom Taube have short reports to present to you and
35 I'm not sure if anyone else does, but they're certainly
36 free to come up if they do.

37

38 MS. WRIGHT: Mr. Chair. My name is
39 Sherry Wright. I'm with the Department of Fish and Game
40 with the board support. First of all, I wanted to thank
41 you for continuing the opportunity for the local Fish and
42 Game Advisory Committees to participate in the RAC
43 process. I think maybe the Board of Game meeting just
44 finishing up is why we don't have much participation here
45 today, but I am happy to see there are three current
46 Advisory Committee members serving on this RAC and that
47 would be Doug Blossom from Central Peninsula, Bob
48 Churchill from Anchorage and Tom Carpenter from Copper
49 River/Prince William Sound. Also Fred Elvsaas was a
50 former Seldovia Advisory Committee. I just wanted to

00291

1 share that because it's kind of exciting to see that
2 there is a coordinated effort there and we appreciate
3 that continued coordination.

4

5 Along that line I provided a tentative
6 Board of Game and Board of Fisheries schedule for your
7 use when you get to that point in your schedule that you
8 look at RAC meetings coming up. My hope is that it will
9 help maximize potential participation of Advisory
10 Committees. The more we can coordinate our schedules,
11 the better for everybody. Thanks again for your
12 continued support.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Is that all?

15

16 (No comments)

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Boy, that is short.

19

20 MR. ELVSAAS: Good report.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You just watch Tom. His
23 will be shorter yet. He'll say I handed you three pieces
24 of paper. Read them.

25

26 MR. TAUBE: We could go that route, Mr.
27 Chairman. My name is Tom Taube. I'm the area biologist
28 of the Sportfish Division in Glennallen and I'm
29 responsible for the Upper Copper River State subsistence
30 and personal use fisheries.

31

32 As the Chairman stated, you received two
33 handouts. One covers the summary of the harvest for 2003
34 and historic harvest in the Glennallen/Chitina
35 subdistricts. The 2003 data is preliminary, but it
36 should be pretty close to what we could finalize. As you
37 can see with the Glennallen subdistrict on Page 2, the
38 harvest was down this year, but what's not included in
39 these harvest assessments are the Federal subsistence
40 harvests and Eric Veatch will be reporting later with the
41 Park Service their harvest. For the Glennallen
42 subdistrict, it was approximately around 20,000. So
43 actually the harvest this year was close to the recent
44 five-year average.

45

46 One thing, the king harvest was down.
47 Again, why that occurred probably has a lot to do with
48 water level this year. We had some fluctuations. The
49 king return was more normal. There wasn't a lot of late
50 returns which we had in the past three years where the

00292

1 sockeye return was normal also this year, so people
2 weren't fishing for sockeye and catching a lot of kings.
3

4 On Page 3, the Chitina subdistrict.
5 Here, again, this doesn't include the Federal harvest,
6 but it's pretty minimal in the Chitina subdistrict.
7 There isn't a whole lot of participation in there. This
8 year's harvest was down again and again. That has
9 something to do with the water level. A lot of
10 fluctuations in the past two years. High water reduces
11 the efficiency of the dipnetters. Word gets out that
12 fishing isn't good, people don't come, the fish show up a
13 week later when they're not there, so I think that
14 influences our harvest.

15
16 Since the Board action in 1999 when the
17 bag limit was reduced from four to one, you can see since
18 2000 the king harvest has essentially been cut in half.
19 This year I expect it may raise a little bit, but this
20 year was the lowest since the late '80s.

21
22 The final page just has a percentage of
23 permits issued by area. As you can see, the Glennallen
24 subdistrict percentage has dropped down significantly
25 since 1990 when the McDowell decision allowed all Alaska
26 residents to participate in that fishery. It's even
27 dropped down more the last two years when the Federal
28 permits have become available. There's still about half
29 of the local residents that would qualify for Federal
30 permits getting the State permit. There are about 400
31 households that could get Federal permits. About 200 of
32 those still get the State permit.

33
34 The Chitina subdistrict, the local users
35 have always been pretty small. It would be pretty hard
36 to decline from one percent to a half percent, so that's
37 pretty much stayed the same.

38
39 The second handout was provided to me by
40 the Division of Commercial Fisheries. It just lists the
41 forecast estimates for this year for Prince William
42 Sound, Copper River and Cook Inlet. This shows the
43 harvest forecast, so I won't really repeat what's there.
44 I'll just say the totals. For pink salmon in Prince
45 William Sound, the actual total is 4.62 million. If
46 that's realized, that would be the 11th largest return in
47 the last 40 years. For chum salmon, it's about 200,000
48 more at 568,000 and that would be the 17th largest since
49 1970. For Coghill Lake, the total return is estimated at
50 398,000. Eshamy Lake, 98,000. For Copper River, the

00293

1 total return is at 1.53 million. If that's realized,
2 that would be the 17th largest since 1978. For Upper
3 Cook Inlet, 5.2 million is the total return estimate.
4 For Lower Cook Inlet is right around 4 million.

5
6 You can see the hatchery returns there,
7 so I won't repeat that. With that, I'll take any
8 questions.

9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom, I must have been
11 missing something, but the numbers I was looking at on
12 this piece of paper weren't matching the numbers that you
13 said on the commercial one.

14
15 MR. TAUBE: These are the harvest
16 estimates that are on there. I was giving you the total
17 run estimates, so that's why those numbers were greater.
18 I didn't want to just repeat what was on the paper. I
19 wanted to give you a little additional information.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I have one other
22 question. With the drop in the last couple years in the
23 Chitina subdistrict, could some of that be attributed to
24 the fact that that road is out of commission?

25
26 MR. TAUBE: I think that's probably
27 responsible for about 99 percent of that decline. That
28 in addition to the fluctuating water levels we've had in
29 the last couple years. We had the fee increase to \$25
30 there about four years ago. This year there will be no
31 fee. With that, we have found out the legislature is
32 putting in some money to either DOT, DNR, Fish and Game,
33 to cover the cost of the services a portion of that fee
34 covered. So there will be outhouses and dumpsters down
35 there this year.

36
37 But, yeah, I think primarily it's that
38 road closure. The last estimate I heard was \$4 million
39 to fix it. With the State's budget, it's unlikely it
40 will get fixed this year.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any other
43 questions.

44
45 (No comments)

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

48
49 MR. TAUBE: You're sure welcome.

50

00294

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Forest Service.

2

3

4 MR. ZEMKE: Mr. Chair, Council Members.
5 My name is Steve Zemke. I'm a subsistence coordinator on
6 the Chugach National Forest. Also in the audience with
7 me are Ken Holbrook, who is the subsistence program
8 manager for the Chugach National Forest and then Milo
9 Burcham, who is wildlife biologist on the Cordova Ranger
10 District.

11

12 I'm going to give you a brief
13 presentation on the wildlife regulation programs that
14 affect the forest. If you have any questions during or
15 after, I'm sure Ken or Milo would be happy to answer
16 those.

17

18 Since there are some new Council members,
19 I'd like to maybe give you a quick overview about Chugach
20 National Forest and I've included in your package kind of
21 two different written packages. One is our traditional
22 schedule of proposed actions, kind of what's going on in
23 the forest, and the second is a brief report on wildlife
24 activities related to subsistence harvest on the Chugach.
25 Also on the back I clipped a map of the Chugach National
26 Forest.

27

28 Basically the Chugach is organized with
29 the supervisor's office here in Anchorage and then the
30 three ranger districts, one in Cordova, there's a Glacier
31 Ranger District in Girdwood and then the Seward Ranger
32 District in Seward. The forest basically encompasses the
33 Copper River Delta, Prince William Sound and kind of
34 northeastern side of the Kenai Peninsula if you're not
35 familiar with that.

36

37 So each one of the ranger districts are
38 involved with resource management projects on the forest
39 and that's what's included in what's called the schedule
40 of proposed actions. I probably won't go into much
41 detail now since I gave you kind of a fairly extensive
42 overview of what was going on last time. Basically it's
43 divided by ranger districts and it includes the project
44 title of the potential project and where it's located,
45 kind of a description of it, kind of where it's in the
46 process. We call it scoping, which is kind of public
47 comments period. And then kind of a decision date and
48 then also is included in the contact.

49

50 So rather than try to go through each one
of those, if you find out later on there's a project

00295

1 you're interested in, the contact person here would be
2 the person you'd probably want to go to to be able to get
3 information. If not, then you can give us a call at the
4 supervisor's office and we could provide more detail on
5 that.

6

7 The other one is our Chugach National
8 Forest kind of wildlife review. I'll make it brief.
9 We're running out of time. Basically we've got kind of
10 two major programs that the Council has dealt with,
11 regulatory proposals that have been enacted once for
12 moose primarily out in Copper River Delta and then also
13 moose in Kings Bay in western Prince William Sound and
14 then also the goat populations in western and central
15 Prince William Sound.

16

17 First, on the Copper River Delta moose
18 permit system that you went through and deliberated,
19 basically the recommendation was kind of 15 bulls and
20 then five cows that would be administered by the Federal
21 program. Actually, it's on a random drawing system and
22 there were 724 permit applications of those 20
23 successful. Basically that is a three percent success
24 rate. Every one of those permits were filled. Generally
25 they're filled before the October 31st, but this year I
26 think the season was extended a little bit and there was
27 one permit that wasn't filled until after the first of
28 November, which was kind of late in the season, but the
29 Council provided some more opportunities for people to
30 hunt out there.

31

32 One of the things that Milo had reported
33 to was that last year the Council and then the Board
34 passed the disabled hunter designated hunter permit and
35 one of the permittees did fall into the temporary
36 disabled category and did designate a designated hunter
37 and they were successful, so that program worked very
38 well out on the Copper River Delta this year.

39

40 In addition, there's been the annual
41 sobriety ceremonial potlatch permit issued to the Native
42 Village of Eyak for one bull and that was also allocated
43 this year and it was also filled.

44

45 The Kings Bay moose hunt is kind of a
46 unique one. It's a small, isolated herd out in Prince
47 William Sound. The numbers have ranged anywhere from
48 nine to 20. The permit available has been one permit
49 each to the Native Villages of Chenega and Tatitlek and
50 that's been going on since 1997, although there was one

00296

1 year when the survey numbers were so low that it was
2 closed by emergency order. It was reopened after the 60-
3 day period. But during that whole period of time there's
4 never been any of the moose harvested. Part of it might
5 be difficulty of being able to get up there and get at
6 the moose. The other one is it's a spike for 50, so when
7 there's only that many animals the chances might not be
8 available. Anecdotally, Tatitlek has made an effort to
9 go up and hunt in the area, but they haven't been
10 successful. I think Chenega has indicated they haven't
11 had the need to try and harvest and catch their moose.

12

13 So that's kind of a short brief on the
14 moose. Prince William Sound goat harvest is managed by
15 registration permit within that area. It's divided
16 between the State and the Federal system. The Federal
17 system has 17 goats established in the six registered
18 goat units. This year there was four subsistence goat
19 permits issued to Federal permit holders, but there was
20 no goats reported harvested. I think last year was one
21 and the year before was zero. The goat populations in
22 the area seem to be fairly stable. They were stable
23 through about 1995 and then they increased through about
24 the year 2000 and gradually declined but not
25 significantly.

26

27 Also the Cordova Ranger District conducts
28 periodic deer pellet group surveys and the surveys in the
29 area provide information that the population is
30 relatively stable. So people don't seem to be having
31 problems getting their deer.

32

33 With that, that's basically all I've got.
34 Though I would like to inform you that Ken Holbrook, who
35 has been kind of a stalwart on not only the Chugach
36 Subsistence Program but the Exxon Valdez Program and the
37 fisheries management from the Cordova Ranger District
38 from the old days, is retiring within the month and I'd
39 like to acknowledge his efforts and dedication to the
40 programs over the years.

41

42 With that, if you have any questions,
43 please ask Milo and Ken and I'm sure they'd be willing to
44 answer your questions.

45

46 Thank you.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

49

50 MR. CHURCHILL: What was the temporary

00297

1 disability that the permit was issued for?

2

3 MR. ZAMKE: I didn't understand your
4 question.

5

6 MR. CHURCHILL: I see Milo approaching
7 stealthily.

8

9 MR. BURCHAM: Milo Burcham, subsistence
10 biologist for the Cordova Ranger District. Actually,
11 that was a permanent disability. There was a guy in a
12 wheelchair who drew a permit this year. The system
13 worked perfectly and I think the designated permits came
14 at a good time. He designated his son, a 13-year-old
15 boy, to harvest his moose.

16

17 MR. CHURCHILL: Neat deal. Thank you.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Office of
24 Subsistence Management. Bill.

25

26 MR. KNAUER: Bill Knauer, Office of
27 Subsistence Management.

28

29 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a couple
30 of personnel changes that some of the Members might not
31 be aware of. Of course, you all know that Peggy Fox
32 retired, the deputy assistant regional director, and Pete
33 Probasco is in that position now. So the fisheries
34 liaison to the Department of Fish and Game is vacant and
35 is being advertised. Helga Eakon, of course, retired at
36 the end of December. Larry Buklis, who most of you know
37 having been your fishery biologist on the team, was
38 appointed to replace her, so that position has also been
39 advertised.

40

41 There are certain briefing topics, A
42 through D, that you can find the information sheets back
43 under Tab D. I'm not going to go into those unless there
44 are specific questions.

45

46 I think you've probably all been provided
47 a copy of the letters relating to the governor's request
48 for a non-voting member on the Federal Subsistence Board.
49 The Board evaluated that, provided a recommendation to
50 the Secretary of the Interior, she accepted the Board's

00298

1 recommendation and sent a letter to the governor
2 indicating that she is willing to appoint a liaison
3 member on the Board that would be consistent with the
4 decision that was signed back in April of 1992 when the
5 program was early in its infancy, then that member would
6 sit with the Board but not be part of the actual
7 deliberations other than being recognized by the Chair.
8 They'd be able to question individuals that testify.
9 They would not normally participate in executive sessions
10 unless specifically invited. That's the same situation
11 that exists for the chairs.

12

13 Then the last topic relates to the Safari
14 Club litigation. That litigation challenged a number of
15 things specifically related to the Regional Councils. It
16 challenged a number of decisions that the Councils had
17 made over the years, it challenged the process and it
18 challenged the membership on the Councils.

19

20 The court primarily rejected most of the
21 allegations that were advanced. One thing that had
22 concerned some Council members that we want to assure
23 them of is that you are all validly and legally appointed
24 members. The ruling looks forward rather than backwards.
25 The appointments will not be rescinded. The process for
26 requesting and reviewing applicants will proceed as
27 planned this year. The only thing is the court said that
28 before the Secretary can use a 70/30 percent
29 representational goal, she must go through a rule-making.
30 That's not to say that she can't use the issue of
31 representation to achieve a fair and balanced membership
32 council, but she does need to go through rule-making.

33

34 We're proceeding with that right now.
35 The proposed rule is currently in Washington. It went to
36 the director's office for surname today and will be going
37 through the various assistant
38 secretaries for their surname prior to signature and
39 publishing in the Federal Register. We anticipate it
40 will be published sometime in April. The Board will be
41 receiving public comments on it for a 45-day period and
42 will take comments at the May meeting.

43

44 Normally, a situation like this, we would
45 come out specifically to the Regional Councils; however,
46 the court admonished us to move expeditiously on this, so
47 based on the fact that the timing is not conducive to
48 having an additional Council meeting, the budget is not
49 conducive to having an additional Council meeting
50 specifically for that, we are providing the opportunity

00299

1 of all the Councils to provide any comments at their
2 Council meetings during this time frame. Some have
3 indicated they have comments, others have not.

4

5 The proposed language merely indicates
6 that it will be a goal to provide a representational
7 ratio of 30 percent sport and commercial users and 70
8 percent subsistence users. It is not a hard and fast
9 statement of fact because we know that in many regions
10 there just aren't many commercial or sport users. Others
11 there are. Plus, in some regions, many of the folks
12 affected are the sport and commercial users. We also
13 know that many of the individuals could actually sit and
14 represent all those groups. They hold commercial
15 licenses, they may be involved in sport activities and
16 also are subsistence users themselves or their families.

17

18 That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

21

22 MR. CHURCHILL: Bill, you may or may not
23 be the right person to ask this. The whole issue of the
24 RACs generating correspondence, could you flesh that out
25 a little bit for me.

26

27 MR. KNAUER: A concern was raised over
28 some correspondence that was generated by one of the
29 Regional Councils and in light of that an examination was
30 requested of the procedures that OSM has. As a result,
31 we now have a FACA coordinator, your old Council
32 coordinator, Ann Wilkinson, is in that position, has been
33 working on that to develop a written policy on
34 correspondence in general. During your training session,
35 she indicated what correspondence could go out directly
36 from the Councils and the other correspondence. It's not
37 that it will be prohibited, but it will just need to go
38 through the Office of Subsistence Management for
39 consistency and administrative record keeping.

40

41 MR. CHURCHILL: Not being in that
42 training session, generally what is permitted? I can
43 look it up, but I'll tell you this rubs a little raw.
44 I'm not terribly happy with this. It just doesn't smack
45 well at all with me, so I'm most unhappy and I'll contact
46 Ann and Donald will give me the material at a later
47 point. I just wanted to put that on the record. It
48 seems to fly in the face of what we're all about.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for

00300

1 Bill. Bill, on your list of things you had right there
2 there was Council topics for the May 2004 Board meeting.
3 There's no action that we need to take on that, is there?

4

5 MR. KNAUER: I think that would be
6 addressed to your Council coordinator.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Donald.

9

10 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

11

12 To address Mr. Churchill's concern about
13 correspondence, this Council can write correspondence
14 directly to the Board or make appointments to the SRC's.
15 Getting back to the Council topics for discussion for May
16 2004, the Board will be meeting in May 18 and 20th, 2004
17 primarily to consider wildlife regulatory proposals. The
18 Board is asking this Council to consider at this meeting
19 topics they would like to bring forward for discussion.
20 In the past, Mr. Chair, the Council chairs were able to
21 meet as a group and bring their concerns forward to the
22 Board and this will bring back that process. This is an
23 opportunity to keep the lines of communication open
24 between the Councils and the Board in the best interest
25 of the subsistence users. So if this Council has any
26 topics to bring forward to the May meeting, now is the
27 time to do it.

28

29 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So if the Council has
32 any topics for the May meeting that they as individual
33 Council members would like to present or would they
34 present them to me and then I would take them to the
35 Board?

36

37 MR. MIKE: We can develop the topics here
38 at this Council meeting and then you can take it forward
39 to the Board.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Are there any particular
42 topics that this Council would like to bring to the
43 attention of the Board. This is your opportunity as
44 Council Members to put topics on the table. They have to
45 be within the parameters that Donald is talking about.

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none, I guess
50 we'll just have to go on. Was there anything else up

00301

1 here, Bill, that we needed to take action on? We have
2 everything else as papers in our packet to just read for
3 informational purposes, such as the rural determination
4 methodology. There's no action that needs to be taken on
5 that, is there?

6

7 MR. KNAUER: There's no action. The only
8 thing is if you wish to provide comments as a board on
9 the 70/30 policy, you could do so. You can also, during
10 the comment period, provide comments as individuals.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Uh-huh. Don.

13

14 MR. MIKE: This is also an opportunity to
15 provide further comments on the draft predator management
16 policy on Page 180 and provide any comments to the
17 coordinator prior to April 1st.

18

19 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think we've made just
22 about all the comments on that that we can make other
23 than just repeating ourselves unless other members of
24 this Council feel strongly that there's something they
25 would like to comment on. We've been pretty adamant
26 about the fact that -- I don't like to say it doesn't say
27 anything, but it doesn't change anything is the way I'll
28 put it. We recognize the political realities behind it.
29 Terry.

30

31 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, just for your
32 information, I know that at least one other Council is
33 revisiting developing some additional comments on the
34 policy and I think was probably going to be in contact
35 with some other Councils. I know the Yukon/Kuskokwim
36 Delta Council crafted some language regarding the draft
37 policy. I don't know if the intention was to share that
38 with all other Councils or submit that on its own.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

41

42 MR. CHURCHILL: Through the Chair. At a
43 previous meeting I was asked to put some language
44 together and I've done that and I've been discussing with
45 Donald and I've given the Chair an opportunity to read
46 some of that. I can make sure that's handed out to the
47 RAC members. We can look at that and see if it might
48 form the body of some comments we could put in writing.
49 They're on the approved writing list, so I think we could
50 probably do that.

00302

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob, I think that would
2 be a good idea if you could have copies made for
3 everybody in the RAC and then if anybody has any
4 comments, could they get back to you on it and we could
5 go from there. I don't know if we need to take action on
6 it as a RAC. We could authorize our secretary to forward
7 those comments.

8

9 MR. CHURCHILL: I have a limited number
10 of copies with me for folks that don't have e-mail. The
11 rest of them I can e-mail as a Word document, so I could
12 do that.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Would a motion be in
15 order from the rest of the Council to authorize Bob, by
16 consulting with us, to come up with a letter to submit on
17 the predator management policy for the Council? You've
18 all got a copy of the draft predator management policy in
19 your book. He will send you what he's got for the new
20 information and then using the two together maybe you can
21 make some suggestions to him if you feel there's a need
22 to change what he's doing. That way we could submit at
23 least a response back to it. I don't know if we have the
24 ability at this point in time to sit down and go over
25 that and craft that kind of language, but I do know that
26 Bob is good at crafting language to say what we like to
27 say. So if we'd be willing to do that as a Council,
28 maybe a motion would be in order to authorize him to do
29 it.

30

31 MS. STICKWAN: I'd like to hear what
32 Eastern wrote.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I don't know if Eastern
35 has written anything yet.

36

37 MR. CHURCHILL: If it's of any help, I
38 talked to some folks out of the Bethel area that they're
39 working on some language as well. They contacted me. Do
40 we have a motion?

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have a motion?

43

44 MS. WELLS: Yes.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have a second?

47

48 MR. BLOSSOM: Second.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and

00303

1 seconded to authorize Mr. Churchill to craft some
2 language to present a policy on the predator management
3 policy to the Federal Subsistence Board. Any discussion.

4

5 MR. CARPENTER: Question.

6

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

9

10 IN UNISON: Aye.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
13 saying nay.

14

15 (No opposing comments)

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Anything
18 else that you can think of, Bill?

19

20 MR. KNAUER: That's all I have, Mr.

21 Chairman.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you muchly.

24 National Park Service.

25

26 MS. CELLARIUS: Mr. Chair, Members of the
27 Council, I'm Barbara Cellarius, subsistence coordinator
28 for Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve. I
29 have just a couple brief items and I believe Eric and
30 Mason also have brief items.

31

32 In January, Wrangell-St. Elias presented
33 Katie John with the Park's Andy Taylor Community Service
34 Award. This was for her work in protecting subsistence
35 rights and in teaching language and traditions to local
36 children.

37

38 As I mentioned earlier, we had our SRC
39 meeting in Slana and it was very well attended. There
40 was a lot of public participation. We were very pleased
41 with the amount of participation we had. As Wilson
42 indicated, we continued to work on our government-to-
43 government relationships with Native villages associated
44 with the park. We recently signed an agreement with
45 Yakutat and I would like to assure Gloria that we worked
46 together with the Chisana Tribal Council on the
47 elder/grandchild sheep hunt idea that we were talking
48 about earlier today.

49

50 With that, I will let Eric and Mason come

00304

1 up unless you have any questions for me.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Barbara. I
4 expect the next time we have game proposals before us
5 we'll have a proposal that will address the actual issue
6 that was before us.

7

8 MS. CELLARIUS: That's the plan.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Eric.

11

12 MR. VEATCH: Mr. Chairman, Regional
13 Council, my name is Eric Veatch. I'm a fisheries
14 biologist for Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and
15 Preserve in Copper Center. I'll be as brief as possible
16 today. Tom gave you a great summary of the harvest in
17 both the Glennallen and Chitina subdistricts earlier.
18 I'll just mention, for those of you that are new to the
19 Council, we have both Federal and State fisheries that
20 occur in the same waters during the same time. These
21 fisheries occur concurrently, so we also issue Federal
22 subsistence permits for both the Chitina and the
23 Glennallen subdistrict. This is relatively new. We
24 started issuing permits for both of these fisheries in
25 2002, so 2003 was the second year that we've issued
26 Federal permits for those fisheries.

27

28 Last summer for the Glennallen
29 subdistrict we issued 221 permits. That's about half of
30 the Federally-qualified households for that subdistrict.
31 That's up just a little bit from 2002. The Federal users
32 did do substantially better for harvest in 2003 than
33 2002. As Tom mentioned, they harvested about 17,500
34 salmon in the Glennallen subdistrict. For the Chitina
35 subdistrict, we issued 100 permits and it looks like
36 about 982 salmon were harvested.

37

38 The one other thing I want to mention is
39 in 2001 the Federal Board found C&T use for freshwater
40 fish in the Copper River drainage upstream of Haley Creek
41 for Federally-qualified users. We've had the ability to
42 issue permits for freshwater fish species such as burbot
43 since that time, but this winter was actually the first
44 time that we've had a request for burbot permits to
45 folks along the McCarthy Road and one burbot permit to a
46 household in Slana.

47

48 What these permits authorized was both
49 the use of set lines and fyke nets or essentially sort of
50 a hoop trap or kind of a cod pod for the take of burbot.

00305

1 Actually, I found out shortly after I issued these
2 permits that while set lines are recognized gear by the
3 Federal Board and they are legal within National Park
4 Service waters, the Federal subsistence regulations don't
5 supersede National Park Service regulations and they
6 require that when you fish within a National Park the
7 line must be closely attended. So you can set set lines
8 in a National Park, you just must closely attend them,
9 which for most folks defeats the purpose.

10

11 The other thing I want to mention to you
12 are just a few of the projects we have on line for this
13 summer. We'll be operating weirs in Tanada Creek again
14 and then we're working with the Collins family to
15 cooperatively operate a weir and also the Copper River
16 Watershed Project at Long Lake. This is a weir that's
17 been in operation since about 1975 and we're just working
18 with the Collins family to continue the operation of that
19 weir. So we're excited about both of those projects.

20

21 We'll also be working with the State this
22 spring to monitor the burbot in Long Lake and that's
23 really in response to the increased interest now in
24 Federal subsistence permits. We'd like to get a handle
25 on that population out there and hopefully develop a
26 population estimate over the next three years.

27

28 We'll also be assisting the State a
29 little bit with their chinook salmon genetics project
30 that the Federal Board has funded in the Copper River
31 this summer as well. So we'll have a busy plan at work
32 and that's really all I have for you, but I'd be happy to
33 answer any questions.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Eric.

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Eric. I have
40 one. Have you got some kind of project in line on how to
41 monitor the burbot population?

42

43 MR. VEATCH: We do. Actually, we'll use
44 hoop traps and it's real similar to some work that's
45 ongoing with the Department of Fish and Game already in
46 the Copper Basin. We'll set a fair amount of hoop traps
47 in Long Lake and what that will give us this year is a
48 catch-per-unit effort estimate, but we'll also mark those
49 fish. So we'll go back and we'll catch them in the years
50 to come and that should give us sort of both a survival

00306

1 and population estimate in the future.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. With that,
4 do we have another Park Service.

5

6 MR. TWITCHELL: Chair, Council Members,
7 Hollis Twitchell from Denali. I'll just talk about a few
8 things specific to Denali and the SRC. Right now two
9 members are appointed to the Denali Commission from the
10 Southcentral Council and they're both in good standing,
11 so you won't deal with another reappointment for I think
12 another year.

13

14 There are two hunting proposals that were
15 addressed this year. Before I go into them, I don't know
16 whether all the new members or not are familiar with what
17 the Subsistence Resource Commission hunting proposals
18 are. The commissions were established by ANILCA to give
19 recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior, the
20 Governor and the NPS regarding subsistence hunting on
21 parks and monuments. They do that through formal hunting
22 plan recommendations. When those commissions formalize
23 formal hunting plan recommendations, they need to go out
24 for consultation to advisor groups, both Regional
25 Advisory Councils, local Fish and Game Advisory
26 Committees, the State of Alaska, the public at large.

27

28 One of the proposals that I will talk to
29 you about is one that came out a couple years ago
30 requesting a three-year duration of residency for
31 Cantwell, one of the subsistence resident zoned
32 communities for Denali, and that was raised by the
33 Commission, by the representatives from Cantwell, trying
34 to address some conflicts they had between newer users to
35 the area and older traditional subsistence users. It
36 mirrored in many ways the proposal from Wrangell-St.Elias
37 asking for a one-year durational residency for their
38 resident zone.

39

40 This fall, the Secretary responded by a
41 letter through their regional director of Alaska
42 acknowledging that they had reviewed those proposals,
43 both Wrangell and Denali, and had come to the decision
44 that the durational residency aspect for eligibility
45 wasn't consistent with ANILCA. Subsequently, that
46 resulted in a formal denial of those hunting plan
47 recommendations. That was consistent with a similar
48 request from Gates of the Arctic in 1988 asking for
49 durational residency for that particular unit, so there
50 is some consistency in terms of that response.

00307

1 It's a bit controversial to us, so I
2 won't go into that. If you want to talk to me off the
3 record later, I'd be happy to. But that's the formal
4 response back to the SRC's. As a result, the Denali
5 Commission is not sure what they're going to do at this
6 point. They still have some conflicts that they receive
7 in the community and they're going to have to give a
8 little more thought as to how to proceed on this now. I
9 think no one was comfortable with deleting the resident
10 zone and going to an individual permit system, nor were
11 they comfortable with or the situation didn't merit 804,
12 which was recommended by the State of Alaska to try to
13 deal with conflicts of resources amongst users. So
14 they're going to step back for a little bit and take
15 another look.

16

17 The second hunting plan proposal that
18 came around to you for advice at your last meeting was
19 one dealing with predator/prey studies and research and
20 the issue raised there by the Council was since national
21 parks and monuments have a standard of natural and
22 healthy that we're mandated to manage to, they were
23 asking for some clarity from the agency of just what does
24 that mean in terms of opportunities for subsistence take
25 or not. One of the focuses was that there is an
26 extensive body of research on predator/prey for wolf and
27 caribou in Denali and they thought this might be a real
28 useful opportunity to look at that particular
29 relationship and see what that means in terms of what's
30 natural and healthy and in terms of opportunity.

31

32 We heard back from the three Advisory
33 Councils for Denali Eastern, Western, Southcentral in the
34 affirmative of that hunting plan proposal. We have not
35 heard back from the State of Alaska, nor our two adjacent
36 Fish and Game Advisory Committees. It was on the agenda
37 for one Fish and Game Advisory Committee, but they didn't
38 take it up in their last meeting, so I don't know there.
39 So we're probably going to go back and open it up for
40 additional comments so we can hear from those other
41 entities. So, as a result, the Commission did not take
42 any final action on that hunting plan recommendation, the
43 predator/prey relationship study.

44

45 In the interim, the NPS Denali had put
46 together a proposal to do just that through our own
47 internal funding mechanisms asking for looking at the
48 Mentasta Caribou Herd and the Denali Caribou Herd in
49 terms of predator/prey relationships. There are some
50 similarities between those two populations. Through a

00308

1 workshop conference to bring together biologist, managers
2 and other informed people to try to put some hands around
3 this issue. That was not funded in this year's cycle. It
4 continues to be the number one proposal that Denali
5 National Park is advancing to this funding source. So
6 we're hopeful that in the future we'll be able to get to
7 this issue a little further.

8

9 I know I'm taking up a lot of time, so
10 I'll bring it to a close. Gilbert didn't put any
11 parameters on me at this meeting, so I'm taking a little
12 more discretion than I normally am given. I'll just say
13 that we finally got an effort in terms of monitoring or
14 doing some trend area survey for moose down in Unit 13 in
15 Broad Pass. It didn't encompass the whole area, but it
16 encompassed the areas from the railroad, westward,
17 encompassing the west fork of the Chulitna, the Bull
18 River, the Cantwell River and the Windy River. In
19 essence, it's not a census, it's simply a trend count.
20 It was quite astonishing to us. We didn't expect these
21 numbers at all.

22

23 The survey was done fairly late in
24 December 11th through the 13th, so it was getting towards
25 the end of when we'd like to be doing this. An estimated
26 273 moose plus or minus 76, a 90 percent confidence
27 interval regarding an area of about 368 square miles,
28 came out with a density of .74 moose per square mile.
29 Observed moose was 16 percent calves, 23 percent bulls
30 and 61 percent cows. Of the cows, 74 percent had no
31 calves, 25 percent had one calf and one percent had two
32 calves. We did not expect that. We expected to see much
33 less. I think what may be going on here, it's fairly
34 late in the year. Snow certainly was affecting the lower
35 part of Broad Pass but not right immediately around
36 Cantwell. Again, temper those numbers with what might be
37 happening there.

38

39 To give some comparison, in 1999, we did
40 a total north side Denali National Park along the Alaska
41 Range, an area of 1,559 square miles and in that area we
42 saw an estimated 857 moose plus or minus 224. The
43 overall density was .54 moose per square mile, 12 percent
44 calves, 53 percent bulls and 35 percent cows in the
45 population. We estimated 73 percent of the cows were
46 without calves, 24 percent of the cows had one calf,
47 three percent of the cows had two calves present.

48

49 So, as you can see, in terms of the
50 numbers, there are certainly a lot more bulls in the

00309

1 northern area and significantly less on the south side
2 and the density of .74 moose per square mile seemed
3 awfully high for me having flown that area quite a bit
4 during the hunting season. I didn't see that kind of
5 numbers in there at that time.

6

7 The last thing I'll mention before I try
8 to answer any questions is that we are expecting to get a
9 report regarding grizzly bear research on the south side
10 of the Alaska Range. It was a joint project between
11 ADF&G and the NPS that was completed in the spring of
12 2003, although the data has not all been analyzed, the
13 preliminary analysis indicates the bear density of about
14 32 bears per thousand square kilometers or 386 square
15 miles. That contrasts with the north side of Denali
16 where bear research had a density of about 27 bears per
17 thousand kilometers.

18

19 With that, I'll close.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

22

23 MR. CHURCHILL: Any thoughts on the new
24 buffer zone that's been established up in your part of
25 the country? I know it's very new.

26

27 MR. TWITCHELL: I don't know if the rest
28 of the Council Members had heard or not. There were four
29 proposals in front of the Board of Game asking to
30 eliminate no hunting, wolfing of trap areas outside of
31 NPS lands, adjacent to it on State lands, which
32 encompassed about 130 square miles of habitat. The NPS's
33 position on this was neutral, which we presented to the
34 Board of Game in Fairbanks. Our position is that the
35 wolf population in Denali is healthy, has been stable
36 since 1999 and approximately 93 to 96 wolves on the north
37 side of the Alaska Range.

38

39 We did have some unusual movements of
40 wolves this year. The Mount Margaret pack, which is the
41 one immediately on the east side of Denali had 12 animals
42 in it all through this fall and winter up until a couple
43 weeks ago. They moved out of the old McKinley Park area
44 to just outside of Healy and were on a moose kill there
45 for a while. A local resident in Healy trapped a couple
46 of the wolves from this pack. The alpha female and a
47 pup. The rest of the wolves moved back a couple days
48 after that and there was eight of them. They were
49 observed back in the old park area again.

50

00310

1 During this same period, a very unusual
2 movement of the Straightaway pack, which is way out off
3 the Foraker Glacier, a pack of 10 wolves crossed four
4 territories, all the way up to the outskirts of Healy in
5 Dry Creek, so we had basically put about 22 wolves right
6 on the back door of Healy. Subsequently, that
7 Straightaway pack has moved back out of the area, back to
8 the west again.

9
10 I guess, in closing, I'll just say over
11 the 18 years of research in Denali we've had over 40 wolf
12 packs on the air and monitored during this period of
13 time. Of that, half or 20 of those packs have
14 disappeared through natural causes. In that same 18-year
15 period, we had four wolf packs that had disappeared as a
16 result of human harvest. So the number of packs going
17 and coming is pretty dynamic in Denali. I think we have
18 like 12 packs monitored and on the air currently on the
19 north side.

20
21 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you. That was very
22 thorough.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Hollis. Any
25 other questions.

26
27 (No comments)

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Okay.
30 Bureau of Land Management. Do we have somebody here from
31 BLM?

32
33 (No comments)

34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I didn't think so.
36 Okay. Council review of draft 2003 annual report. Look
37 in Tab E. Donald.

38
39 MR. MIKE: This Council brought up annual
40 report items at the Talkeetna meeting and this is the
41 result. I've sent e-mails to the Council Members for
42 comments and additional items and I gave hard copies to
43 the rest of the Council Members.

44
45 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Donald. I
48 think we need to take action on this to approve it. A
49 motion is in order.

50

00311

1 MR. CHURCHILL: I move that we approve
2 the letter as drafted for us on Page 187 of our work
3 book.

4
5 MS. WELLS: Second.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
8 seconded. In this we do express some comments on the
9 predator management policy. We say although the policy
10 is moving in the right direction, the Council strongly
11 feels that it is not what the Council was working towards
12 in addressing predator control in Southcentral Region.
13 So we do make it fairly evident that while the policy is
14 there, we recognize there's not much we can do about it.
15 It's not what we'd like.

16
17 MR. CHURCHILL: Call the question.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
20 called. All in favor of submitting our annual report to
21 the Chair signify by saying aye.

22
23 IN UNISON: Aye.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
26 saying nay.

27
28 (No opposing votes)

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. Other
31 business. Does any Council Member have any other
32 business that they'd like to put on the table or put on
33 the agenda for next time? Bob.

34
35 MR. CHURCHILL: Just briefly, and I'm
36 reflecting the other conversations. I'd like to ensure
37 Donald is thanked on the record for all his hard work and
38 all the extra miles he went to to make sure we had what
39 we needed.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, this is probably a
42 pretty complicated meeting with more new people on it and
43 more new things to do.

44
45 So thank you muchly, Donald.

46
47 Tom.

48
49 MR. CARPENTER: Just a quick comment. I
50 don't know if we need to still address the issue that

00312

1 Doug brought up about two Council members for the working
2 group in April.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, we do need to do
5 that. Thank you muchly.

6

7 We need two Council Members that in April
8 would be capable of attending -- describe it again, Doug.
9 Give me the proper name for it. The working group. This
10 is on fisheries. At the time he called me and asked me
11 about it, I wasn't sure whether anybody else would want
12 to do it, so I volunteered Bob and myself and I said that
13 was subject to Bob's approval and that was subject to the
14 rest of your approval. If somebody else would rather
15 attend, I, myself, would be very happy to let somebody
16 else attend.

17

18 You'd like to attend? Okay. This will
19 be in Anchorage, 20th and 22nd. I'll be very happy to
20 have Gloria take my place. Are you willing to go?

21

22 MR. CHURCHILL: Yes.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Is there anybody else
25 that would like the opportunity to work on something like
26 this?

27

28 (No comments)

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Then this will be a
31 workshop for setting goals for what kind of information
32 we want to gather. If that's the case, I'll be happy to
33 let Gloria go and Bob if it's agreeable to the rest of
34 the Council. Is this something that the Chair would
35 appoint? If it is, then I appoint them. If it's
36 something we need to vote on, a motion is in order.
37 Okay, I just appointed them.

38

39 With that, we need to establish a time
40 and a place for our next meeting if there is no other
41 business.

42

43 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, Donald.

46

47 MR. MIKE: The fall 2004 Regional Council
48 meeting window is established in Talkeetna or
49 Kenai/Soldotna.

50

00313

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's the spring meeting
2 we need to establish.

3

4 MR. MIKE: Right.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been a long day.
7 February 21st to March 25th, 2005. Are there any strong
8 feelings, suggestions. Susan.

9

10 MS. WELLS: The window is from the 4th to
11 the 13th, so if we have to schedule three days, midweek
12 of 8th, 9th and 10th might work unless you want to go
13 over a weekend.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That sounds good to me.
16 Tom.

17

18 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman, that is
19 directly in the middle of when the Alaska Board of Game
20 is meeting in Anchorage. Just to bring it up as a
21 possible conflict. I don't know if there is or not.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's a conflict if we
24 want to send a representative to it or if somebody wants
25 to attend it.

26

27 MR. CHURCHILL: Before you get too deep,
28 they should be in deliberation at that point. So I'm not
29 entirely sure we'd be in conflict there.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Terry.

32

33 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, if you'd like
34 representation at your meeting from subsistence and
35 wildlife Staff, I would urge you not to schedule your
36 meeting during the Board of Game meeting.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Very good.
39 Could we do it a week later? That way we would also have
40 the benefit of having their decisions in front of us when
41 we're working on it.

42

43 MR. CHURCHILL: The 15th, 16th and 17th.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So if the 15th, 16th and
46 17th is acceptable to everybody, we'll set that as the
47 Southcentral.

48

49 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair, do you have a
50 location you want to look at?

00314

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: For the spring one, it's
2 pretty hard to beat Anchorage because it's the easiest
3 place for us all to get to in this kind of weather.
4 We'll direct Donald to make sure we have a warm room, but
5 not so warm that I go to sleep.

6
7 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair, I'll start working
8 on a location in Anchorage and we'll find a warmer
9 conference room.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Is that agreeable to
12 everybody on the Council for the spring meeting to have
13 it in Anchorage? Then the fall meeting we have a
14 tendency to try to have it in some outlying place where
15 the hunting is good -- I mean some outlying place.

16
17 Okay. Now we have one other thing we
18 have to do. We have to adjourn.

19
20 MR. CHURCHILL: So moved.

21
22 MR. CARPENTER: Second.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
25 seconded that we adjourn.

26
27 MR. CHURCHILL: Question.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We don't need to call
30 the question on adjournment. We don't need to vote, do
31 we? You make the motion and second it. There's no vote
32 on adjournment.

33
34 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

00315

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

I, Joseph P. Kolasinski, Notary Public in and for the state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 160 through 314 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the SOUTHCENTRAL FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME II, taken electronically by Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC on the 11th day of March 2004, in Anchorage, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by under my direction and reduced to print to the best of our knowledge and ability;

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

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 29th day of March 2004.

Joseph P. Kolasinski
Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 03/12/2008 _