

1 SOUTHCENTRAL FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

3
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5
6 VOLUME II

7
8 Cordova, Alaska
9 March 13, 2008
10 8:30 o'clock a.m.
11

12
13 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

- 14
15 Ralph Lohse, Chairman
16 Doug Blossom
17 Tom Carpenter
18 Greg Encelewski
19 Ricky Gease
20 Robert Henrichs
21 James Showalter
22 Gloria Stickwan
23 Willard Stockwell
24 Tricia Waggoner
25
26
27 Regional Council Coordinator, Donald Mike
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 Recorded and transcribed by:
45
46 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
47 700 W. 2nd Avenue
48 Anchorage, AK 99501
49 907-243-0668
50 jpk@gci.net/sahile@gci.net

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

2
3 (Cordova, Alaska - 3/13/2008)

4
5 (On record)

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'd like to call the
8 spring meeting of the Southcentral Federal Subsistence
9 Regional Advisory Council back into session.

10
11 As we said yesterday, we're going to
12 start this morning with WP08-11, which is the moose
13 hunt in Cordova.

14
15 There are green slips like this on the
16 back table. If you're going to testify, sign up on the
17 green slip and give it to Donald. And we have one
18 testifier who has to be some place who's requested that
19 we allow him to testify first so that he can get out of
20 here And then after that we're going to go into the
21 regular way that we take care of WP08-11.

22
23 But we are going to hopefully -- do you
24 have time to wait for the introduction to the proposal
25 before you testify? So we will start with our
26 introduction of the proposal and the analysis from the
27 State. And so that everybody knows what we're talking
28 about, and if you've got a book, you find this on Page
29 -- it starts on Page 61. If you don't have a book,
30 there's probably copies of it in the back. And we
31 welcome everybody here.

32
33 And with that, we're going to get
34 started.

35
36 MR. BURCHAM: My name is Milo Burcham.
37 I'm a wildlife biologist with the Forest Service here
38 in Cordova, and working with OSM Staff on this
39 analysis. I think Ralph just mentioned it's on Page 62
40 in your book, and this is analysis WP08-11.

41
42 This proposal was submitted by Alaska
43 Department of Fish and Game and it requests the Federal
44 portion of the Unit 6C moose harvest be changed from
45 100 percent of the antlerless moose permits and 70
46 percent of the bull moose permits to 30 antlerless
47 moose. And when fewer than 30 antlerless moose are
48 available in the harvest quota, the difference will be
49 taken from the State bull harvest to maintain a 30
50 moose subsistence quota. This proposal would allocate

1 bull moose and all but 30 antlerless moose permits to
2 State management in Unit 6C.

3

4 When Federal subsistence harvest of
5 moose in 5C began in 2000, all cow permits were moved
6 into the Federal subsistence program. At that time,
7 the total Federal subsistence moose harvest was just
8 five cows, or five antlerless moose.

9

10 The proponent believes that with the
11 moose population at or above the population objective
12 stated in the management plan, with historically high
13 harvest, the number of Federal moose permits in Unit
14 6C, which was 104 this year, is greater than intended
15 when the Federal management of moose began in 2000.
16 Since the population objective is to manage for a
17 stable herd size, they feel that a fixed allocation
18 that meets subsistence needs is preferable to a
19 percentage. And they also suggest that subsistence
20 harvest continue to be taken from Unit 6C as it is the
21 most productive part of the -- most productive portion
22 of Unit 6, and that Federally-qualified subsistence
23 users already take the majority of the harvest from
24 nearby areas in 6A and 6B.

25

26 For a little bit of background, 70
27 percent of Unit 6C are Federal public lands. And to
28 give you a little bit more background of just the
29 setting, the Copper River Highway is the main road
30 access in Unit 6, and this might become important when
31 I talk about some things in a minute. The Copper River
32 Highway is the main road access in Unit 6 -- 6C I
33 should say, and the moose habitat along the Copper
34 Highway runs from roughly 6 mile to the 27-Mile Bridge.
35 So 21 miles of moose habitat along the highway. Some
36 of the non-Federal lands, private, Eyak Corporation,
37 and State lands are along those roads, and therefore
38 closed to Federal subsistence users, and those closed
39 lands run from roughly 10-Mile to 18-Mile. So you have
40 moose from 6 to 27-Mile along the highway, moose
41 habitat. And from 10 to 18-Mile is non-Federal lands
42 that are closed to subsistence hunting. So there's a
43 good sized block of lands that aren't open to the
44 Federal season.

45

46 Some more background, this is an
47 introduced moose population. It was introduced in the
48 1950s. The first moose hunt began in 1960. In 1984
49 the hunt was changed to a draw permit, which is that it
50 is right now. The Federal hunt began in 2000 when

1 those five cows were moved into the Federal subsistence
2 program. And in 2002 there was a proposal to move the
3 bull moose into the Federal subsistence program. The
4 way that it ended up, the compromise, if you want to
5 call it that, was that it eas -- it ended up being 75
6 percent of the bulls would be subsistence, and 25
7 percent were left in the State program, partially based
8 on the land ownership that I mentioned, not just that
9 70 percent is Federal and 30 percent is not Federal,
10 but also because of this land along the road, you know,
11 that is more available to people hunting from personal
12 vehicles.

13

14 So as a result of these changes in Unit
15 6C, hunters currently have the opportunity to harvest
16 moose on Federal public lands under both the State and
17 the Federal system, and on private lands -- and on
18 private and other non-Federal lands under the State
19 season.

20

21 Current cooperative management
22 objectives, the management plan, are to maintain a
23 post-hunting population of 400 moose. Moose numbers in
24 Unit 6C have increased since implementing the plan in
25 the mid 90s and have reached an historic high in the
26 2006/2007 season, and this past year we had our highest
27 harvest ever from the unit, which was a total of 122
28 moose from Unit 6C. And the way that broke out was 50
29 cows, which is all the cows in the harvest were under
30 the Federal subsistence program, 54 bulls were under
31 the subsistence program, and 18 bulls were under the
32 State program for a total of 72 that were harvested --
33 or I should say permits that were available.

34

35 The other interesting aspect of this
36 hunt is it's relatively accessible. It has the road on
37 it, but also it's airboat accessible. And I will say
38 this, is that Cordovans are very good at getting their
39 moose. Because of the relatively easy access in Unit
40 6C, especially by road and airboat, hunter success is
41 nearly 100 percent, and even this year with the high
42 harvest, I was very skeptical that, you know, they
43 would come close, and I don't have the number in front
44 of me, but I'll say the hunt success was close to 90
45 percent or maybe a little higher than that. They came
46 pretty close to getting all the moose that were
47 available.

48

49 This hunt is extremely popular, and I
50 can't stress that enough. Over 900 people applied for

1 the 104 subsistence permits this year, so even with
2 this high population and the high harvest that was
3 available to people this, the demand, the Federal
4 subsistence demand doesn't seem to have been met.

5
6 Currently the demand for moose in unit
7 6C exceeds the number of moose that can be harvested.
8 This proposal would result in fewer moose permits for
9 Federal subsistence users in Cordova.

10
11 In analyzing this, we looked at some
12 other alternatives, some other directions to go with
13 this proposal. One of them would be, you know, to
14 maximize the number of moose for Cordova residents.
15 And I should say that the town of Cordova are the -- is
16 the only town that has the customary and traditional
17 determination to harvest from Unit 6C. It also
18 includes residents of 6A and 6B, but very few people
19 live in those areas.

20
21 One alternative that we considered was
22 moving all the moose into the Federal subsistence
23 program. That would maximize the number of permits
24 that would go to Cordova residents, but it has some
25 disadvantage, and that is what I mentioned about land
26 ownership. There would be a relatively large block of
27 land and a large chunk of the highway where no moose
28 harvest could occur. And I came from a background of
29 doing elk research and moose research in Montana, and I
30 know that elk figure out refuges real fast. I don't
31 want to say moose are slow, but they might catch on to
32 things like that as well. So, anyway, moving all the
33 moose into subsistence would create a closed area where
34 no moose hunting could occur.

35
36 The other alternative that we
37 considered was splitting the antlerless harvest
38 allocation. The antlerless harvest -- currently the
39 bull moose harvest is split 75/25, and all the cows are
40 in the Federal subsistence program. Another
41 alternative would be to extent that 75/25 split to the
42 antlerless harvest so cows could be harvested,
43 antlerless moose could be harvest on some non-Federal
44 lands in that area, and that would make them more
45 accessible to people who are hunting from their -- who
46 don't have access to airboats and have to hunt from
47 their highway vehicles. The disadvantage is that makes
48 slightly fewer permits guaranteed to Federal
49 subsistence users, but it's got, you know, some plus
50 sides, too.

1 So those are the two things that we
2 also just threw out there as possibilities.

3
4 But the preliminary OSM conclusion was
5 to oppose this proposal. And the justification was
6 that the demand for by Federally-qualified subsistence
7 users in Unit 6C greatly surpasses the number of moose
8 available for harvest even with the increased harvest
9 quota these last several years. The proposal would
10 reduce the number of moose available to Federally-
11 qualified users and the fixed allocation of 30 moose as
12 recommended by the proponent does not allow for
13 fluctuations in the moose population or increased
14 harvest as occurred this year. It wouldn't allow us to
15 take advantage of -- Cordova residents to realize the
16 advantage of high populations and high harvest as we've
17 had in the recent years.

18
19 That concludes my presentation.

20
21 All that said, I do want to end with
22 just saying that Dave Crowley and the State have been
23 instrumental in managing this population, you know,
24 making the harvest calls and surveys. And I want to
25 say they've done an excellent job. In this past year
26 in particular, the moose harvest was under a
27 microscope, because of the large projected harvest, you
28 know, the large number of permits available. And there
29 were a lot of Cordova residents that were really
30 skeptical, you know, that the herd could withstand that
31 level of harvest. And Dave Crowley has been the one
32 who's been, and the State, has been doing the surveys
33 and the modeling. And the models have all played out
34 as projected. We got good surveys after the hunt this
35 year, and things have played, you know, pretty much as
36 projected. We're still in pretty good shape and things
37 have gone as planned. So I just wanted to recognize the
38 State role and the good job they've been doing in
39 managing this population.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you Milo. Any
42 questions for Milo.

43
44 (No comments)

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I've got a couple that
47 I wrote down, Milo, if you don't mind.

48
49 If you go to Page 67, the second
50 paragraph down.

1 MR. BURCHAM: Yep.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And it says that by
4 reducing the Federal -- the last line, but by reducing
5 the Federal allocation, could open for consideration
6 the no Federal open season in other parts. What -- I
7 don't know what that applies to.

8

9 MR. BURCHAM: Well, that just --
10 throughout their -- the State as part of their
11 justification for submitting this proposal said
12 something about, you know, recommending that
13 subsistence continues to come from only Unit 6C. There
14 is no Federal season in 6B and 6A. And if for some
15 reason Federal subsistence users thought that they
16 weren't getting -- you know, if this proposal passed,
17 or, you know, other things happened down the line and
18 they felt that they weren't getting their fair share of
19 moose out of here, Unit 6A and 6B, you know, could be
20 considered as, you know, opening Federal subsistence
21 hunts in the future. It was just kind of just throwing
22 that out there as a possibility in the future. Nothing
23 that we're planning on -- or that we intend to or hope
24 to act on right now.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Milo. One
27 other question I had, you know, I know the -- I was
28 there when were working on the moose management plan to
29 begin with, and I know that Cordovans for a number of
30 years didn't take as many moose as what had been
31 originally expected to be taken to allow the moose herd
32 to grow, and that this kind of was an anomaly this
33 year. What happened, if I remember right, we didn't
34 get good counts for a couple of years because of
35 weather conditions, and the herd all of a sudden was
36 bigger than we thought. If the herd gets down to
37 manage -- to our goal levels, the management goal
38 levels of just 400 moose after the harvest, what would
39 be the normal average -- let's say, what would be the
40 average take of moose out of this herd, knowing that
41 this year was not a normal year.

42

43 MR. BURCHAM: I think I'll let Dave
44 speak.

45

46 MR. CROWLEY: 75.

47

48 MR. BURCHAM: He says 75 moose total.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: 75 moose total is

1 what.....

2

3 MR. BURCHAM: Yeah.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:we hope that we
6 can stabilize the herd at.

7

8 MR. BURCHAM: Yeah.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Well, that's
11 what I was wondering. Okay. And that's what I wanted
12 to know.

13

14 MR. BURCHAM: And in the previous, you
15 know, 7 or 8 years, or let's say 10 years, you know,
16 after that management plan was adopted, that antlerless
17 harvest was intentionally kept low at 5 moose so that
18 it could grow to reach the objective. The population
19 seemed to have stabilized or stagnated at around 350
20 animals. And a few years went by without surveys, and
21 we assumed it was still around 350, and suddenly with
22 good surveys in these last few years, we realized,
23 whoa, we're way up over 400, even up to 560, and that's
24 why we've had this larger harvest last few years to
25 bring it back down to objective. And I say that it
26 came as a surprise, but it was exactly as the
27 population was modeled to do. We just didn't have good
28 counts in the meantime.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Have we done any
31 surveys on range condition with this larger amount of
32 moose? Are we having some range damage?

33

34 MR. BURCHAM: We're starting to look at
35 that, and we're actually on the district or the Forest
36 Service end, the Native Village of Eyak, starting to
37 look at doing some habitat improvement kind of to off
38 set, to maintain the productivity of the delta, given
39 that succession is going on after the earthquake. and
40 it's tending to change to spruce forest. We want to
41 make sure we keep it as productive as it is. So we're
42 starting to look at that. And at the same time, we
43 started looking at moose browse, not quantifying it,
44 but, you know, just making general observations. And
45 some parts of it are used -- core winter range is used
46 pretty heavily, other parts aren't. It's not abused at
47 this point, but it's receiving, you know, a pretty good
48 level of use right now.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So we don't have any

1 apparent damage from the surprise high on the moose?

2

3 MR. BURCHAM: No, we don't. And I was
4 just in Gustavus with Dave Crowley at a moose workshop
5 last spring. And we saw a good example of what damaged
6 habitat is. And we're not there, and we don't want to
7 get there as well. That can have long-term effects on
8 the productivity.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Milo.
11 Bill.

12

13 MR. STOCKWELL: Thank you, Mr.
14 Chairman.

15

16 Is the 400 moose based on carrying
17 capacity?

18

19 MR. BURCHAM: The 400 moose is based on
20 an estimated carrying capacity, you know, from research
21 done in the 90s, and what it estimated is that the
22 delta could hold somewhere between 380 and 1400 moose,
23 based on winter severity. And in a severe winter, the
24 lower number is the number that you would expect the
25 delta to support. And so it's a conservative figure.
26 I allows for survival in severe winters.

27

28 MR. STOCKWELL: Thank you.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Milo. Tom.

31

32 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah, Milo, just a
33 couple comments. I was glad you mentioned some of the
34 habitat projects that the Forest Service is considering
35 to out on the delta. I think those are good plans.

36

37 One thing to consider, what Milo said,
38 was the need for the moose meat in particular in
39 Cordova. You could never go and meet the true need of
40 what Cordova residents need in regards to poundage.
41 You take this year for example. I would say that
42 Cordova has kind of a wide and diverse palate for
43 different tastes for good foods. And this year the
44 deer populations were down a little bit, and I would --
45 I'm just guessing, but I would say that the harvest was
46 probably 25 percent to 40 percent of what the average
47 harvest is for deer. So the moose that were harvested
48 this year were even that more significant to the
49 subsistence need of Cordova.

50

1 So I think when you talk about taking
2 moose away from the already decreasing, you know,
3 harvest number that we're going to project in the
4 future, it's even more important, depending on what --
5 how the other food sources are meeting the needs of
6 Cordova. So I'm glad you stressed the overall need,
7 because I think that's really the most important thing
8 to focus on. So, thanks.

9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any other
11 questions for Milo.

12
13 (No comments)

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none, thank
16 you, Milo.

17
18 Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

19
20 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, did you want
21 -- you had a.....

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I was going to take
24 the testimony, but I thought that possibly he was
25 nodding that it was okay to take you guys first. That
26 way we have something to testify to.

27
28 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
29 For the record, Terry Haynes, Federal subsistence
30 wildlife coordinator for Department of Fish and Game.
31 And Dave Crowley, the area biologist is here to answer
32 questions you might have.

33
34 But this Department proposal is an
35 attempt to adjust the number of moose allocated to the
36 Federal subsistence moose hunt in Unit 6. And what it
37 boils down to is that as the moose population has grown
38 in Unit 6C, the number, the proportion of moose going
39 to the Federal hunt has increased. And Cordova
40 residents continue to take a substantial amount of the
41 moose harvest under State regulation in other subunits.
42 So we're seeing the overall moose harvest continue to
43 rise.

44
45 And we think it's appropriate to bring
46 to the table an appropriate question. That is, what
47 constitutes an amount of moose that's appropriate to
48 accommodate subsistence uses by Cordova residents. The
49 current increase in harvest could go on endlessly,
50 because of -- if we looked at attempting to meet the

1 demand in Cordova or any place else in the State, we
2 could probably never do that for any resource. And so
3 we're looking at some way for the State to understand
4 what is an appropriate allocation of moose for Cordova
5 residents, or for the Unit 6C moose hunt.

6
7 The Staff analysis points out several
8 times that demand for moose in Unit 6C greatly exceeds
9 supply. It's also true that, as I pointed out, that
10 moose harvest by Cordova residents in Unit 6A, 6B, and
11 6C combined have grown steadily over the past 10 years
12 from 34 in 1997 to 102 in 2006. In Unit 6C alone
13 during this same 10-year period, Cordova residents
14 harvested a low of 15 moose in 2001 and a high of 73 in
15 2006. And then I believe the harvest was higher this
16 past year.

17
18 The State hunts that Cordova residents
19 participate in, there is a huge demand, and many people
20 apply for these drawing permits that are available.
21 Cordova residents have been receiving a half or more of
22 the State permits in these adjoining subunits and
23 taking half or more of the harvest. And so again the
24 question just becomes at what point have the Federal
25 regulations provided adequate opportunity for
26 Federally-qualified users.

27
28 As you know, the State has
29 responsibility to provide for a wider range of users,
30 and we think our proposal is an attempt to accommodate
31 Federally-qualified subsistence users in Unit 6C,
32 recognizing that Cordova residents also are
33 consistently taking a large number of moose in the
34 adjoining subunits.

35
36 So we appreciate the Council's
37 consideration of this proposal. And Dave and I will
38 try to answer questions you have.

39
40 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

41
42 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
43 Preliminary Comments to Regional Advisory Council.

44
45 Wildlife Proposal WP08-11:

46
47 Adjust the number of moose allocated to
48 the federal subsistence moose hunt in Unit 6C.

49
50 Introduction:

1 Current regulations allocate a high
2 percentage of the harvestable surplus of moose in Unit
3 6C to the federal subsistence hunt, totaling 100% of
4 the antlerless quota and 75% of the bull quota (about
5 95% of the overall harvest quota). As the moose
6 population has grown in recent years, this formula has
7 resulted in a growing number of moose being set aside
8 for the federal hunt while the population of federally-
9 qualified subsistence users remained constant. This
10 proposal would allocate a specific number of moose
11 (n=30) to the federal hunt instead of a percentage of
12 the harvestable surplus.

13

14 Impact on Subsistence Users:

15

16 Based on moose harvest trends among
17 federally-qualified subsistence users in recent federal
18 and State hunts and based on projected harvests under
19 the proposed change in allocation, we do not anticipate
20 negative impacts on subsistence users.

21

22 Opportunity Provided by State:

23

24 The State moose hunt in Unit 6C is open
25 to residents only and is administered by drawing
26 permit. One bull may be taken during the September 1
27 October 31 season. Federally-qualified subsistence
28 users have obtained an average of two-thirds of the
29 State drawing permits issued annually for this hunt
30 over the past 10 years. Under current regulations, 75%
31 of the harvestable surplus of bulls is allocated to the
32 federal hunt and 25% to the State hunt.

33

34 Other Comments:

35

36 The staff analysis points out several
37 times that demand for moose in Unit 6C by federally-
38 qualified subsistence users greatly exceeds supply.
39 However, it is also true that moose harvests by Cordova
40 residents in Units 6A (West), 6B, and 6C combined have
41 grown steadily over the past 10 years, from 34 in 1997
42 to 102 in 2006. In Unit 6C during the same 10-year
43 period, Cordova residents harvested a low of 15 moose
44 in 2001 and a high of 73 in 2006.

45

46 The State s proposal illustrates the
47 need for the Federal Subsistence Board to determine how
48 many moose in Unit 6 are necessary to provide for
49 subsistence uses by Cordova residents. Under the
50 current regulatory framework, the number of moose

1 allocated to the federal hunt in Unit 6C will continue
2 to grow unchecked as the moose population increases.
3 This has the effect of restricting opportunities for
4 other hunters without first determining the amount
5 necessary for subsistence.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Terry.

8

9 I'll start off. Or, Tom, do you want
10 to start off with the first question? I was going to
11 start off with the first question, and that was that
12 you were saying that at least in recent history Cordova
13 residents have been taking about 50 percent of the
14 available moose in A, B, and C, if I understand
15 correct, and greater in the last couple years with
16 what's been happening in Unit 6C.

17

18 MR. CROWLEY: Good morning, Mr.
19 Chairman. Dave Crowley, Fish and Game.

20

21 In 6A, B and C combined Cordova
22 residents, oh, have taken since 2005 between 80 and 150
23 moose in those three areas, and that constitutes 90 to
24 93 percent of the total harvest, State and Federal
25 combined. So Cordova residents are taking up to 93
26 percent of the available harvest quota in those three
27 areas.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But if you look back
30 from 1960 to 2000, what would be the percentage of
31 moose that went to Cordova residents during that time
32 period, before we had the -- I think it was 2000 that
33 we started getting a lot of interest from places other
34 than Cordova and a lot of applications for permits from
35 non-Cordova residents. But if I remember right, from
36 about 1960 to 2000, I think the same percentage moose
37 or greater was taken by Cordova residents, am I correct
38 on that assumption?

39

40 MR. CROWLEY: It was about 10 percent
41 lower. It was between 70 -- correction, between -- oh,
42 yes, between 70 and 80 percent went to.....

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Between 70 and 80
45 percent.

46

47 MR. CROWLEY:in A, B and C
48 combined went to Cordova residents.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.

1 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah. Thanks, Terry
2 and Dave. That was actually one of the questions I was
3 going to ask.

4
5 But just a statement in regards to
6 something you said, Terry. You know, when you take
7 small communities like this, they're pretty dependent
8 on, you know, all types of wild foods. The problem
9 that communities like this have is that the only option
10 we have to try and maintain the level to satisfy our
11 needs is the State's Tier II system, which is extremely
12 flawed. And I don't think we need to debate that one,
13 but we could go on. But there's been a pretty -- as
14 long as I've been involved with this, you know, with
15 the Advisory Committee and different things in town,
16 there's been a longstanding tradition that we do not
17 want to participate in Tier II because it is so flawed.
18 And when it came to, you know, 2000 and the percentage
19 of moose permits that were available to Cordova
20 residents fell below what the people from other parts
21 of the State were taken out of town, I think people
22 kind of got frustrated. And a lot of the frustration
23 was because the moose are here because of Cordova
24 residents mainly. And I think we might not have this
25 situation if the State would somehow figure out how to
26 deal with the Tier II problem. And it's a more
27 divisive problem within a community like this than this
28 Federal subsistence hunt could ever be, because then
29 you're taking people and you're challenging them to
30 prove within a group of people who qualifies to harvest
31 within a community and that's even more divisive.

32
33 So just a comment, and I think Ralph
34 asked the question that I was going to ask earlier.
35 Thanks.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tom. I had
38 one more question I wanted to ask Dave, and then I'll
39 let somebody else ask questions.

40
41 We were talking on the long-term, if
42 you go back prior to 2000, we had about a 70 to 80
43 percent take. Under our current management system, if
44 we get down to our management goal, which is a
45 maintained herd of about 400 moose in Unit 6C, will we
46 under our current management system, will we back in
47 that range for the historic range for the historic take
48 for Cordova of about 70 to 80 percent, you know, taking
49 out these anomalies of the past couple years, so that
50 it would maintain the historic average of Cordovans

1 making use of the moose herd that they planted on the
2 Copper River Delta?

3

4 MR. CROWLEY: Mr. Chairman. Under the
5 -- we're there now. We're at 430 moose, so we're
6 pretty close to our objective. We'll be harvesting,
7 you know, between 70 and 80 moose, depending on
8 production and that type of thing from year to year.
9 And this harvest under this management scenario is
10 double what we have harvested before we got to this
11 point. We were taking I believe it was 20 bulls and 5
12 cows for many years while we built the population, and
13 now we're going to be taking 75 in combination, so
14 we're at double the harvest now, and that's what we
15 intend to maintain in the long run.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I know that that was
18 our intention when we put in the moose management plan
19 was that we would take the 20 and the 5 for a long time
20 and get the herd up to where it could maintain this.
21 But let's say we have a harvest of 75 to 80 moose, if
22 we took the same percentages, if we took the amount of
23 animals this year, the same percentages of State to
24 Federal, what would be the average? I mean, would that
25 put back Cordova back in its historic average range for
26 making use of the herd on the Copper River Delta?

27

28 MR. CROWLEY: If you're talking about
29 percentage of harvest going to Cordovans?

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

32

33 MR. CROWLEY: It's much higher. We're
34 at 95, 96 percent now of the Unit 6C harvest going to
35 Cordovans, and the long term average was more like 74
36 to 75 percent under the State-only hunt.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Roger. But what I'm
39 asking is, when we get down to the stabilized moose
40 herd, what would -- if we had the same percentages as
41 we took this year, not the percentage that came out
42 because of the increased moose herd, but the same
43 percentage of permits going to the State and Federal,
44 the same average amount of non-residents getting State
45 permits, what would be our percentage then?

46

47 MR. CROWLEY: It would be about 95
48 percent going to Cordova residents.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So would it stay the

1 same as this year?

2

3 MR. CROWLEY: Yes. Yes.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: How?

6

7 MR. CROWLEY: Because it's basically
8 the same percentage regardless of the number, because
9 the percentage of the allocation is the same regardless
10 of the harvest number itself.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But a higher
13 percentage of the herd would be available for State
14 hunts?

15

16 MR. CROWLEY: No, just 25 percent of
17 the bulls.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Okay.

20

21 MR. CROWLEY: And that gets to the crux
22 of the matter. Mr. Chairman.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. And the other
25 question that I had, you know, we talked about it grow
26 -- I mean, you talked about it growing unchecked. But
27 if you're on a moose management plan that has a goal of
28 so many moose, the harvest can't grow unchecked,
29 because you've only got a limited supply that you can
30 grow to. Or am I missing something there? That's what
31 I'm trying to figure out. ADF&G has used that comment
32 in a number of their places that the potential for the
33 Federal subsistence harvest to grow unchecked, but if
34 you have a moose management plan that is aiming for a
35 lower number of moose than we have right now, or let's
36 say what we have right now, your harvest shouldn't
37 grow. Your harvest should actually maintain a certain
38 number, or close to a certain number, shouldn't it?

39

40 MR. CROWLEY: Yes.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Terry.

43

44 MR. HAYNES: Yeah. Mr. Chairman. The
45 intent of that comment was, you're correct, that this
46 population is not going to grow unchecked, but to date,
47 its consistent.....

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

50

1 MR. HAYNES:growth to date has
2 corresponded with this consistent increase in the local
3 harvest. So that was what we were attempting to say.

4
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But the potential to
6 continue to grow unchecked if the moose management plan
7 takes effect isn't there.

8
9 MR. HAYNES: Certainly. The
10 population's going to be stabilized. Correct.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right. Thank you.
13 Ricky.

14
15 MR. GEASE: So let me just get my math
16 right. From the 60s to the 90s, there's about 30 moose
17 harvested and about 20 to 30 percent of those were
18 harvested by outside of Cordovan residents, is that
19 correct, which would be about 6 to 9 moose per year.

20
21 MR. CROWLEY: It's actually changed
22 quite a bit over the years from the 60s, but if we look
23 at just the last, oh, say the 10 years before
24 subsistence came on board in 2000, the harvest was
25 about 25, and on average three-quarters of that harvest
26 went to Cordova residents.

27
28 MR. GEASE: Right. So between 6 to 9
29 moose were going to non-Cordovan residents, is that
30 correct?

31
32 MR. CROWLEY: I think that's about
33 right, yes.

34
35 MR. GEASE: Okay. So now if we're in a
36 situation where we have about 100 moose being taken,
37 and about 90 percent of those are Cordovan residents,
38 we're still having a harvest by non-Cordovan residents
39 of around 10, is that correct?

40
41 MR. CROWLEY: Yes. We're having --
42 it's at 95 percent, and the non-local harvest is -- I
43 believe it was 3 in Unit 6C this year, and that's more
44 or less how it goes, because most of the State permits
45 also go to local residents.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tricia.

48
49 MS. WAGGONER: Of the proposed, you
50 know, maintaining a harvest level 75 moose, and 30 cows

1 under your proposal going to Federal subsistence, so
2 the State would be 45 bulls, is that correct, or would
3 there be potential for antlerless under the State hunt?

4

5 MR. CROWLEY: Mr. Chairman. Under our
6 proposal, right now there would be 25 cows available
7 so, yes, those would -- the other 20 -- or the other
8 five, I'm sorry, would come out of the bulls, so there
9 would be 5 bulls and 25 cows under this proposal.

10

11 MS. WAGGONER: Okay. But what I'm
12 saying is, if you're predicting to maintain, you know,
13 a 15 to 100 bull to cow ratio, and maintaining the herd
14 at 100, and you're saying the average annual harvest in
15 6C would be 75 moose, so the other 45 moose that are
16 not under the Federal program, would be bulls under the
17 State program?

18

19 MR. CROWLEY: Yes, that's correct.

20

21 MS. WAGGONER: So if you're looking at
22 45 bulls, 30 cows a years, is that consistent with
23 maintaining the 15 to 100 bull to cow ratio?

24

25 MR. CROWLEY: That bull to cow ratio is
26 kind of a moving target. Right now we're at 30 bulls
27 per 100 cows, and it's my belief that 15 bulls per 100
28 cows is too low. We need to keep that higher in order
29 to keep our production up. And that's something that
30 we look at from a year-to-year basis, and, you know,
31 the number of bulls and cows is going to vary over the
32 year, but for the most part that harvest is going to
33 remain about the same.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bill.

36

37 MR. STOCKWELL: Mr. Chairman. When
38 Milo was talking, you've got an area out on the highway
39 that's -- it's State, it's non-Federal lands, which
40 under the present management system, is closed to all
41 cow hunts. How much opportunity for cow harvest is
42 lost because there's no hunt in that area? Is it good
43 habitat, are there a lot of cows there or.....

44

45 MR. CROWLEY: Mr. Chairman. Yes, it is
46 good habitat, and the cows tend to not congregate near
47 the roads, but they just tend to be more accessible
48 along the road in those areas, so there is some
49 opportunity lost there. However, we had a cow quota
50 of, oh, 50 I think this year, and, you know, that quota

1 was pretty much met.

2

3 MR. STOCKWELL: So what you're saying,
4 if I'm matching it then, the opportunity's available
5 some place else, it's not really a problem by losing
6 the opportunity along the State road system?

7

8 MR. CROWLEY: I think that it makes it
9 more difficult for people with cow tags and it does
10 take the entire season to meet that quota, so I think
11 there is if not lost, but at least delayed opportunity
12 by having that area closed.

13

14 MR. STOCKWELL: Thank you.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Bill. Mr.
17 Henrichs.

18

19 MR. HENRICHS: Yeah, I'm just curious.
20 Does this proposal represent a shift in State policy?
21 How did this proposal come about?

22

23 MR. CROWLEY: Mr. Chairman. Mr.
24 Henrichs. This came about because in looking over the
25 harvest statistics for Unit 6C, I just came to notice
26 that Cordova residents are now taking 95 percent of the
27 available quota in Unit 6C; however, there's only 71
28 percent available lands are Federal lands out there,.
29 And the other side of the coin is that if you look at a
30 historical harvest, we're at double that now. And so I
31 guess I just wanted the Council to look at this
32 situation, because in my mind, yes, there's the demand
33 out there, but we'll never meet that demand and we're
34 not in the business of meeting demand. What we need to
35 do is provide a subsistence priority. And does that
36 subsistence priority -- is that based on land
37 availability? Is it based on, you know, 71 percent
38 Federal lands? Is it based on historical harvest? Is
39 that our subsistence priority? Or is it based on this
40 fickle notion of demand? Demand has been increasing in
41 recent years Just in the last few years, if you look
42 at the number of applicants who have applied, if you
43 look at the number of first-time license purchasers, we
44 had 20 percent of the subsistence permit holders in
45 2007 had never bought an Alaska hunting license before.
46 So we've increased demand, not on purpose, but we've
47 actually increased demand, because, yeah, we had a lot
48 of moose coming into town, we had very high harvest,
49 and the subsistence applications are easy to do. You
50 don't have to buy a hunting license. So there's just a

1 whole lot more interest. It's become very popular and
2 I think that there's a difference between demand, or
3 popularity, and a subsistence priority. Under the
4 State-only system, we had 75 percent of the moose going
5 to qualified subsistence users, now we have 95 percent.
6 And I guess I just wanted to bring that to the Council
7 and have the Council aware of this and, you know,
8 that's my goal.

9

10 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Terry.

13

14 MR. HAYNES: If I could just add, Mr.
15 Chairman, this is a difficult question. And certainly
16 we're not -- our intent is not to restrict opportunity,
17 but one of the fundamental questions that the State
18 deals with in allocating resources for subsistence uses
19 is to look at what are the amounts necessary for
20 subsistence. The Federal system doesn't have those
21 numbers to work with, but we believe it's an important
22 part of the equation to know what is required to
23 accommodate subsistence users. And when we look at
24 what -- look at moose hunting in Cordova, we're looking
25 at Unit 6C as well as other units where Cordova
26 residents are doing the harvesting, and don't look at
27 our proposal as something that's trying to restrict
28 opportunity and restrict harvest, but to suggest that
29 there must be some -- at some point, we must be
30 providing that opportunity and not limiting
31 opportunity. So the point of this proposal is to get
32 that question on the table, and it's one that we
33 believe is going to need to be addressed in other parts
34 of the State as well.

35

36 But this was a good example of a
37 management question from our perspective that deserves
38 some discussion.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Terry.

41

42 Any other questions for the Department
43 of Fish and Game.

44

45 (No comments)

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, gentlemen.
48 We'll probably be calling you back.

49

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

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have any other
2 Federal, State or tribal agencies that wish to testify
3 at this point in time? I'm going to get George next.
4 We did have a tribal agency, and then we'll get to --
5 then we'll take George.

6
7 MR. CAIN: Yeah. Bruce Cain, executive
8 director for the Native Village of Eyak.

9
10 And the Native Village of Eyak is
11 opposed to this proposal. We have a drawing situation
12 because there is a greater demand than there is for
13 people to get moose. And as long as you're in that
14 situation, you've got unmet subsistence needs. And to
15 talk about taking it away, what we have available isn't
16 -- I don't believe it meets the laws and the
17 regulations.

18
19 That's basically our comment. This is
20 -- this hunt it working. I think it's a real good
21 success model. And I think it's a very well-managed
22 hunt given the situation that we've got. And I
23 wouldn't recommend the changes that the State's
24 proposing.

25
26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Bruce.

27
28 Any questions for Bruce. Bill.

29
30 MR. STOCKWELL: Thank you, Mr.
31 Chairman.

32
33 Would it be beneficial to Eyak to have
34 some of the cow permits available on the lands that are
35 non-Federal along the highway?

36
37 MR. CAIN: The cow harvest is -- you
38 know, I mean it varies from year to year, and, you
39 know, you have to be careful when you're taking too
40 many cows. So, you know, I think that the cow permits
41 that are available end up getting taken. It's tougher
42 to hunt them, but it gets -- the job get done with that
43 long season.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Thank you,
46 Bill.

47
48 No other questions.

49
50 (No comments)

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Bruce.
2
3 MR. CAIN: Thank you.
4
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. At this point
6 in time, I'd like to let George testify, because I know
7 he has to go some place. And then we're going to go on
8 to InterAgency Staff Committee comments, there are
9 none. And we have Fish and Game Advisory Committee
10 comments after George. And I see that Tori's here.
11 Are you going to present the Fish and Game Advisory
12 Committee comments?
13
14 TORI: No.
15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No. Okay. Mark is.
17
18 MR. KING: I've got to leave, too.
19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We'll allow you
21 to come next then, too.
22
23 Okay. George.
24
25 MR. COVEL: Yeah. Good morning, Mr.
26 Chairman. Council members. And thanks for being
27 flexible here. I'll be brief, because I intend to make
28 good use of the rest of this beautiful day very short.
29 My name is George Covell, I'm a resident here in
30 Cordova. I'd like to offer a couple of quick points in
31 opposition to the State's proposal.
32
33 I was a member of the advisory
34 committee for many years, and I remember well when we
35 set out to increase the size of this moose herd,
36 increase harvest opportunity. And I also remember when
37 we addressed opportunity by petitioning the Federal
38 Board for the current regulatory scheme.
39
40 I think as we kicked this winter in the
41 advisory committee and on the streets and elsewhere in
42 the community, one of the things that's become very
43 clear to us is that there is a very high degree of
44 community satisfaction with the current regulatory
45 scheme. It's worked well. As we look back on what
46 we've done I think we can be proud that we've achieved
47 what we set out to do.
48
49 The other point I wanted to make is
50 that as we design -- when we designed this thing, we

1 did so in a deliberate manner, and I think that Milo
2 and -- Milo pointed out how we designed this thing in a
3 proportional way to address not only land ownership,
4 but the also the opportunity that was available or at
5 least perceived as available. I think if we change any
6 of those, we'll be upsetting the balance that we set
7 out to achieve there as well.

8

9 That's all I've got for you.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, George.
12 Any questions for George.

13

14 (No comments)

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: George, just one
17 question on my part then, and I know it was a part of
18 the original when were working on setting up the moose
19 management thing, but I wasn't part of the part when
20 you were working on designing things. This was not
21 just a spur of the moment thing. This was pretty
22 carefully thought out and deliberately designed to
23 accomplish exactly what it's accomplishing, wasn't it?

24

25 MR. COVEL: Mr. Chairman. That's
26 correct. Yeah, we saw a trend developing in where the
27 harvest was going. We also looked at other things that
28 were on the horizon first at the time, such as better
29 access to the community and increased interest
30 elsewhere in the State. And we saw a trend that we
31 interpreted that if we didn't somehow address it that
32 probably would have led to higher and higher levels of
33 moose harvest by people other than those in Cordova.
34 This s a very, very attractive hunt. It's very
35 accessible. We have lots of trophy animals. And now
36 it's much easier to get to Cordova. So we sort of took
37 this as a preemptive way to address the needs of the
38 community.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, George.

41

42 Any other questions for George.

43

44 (No comments)

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, George.
47 Thanks for coming. And we'll let Mark real quickly
48 come in and then you two can go and then we'll get back
49 on schedule.

50

1 MR. COVEL: Thank you.

2

3 MR. KING: Yeah. Mark King, 51 Fourth
4 Street, Cordova. Thank you.

5

6 A little history of the moose herd out
7 here. My father, Bob Henrichs' father, the Izaak
8 Walton League, Foss Green, Mudhole Smith volunteered
9 his airplanes to bring the moose in here. They came
10 from the Kenai. They brought calves in here and a lot
11 of us youngsters back then hand fed these moose behind
12 the Federal Building up here, which is the Forest
13 Service Building now. And those moose were put here
14 for the -- my interpretation, talking with my father,
15 were put here for the community of Cordova. Back then
16 we were forced to subsist with a sporthunting license.

17

18 And as the -- through the history of
19 the herd, we've seen the moose migrate all the way down
20 to Icy Bay, down by Yakutat. That area now, I'm not
21 sure if it's 6A, I'm not sure how the A, B, C works,
22 but Bering River is another area, and then this 6C is
23 27 miles of town. The moose have also expanded to
24 Hinchinbrook Island, Brood River up at the head of the
25 bay, which is out of the units that have been
26 discussed, and there are some moose taken in those
27 areas.

28

29 But I personally have seen the
30 sporthunting moose where the antlers are cut off,
31 backstrap's cut out, the ribs left laying in the field,
32 hind quarters taken and stuff like that. But there
33 needs to be an understanding here in Cordova that when
34 we harvest these moose, most of the time the whole
35 moose comes out of the field. All that's left there is
36 a gut pile, you know. And I've seen the effects of
37 sporthunting moose.

38

39 That area down in Icy Bay is now -- up
40 to Cape Suckling, is a trophy only area. So there's
41 not very many local residents go down in that area,
42 because it's 50-inch plus I think.

43

44 So I think the system is working here.
45 Thank God, we finally got the Federal system for
46 subsistence to where we can -- although we still have
47 to buy a sport license to go out and do this, that we
48 can harvest our moose that we -- that we put there for
49 the local community of Cordova.

50

1 The other thing I'll say, too, is, you
2 know there's other areas that -- there's Unit 13 up the
3 Copper River that's got this area that there's moose
4 in. So these moose that were planted here expanded out
5 into other areas.

6
7 And maybe it sounds like we're selfish
8 here, but we do utilize every bit of these moose. And
9 most of the time whenever there's a problem here with
10 somebody just whacking the horns off of moose, it's
11 from somebody that doesn't live in this community.

12
13 Anyway, that's all I have.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for
16 Mark.

17
18 (No comments)

19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Mark.

21
22 Okay. We do not have any InterAgency
23 Staff Committee comments at this point in time. We
24 should have Fish and Game Advisory Committee comments
25 from Prince William Sound/Copper River Advisory
26 Committee. Do we have them?

27
28 MR. CARPENTER: Do you want me to do it
29 -- I'm going to do it, do you want me to do it there or
30 here?

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Go up there.
33 Tom is wearing two hats.

34
35 MR. CARPENTER: I'm doing it. Thank
36 you, Mr. Chairman. Tom Carpenter, the chair of the
37 Copper River/Prince William Sound Advisory Committee.
38 I'll just be brief.

39
40 Our comments are on Page 68. A lot
41 that's been said, you know, from both sides of the
42 management scheme, from the State and Federal
43 Government, is all very true.

44
45 A couple of things that I'd like for
46 the Council to consider when making this decision, is
47 number 1, I'd like to stress that there is a true and a
48 desirable need for this meat to stay within the
49 community of Cordova. It's very important, and it's
50 one of the -- besides deer, it's the most important

1 subsistence food for volume that we have in this town.

2

3 I think the Advisory Committee over the
4 years has been a very self-regulating committee. We've
5 put a lot of time and effort into coming up with a
6 management strategy for the moose herd on the Copper
7 River Delta, and I think it's worked well over time.

8

9 One of the reasons that the Advisory
10 Committee feels that this allocative number ought to
11 stay with the Federal Board -- and there was a few
12 people on the Advisory Committee -- the vote was 11 to
13 3 to oppose the State's proposal, so there were three
14 people that did agree with the State, so it wasn't
15 unanimous, but it was -- there was a large majority of
16 the members that felt that the allocative number ought
17 to stay towards the higher end on the Federal side.

18

19 The one thing that we seem to forget
20 sometimes when we're talking about moose that are
21 actually available on the Copper River Delta to all
22 State residents, when we did develop the management
23 plan, besides the area that we're specifically talking
24 about right now, which is basically between town and
25 the Copper River, which is basically 27 miles,
26 approximately 21 miles of that is reasonable moose
27 habitat. We also have three other subunits that extend
28 down the coast.

29

30 When the management plan was developed,
31 and I believe Mark just spoke to one of the areas, we
32 have area 6A East which was determined to be and
33 developed to be a trophy area. It's the only area in
34 Unit 6 where there's a spike-fork-50 component to it,
35 and that was developed years ago, long before a lot of
36 the other units around the State went to it. And it
37 was determined that we would do that so that we could
38 try and grow some really nice trophy bulls in that
39 area. It's a very -- it's somewhat of a non-accessible
40 area except by plane, but you do have some non-resident
41 hunting component there. But it's also open to
42 everybody in the State through registration permit.

43

44 Coming towards Cordova some, you have
45 Area 6A West which is open to the general public
46 through registration permit, and there is also -- and
47 I'm not sure if there was last year, I can't remember
48 offhand, but typically there are five antlerless moose
49 in this area that are available to all State residents
50 through a drawing process. The bulls that are

1 harvested in this area are done through a registration
2 area. And being that it's pretty remote and not
3 accessible, this area was determined, when we developed
4 the management plan, to be an any bull harvest area.
5 So you don't have any of the spike-fork-50 component
6 there. It's if you see a bull, it's available for
7 harvest. And a lot of the moose in both of these areas
8 each year, even though they are available to all State
9 residents, go unharvested. So the idea that the demand
10 from the State -- all State residents is that high, you
11 know, that's debatable. I think you could go back over
12 time, and if you took a percentage of the applicants
13 that put in for the State drawing permits, I would
14 think that Cordova residents overwhelmingly were a
15 large majority of those people. And we feel that the
16 allocations should stay the way.

17

18 You also have an area that's just
19 across the river from the Copper River, Area 6B, the
20 Martin River area. That's also road accessible.
21 There's ample opportunity for plane access, air boat
22 access, river skiff access. It has both a non-
23 motorized component to it for people that don't have
24 the ability to use motorized vehicles. And then after
25 that five days of the hunt is over, there is a
26 motorized aspect to it, with some restrictions
27 involved, which were also self-imposed by the Advisory
28 Committee in town to control the harvest levels. This
29 is also an any bull area available to all State
30 residents.

31

32 So I guess the point that I'm trying to
33 make is, we're basically asking that a large percentage
34 of the moose be made available to Cordova residents
35 through the Federal Subsistence Program in Unit 6C,
36 which is -- I can't read it -- it's a good moose area.
37 I mean, don't get me wrong, but there is area available
38 to all residents in the State, and so I do believe that
39 there is plenty of opportunity offered to them. And
40 we're not trying to -- you know, we're trying to
41 protect our own back yard per se, but we're also trying
42 to allow opportunity for everybody else, because I do
43 think that that's a good thing.

44

45 So I think that's all I have to say for
46 now. If there's any questions, I'll be glad to answer
47 them.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tom. It's
50 interesting that you used a word that I would have used

1 when you said back yard. I was just going to ask you,
2 when we get a nice day in Cordova with the kind of
3 roads that we have around here, where does most of
4 Cordova end up?

5
6 MR. CARPENTER: Well, they're probably
7 not going to end up out there as much any more at \$5 a
8 gallon, but typically most of the people use the
9 highway system between town and the Copper River, which
10 is the area that we're talking about. It has the most
11 -- you know, there are several Forest Service trails.
12 There's a couple of spur roads that the Forest Service
13 maintains that makes this area available to the
14 different river systems. And I guess that's kind of
15 why we like to call it our own back yard, and I guess
16 that's why we're a little bit protective of it.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: To go some place else
19 takes a lot more effort, because you have to take a
20 ferry or an airplane.

21
22 Bill.

23
24 MR. STOCKWELL: Thank you, Mr.
25 Chairman.

26
27 Tom, did -- as it was -- one of the
28 issues brought up by the Federal analysis, did your
29 committee look at changing the -- or making any cow
30 opportunity in the State lands along the highway?

31
32 MR. CARPENTER: Well, one of the things
33 that we did discuss, you know, there are a lot of cows
34 along the highway. There's no doubt about that. Cows
35 tend to hang around that area a little more than the
36 bulls do, especially after the hunt gets started. The
37 bulls tend to scatter a little more. But the one thing
38 that we considered is that at -- on the A.C. level, and
39 I've heard this discussed at several other places
40 besides this, is if you're going to pick between a bull
41 and a cow, which one's more of subsistence animal? A
42 cow. Why would somebody from Fairbanks want to come to
43 Cordova and shoot a cow? So why should a cow be
44 available through a State drawing system? Typically
45 people harvest cows where they live. It's more of a
46 subsis -- it's to put food in the freezer, supply your
47 family and your friends with food for the winter.

48
49 So that was a discussion, and we do
50 feel that all the cows should stay under the Federal

1 system for that reason.

2

3 The one thing you've got to consider is
4 this is kind of a unique area. You know, we -- there's
5 not many places that harvest moose like we do. And
6 there's probably not many places that bring out such a
7 fine piece of meat when it's done, you know. We shoot
8 these moose and we bring them out whole. I mean,
9 there's no where else that you can do that really with
10 the -- over time we've developed the airboat system. I
11 mean, it's basically a swampy delta out here. It's
12 actually changing a little bit now. But there's
13 several people that drew cow tags this year and were
14 having a hard time getting them, because over time, a
15 lot of the easy ones that are along the road are on
16 State lands. It was a little bit tougher for these
17 people to harvest these animals. But there are also a
18 lot of people in town that stepped right up to help
19 these people and to help them go out and get the cow
20 for them in the areas that were a little bit less
21 accessible, and thus the friendly spirit and the giving
22 spirit of people in town ended up putting the meat in
23 the freezer for those people.

24

25 So I think notwithstanding some of the
26 easy cows that might be lost to the person driving down
27 the highway in their car, I think that a large percent
28 of the people that do draw one of these tags, they're
29 going to go -- they're going to get harvested.

30

31 MR. STOCKWELL: Thank you. Just one
32 other quick question. You've got the trophy hunt area
33 in the east section, does that provide -- including the
34 guides around that are using that area for -- to
35 provide an economic opportunity for the community?

36

37 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah, there's a couple
38 places that the guides operate. They're not allowed to
39 guide in the area that we're talking about here with
40 this proposal.

41

42 MR. STOCKWELL: No, I know.

43

44 MR. CARPENTER: But down on the coast,
45 there are these -- the trophy area that was developed,
46 that was one of the main reasons that it was developed,
47 and it was to satisfy some of the guides that have been
48 working in the area for a long time, not to
49 disenfranchise them by all of a sudden taking, you
50 know, that area away from them. And that is where they

1 mainly operate. They also operate in a couple of other
2 areas down the coast. But that's typically where it's
3 done for the moose hunting.

4

5 MR. STOCKWELL: Thank you.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Bill.

8 Ricky.

9

10 MR. GEASE: Yeah, you had -- two
11 questions, the first one being you'd mentioned the vote
12 was 11 to 3. Could you just expand a little bit about
13 what the three people were thinking when they voted for
14 this?

15

16 And then the second point is, if this
17 proposal were to pass, what in your mind would be the
18 effects of the percentages of take of Cordovan
19 residents relative to non-residents.

20

21 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah. To discuss the
22 first part of your question. The three people, if I
23 recall correctly, a lot of it had to do with, you know,
24 and it's something that we don't really have the
25 ability to mandate or legislate. A lot of it had to do
26 with the funding aspect. You know, the State is
27 responsible for, you know, doing the aerial surveys,
28 doing the -- coming up with the models to calculate the
29 population size, how many the animals are going to be
30 harvested, things like that. And there were a few
31 people on there that felt, you know, and the numbers
32 weren't specifically discussed at to what percentage
33 the State pays for, and what percentage the Forest
34 Service. I do know that the Forest Service does help
35 contribute money to the State, or they share expenses
36 for, you know, aerial surveys or what have you. But I
37 think that there was a few people on there that felt
38 that if the Federal system was going to take 80 percent
39 of the moose, that the Federal system ought to pay for
40 80 percent of the survey work. And I think that's
41 where a lot of that came from.

42

43 There was one individual on the
44 committee, and I used to feel like this to a certain
45 degree, that he felt like there ought to be areas all
46 around the State that are open to all people of Alaska,
47 because eventually, if we close down everything to
48 everybody else except your own backyard, it's kind of a
49 limiting factor of as to where you can and where you
50 can't go enjoy the different values that the State has.

1 So that was one of them.

2

3 Could you repeat your second question?

4

5 MR. GEASE: The second question being
6 in your mind, if this proposal were to pass from the
7 State, what would be the effect on the relative
8 proportion of the number of moose that would be taken
9 by Cordovan residents versus other residents of the
10 State?

11

12 MR. CARPENTER: Well, you know, I think
13 it depends. I think if you come down to an average
14 number over time, probably it's 70 or 80 moose, which I
15 think is about what Dave said it would be if you used a
16 population estimate of 400 animals over time.

17

18 Well, first of all, I think there's two
19 things that are going to happen. First of all, I think
20 that the Cordovans are always going to harvest what's
21 available to them. If 50 of the moose are available to
22 them, they're going to harvest 50. You know, the
23 percentage of harvest is always extremely high,
24 probably the highest in the State.

25

26 But the second thing I think's going to
27 happen is that if some of these moose get taken away,
28 that friendly spirit that used to be available to
29 people that didn't live in Cordova that drew one of
30 these tags may not be available to them any more. And
31 the reason I say that is, is I think a large percentage
32 of the people that draw tags out of town, show up here,
33 and they don't really know what they're getting
34 themselves into. It's just water and alders, and
35 unless you have a moose that's visible from the
36 highway, the percentage -- your ability to harvest the
37 animal out here is going to be kind of small in most
38 areas. But there are a lot of people in town that have
39 been very nice in the past and have, you know, help
40 these people get these moose. I don't think that's
41 going to be available to people in the future.

42

43 So I don't want to see a conflict start
44 that way. That's something else to consider, and I
45 think it's very possible that it's going to happen,
46 because there was already some small signs of it this
47 year, and I don't think that's where we really want to
48 go in the long run.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tom. Any

1 other questions for Tom.

2

3

(No comments)

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, I was just going
6 to ask, I think you kind of answered it when you were
7 even talking about people from out of town coming here.
8 One of the reasons Cordova has such a high percentage
9 of harvest -- success rate I'll say, not harvest, is
10 basically the community spirit that works at harvesting
11 moose. Very few people harvest the moose by
12 themselves. It's pretty much -- they have other
13 members of the community helping them. And everything
14 from processors in town making forklifts and freezer
15 vans available, people offering their garages to hang
16 the moose in, and people going out to help bring it in.

17

18

19 We've had incidences in the past where
20 people have come from out of town, tried to do it
21 themselves, hiked off the road, shot themselves a
22 moose, and said, oh, my gosh, now what do we do? And
23 by the time they've hauled half of it out and half of
24 it's spoiling, they're wondering, what are we going to
25 do with this, and somebody pitches in and goes out and
26 gets it for them, simply because they come here and
27 find out that it's -- like you said, unless it's on the
28 road, it's pretty hard to get.

29

30 So I think you answered that pretty
31 good, and that was a question I was going to ask you
32 about the community spirit in the moose hunt.

33

34 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah. I'd just make
35 one comment to that, that, you know, there is a big
36 community spirit in regards to this moose hunt. You
37 know, you go to these meetings, and you hear some of
38 the different subsistence reports, and one of the words
39 they always use in some of their reports is the idea of
40 sharing. And I don't know very many people in Cordova
41 that harvest a moose that at least a quarter or more of
42 it doesn't go to either the person that helped them,
43 because like you say, you don't do it by yourself, or
44 more of it. You know, I know people last year that
45 shot moose, and I'll bet you they kept 25 percent of
46 it. 75 percent of the moose that they went and
47 harvested, and these are very desirable permits -- I
48 mean this is something that, you know, your chance of
49 drawing are about -- I'm not sure exactly what it is,
50 but three of four percent at the very most. So some

1 people wait an entire lifetime to draw one of these
2 permits. And it's kind of like drawing a buffalo
3 permit in Delta or something, it's that difficult. Or
4 a Tok sheep tag. And so I do think the idea that the
5 sharing aspect is very high in this town, and I think
6 that's the main focus behind the subsistence spirit.

7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions
9 for Tom.

10
11 (No comments)

12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tom. I
14 think we're going to take a break, and then we'll go on
15 to written and public comments.

16
17 Milo, what were you trying to give to
18 me?

19
20 (Off record)

21
22 (On record)

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Let's take our seats
25 so we can get back in session.

26
27 Again I'd like to remind anybody that
28 wants to testify to get one of these green slips and
29 fill it out and give it to Donald. It's not too late
30 at this point in time.

31
32 What we're going to do is we're going
33 to go through the summary of written public comments,
34 and then we're going to go on to go on to public
35 testimony, and then the Council will go on to
36 deliberations.

37
38 So at this point in time, do we have
39 any other Fish and Game Committee comments on this.

40
41 (No comments)

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none, we'll go
44 on to a summary of written public comments. Donald.

45
46 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We
47 received only one written public comment, and it's on
48 Page 68, and it was submitted by the Copper
49 River/Prince William Sound Fish and Game Advisory
50 Committee. And Mr. Carpenter presented their comments.

1 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Donald.

4

5 With that, we're going to go on to
6 public testimony. And I'll just go right down the
7 list. Harry Dean Curran.

8

9 MR. CURRAN: My name is Dean Curran.
10 I'm a local resident and highly involved in the moose
11 hunting here. I've been raised here all my life.

12

13 And like Mark King said, that these
14 moose were put in this area by the Izaak Walton, you
15 know, for the community. And we are a rural
16 subsistence area. These moose are highly utilized. I
17 mean, you can't find another place that probably has as
18 much rural people utilizing the moose that are here,
19 you know.

20

21 The State is trying to say we would
22 have like 70, 80 percent. The reason we went to the
23 rural subsistence in this area is because the permits
24 that were going statewide, went as high as 50 percent
25 of them were going out of town. And so as a community,
26 we decided to go to the Federal subsistence so that
27 more would stay here. And it seems to be working a lot
28 better to have the deal under the Federal subsistence.

29

30

31 I would really hate to see it go the
32 other way. I'm totally against more State permits,
33 because we're utilizing the whole resource right here.
34 You give us the opportunity to go out there and get
35 them, and we'll do it, and they're shared with a lot of
36 people in the community.

37

38 And that's what I'd like to say. I'm
39 totally against it going more to the State.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Dean. Any
42 questions for Dean.

43

44 MR. CARPENTER: I've got a question.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.

47

48 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah. Dean, thanks for
49 your testimony. You know, without being too specific,
50 I know you're one of the people in town that a lot of

1 -- there's a lot of people that maybe first time moose
2 hunters or from families that haven't necessarily been,
3 you know, moose hunting families for whatever reason.
4 How many people do you typically help a year to go out
5 and get a moose, and then how much of that moose that
6 you guys harvest get spread between, you know, a
7 variety of different families?

8
9 MR. CURRAN: This year I helped
10 probably 12 people go get their moose, and it is spread
11 to a lot of different families without a doubt, I mean,
12 you know. I have an airboat, and so I take people out
13 to help them get their moose. And I'm just one of many
14 other people that will help other people go out to get
15 their moose that are.....

16
17 MR. CARPENTER: Okay. Thank you.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Dean. Any
20 other questions for Dean.

21
22 (No comments)

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'm going to ask you a
25 question that's kind of a personal then, but -- and
26 this is just from what I've seen. The majority of the
27 people that help other people get their moose aren't
28 doing it for pay or to get anything for themselves.
29 They're just doing it to help other people, aren't
30 they?

31
32 MR. CURRAN: That's right. Because a
33 lot of people can't go out there and get them. I have
34 a way of doing it, and I grew up in this town, and we
35 like to help other people that live here.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Dean. Any
38 other questions for Dean.

39
40 (No comments)

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Dean.
43 Thank you for your testimony.

44
45 Jennifer Gibbins.

46
47 MS. GIBBINS: Good morning. My name is
48 Jennifer Gibbins. Okay. There we go. Hi. My name is
49 Jennifer Gibbins, and I have been a Cordova resident
50 for about five or six years now.

1 I had never hunted before I moved to
2 Cordova. And even when I moved here, I thought I would
3 never hunt. I had no interest or desire in hunting
4 whatsoever. Since I have lived here, I have a new
5 appreciation for hunting. I've learned to live a
6 subsistence lifestyle, which is very important here.
7 And I was very fortunate, I got drawn for a cow permit
8 in I think 2006. Never held a gun before. So I went
9 out with the help of some Cordovans in classic Cordovan
10 experience. And they not only made it possible for me
11 to hunt, but they taught me how to go about it. And it
12 was a very powerful experience, it was a very
13 enlightening experience, and it made me appreciate the
14 importance of hunting, especially when it's done in a
15 very respectful manner. I think the respect and the
16 efficiency and the community spirit that goes behind
17 the subsistence hunting here is a very important part
18 of our culture.

19
20 A couple of people have commented on
21 the importance of this subsistence resource to the
22 community, and I think it's incredibly important. I
23 have benefitted from the generosity of other people in
24 the community sharing wild meat or fish with me. And I
25 was then able, once I got drawn, to return some of
26 that, you know, generosity that had been shared with
27 me. And do when people talk about are these hunts
28 appreciated, are they needed, are they efficient, and
29 do they go to the greater good to the entire community,
30 absolutely.

31
32 This hunt also was something that was
33 an accessible opportunity for me with the support of
34 the community members who helped me. I'm not someone
35 who's going to go out like a lot of other people who
36 participate in this, there are other people who can't
37 go out to other regions and hunt. So that's very, very
38 important.

39
40 I can't possibly imagine any reason
41 based on what I've heard and read, why the current
42 regulations would be changed. They're just incredibly
43 important to the community, and I'm very appreciative
44 of Milo's moose school and everything else that I
45 learned.

46
47 So, thank you.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions? Don't
50 run off. Any questions for Jennifer.

1 (No comments)
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Jennifer.
4
5 MS. GIBBINS: Thank you muchly for your
6 testimony.
7
8 Marvin Van den broek.
9
10 MR. VAN DEN BROEK: My name is Marvin
11 van den broek. I've lived in Cordova for 38 years.
12
13 Thank you guys for all putting this
14 work together and doing the job.
15
16 I need a reason to live in Cordova,
17 another reason. I'm losing some reasons, but this is a
18 good one, the moose is absolutely the best thing. If
19 you're elderly, you're kind of at the end of the food
20 chain. It's not quite as easy to get them anymore, but
21 people are willing to help you, and I have been the
22 recipient of a shoulder of a moose just this past
23 season. They guy calls me up and says, hey, you know,
24 I know you need one. We tried to shoot one ourselves.
25 We couldn't shoot one ourselves, so I still ended up
26 getting a nice shoulder. So this is how things are
27 shared. I just want you to know that I'm the
28 recipient, and I have been now like three times. I've
29 been the recipient of a shared moose, which has worked
30 out perfectly.
31
32 Of all the people I'm in a group with,
33 I was the only one ever drawn for moose Federally, and
34 that was 2005. So I know that there's -- in the group
35 that I'm with, we're not rich in moose. And every bit
36 is used. This is a -- I think Federal subsistence is
37 priority number 1, and I thought that, and I thought
38 that was the rule.
39
40 So I'm really opposed to any change. I
41 think it's working nicely the way it is.
42
43 So thank you very much.
44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for
46 Marvin.
47
48 (No comments)
49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Marvin, thank you for

1 your testimony.

2

3 Tom Church.

4

5 MR. CHURCH: Tom Church. I've lived in
6 Cordova from 1968, and I've hunted many years with
7 Marv.

8

9 And we're kind of at the point now
10 where we have to limit our hunts to kind of the areas
11 that are closer to the road. And I've never had the
12 fortune to get a Federal subsistence moose permit, nor
13 have my wife or my children or my son-in-law. And I
14 would hate to see a limitation put on our opportunity
15 to get that subsistence permit. We've been fortunate
16 that we've had other people share moose with us.

17

18 And it seems like what people have said
19 here, that the system is working well, that has been
20 designed, and I'm in opposition to any changes that are
21 proposed in this regulation.

22

23 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tom. Any
26 questions for Tom.

27

28 (No comments)

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom, it's kind of
31 interesting that both you and Marvin brought up
32 something. You know, it probably seems to other people
33 that with all of these moose and all of these permits,
34 that everybody in town gets a permit fairly frequently.
35 And it's interesting that you've been here since 1968,
36 Marvin's been here for 38 years. I'm sure that you
37 probably put in for every permit that's ever been
38 available down through the years, haven't you?

39

40 MR. CHURCH: Right.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I know, because I know
43 our family's done the same thing, and I have a fairly
44 large extended family here in town. And the amount --
45 if we had to live off the amount of moose that we've
46 drawn on our permits, we would have starved to death a
47 long time ago. But it's sure been nice the times that
48 we've got one, and it's been nice to have shares of
49 other people's moose. So that's the same thing you've
50 experienced.

1 Thank you, Tom.

2

3 Bob Henrichs.

4

5 MR. HENRICHS: The weather is like this
6 every day here.

7

8 (Laughter)

9

10 MR. HENRICHS: I'm speaking today as
11 President of the Native Village of Eyak. We're the
12 largest tribe in Prince William Sound. And I've also
13 been instrumental in the planting of these moose here.

14

15

16 And Cordova's reputation over the years
17 is they've always been proactive. They've been kind of
18 ahead of the curve compared to other communities.

19

20 In the 1930s the Cordova Chamber of
21 Commerce wanted to see some deer up here, because they
22 didn't have any deer so they -- that was before area
23 fishing, and a lot of the Southeast seine boats came by
24 here and went to False Pass to fish. So they cut a
25 deal with some of these Southeast seiners, and they
26 paid them to haul some deer up here. And those guys
27 got them down there by having dogs chase them into the
28 water, and then they would haul them out of the water,
29 throw them in the fish hold, and when they got them up
30 here, they'd kick them overboard, and that's how this
31 deer herd got started here, because the Cordova Chamber
32 of Commerce wanted to see some deer.

33

34 Well, in the 1950s the Izaak Walton
35 League thought this would be good moose habitat, so
36 they rounded up a few dollars, and got a lot of
37 volunteers. And most of the moose came from kills by
38 the Alaska Railroad. They used to kill a huge amount
39 of moose. And they would scoop up the calves and
40 Mudhole Smith would fly them down here for free, and
41 we'd spend the summer raising them, and then turned
42 them loose. We turned 28 moose loose that started this
43 whole moose herd. And while a lot of people were
44 involved in it, it was people like myself and Paul
45 Jodyck and my sister and other young people that were
46 actually down there shoveling moose manure and feeding
47 moose and hauling milk and doing all this stuff that
48 you do just like with cows, I suppose. But it became
49 very successful.

50

1 And our tribe actually put in the
2 original Federal subsistence moose hunt proposal, and I
3 personally wrote it. And when we put it in, we put in
4 for 10 cows and 10 bulls, and then when they passed it,
5 they passed it for five cows and we were ecstatic that
6 we actually got it in. And it's worked out real well.

7
8 And the subsistence moose hunting is
9 just not putting meat on the table. It's part of the
10 community sharing and working together. A subsistence
11 moose hunter in Cordova is somebody with an old pickup
12 and he gets drawn for a permit, and they go drive that
13 road every day until they find a moose. And then they
14 go get him, and then everybody jumps in and helps him
15 get it to the road.

16
17 One of the unique things I've seen
18 here, because there's a lot of seiners here, if they
19 shoot a moose within 900 feet of the road, they go
20 borrow some purse lines from somebody, and you put a
21 block on one truck and tie it to the moose, run it
22 through there and then you start towing it with the
23 other truck until pretty soon this moose comes dragging
24 along through the brush up to the road. And it's
25 gotten to the point where if it's further than that,
26 people are borrowing two purse lines. And then once
27 you get it to the road, there's always cars coming by,
28 and people just jump out and help you get it into the
29 truck. I've seen -- get enough bodies on some of those
30 moose and they just pick the whole moose up and set
31 them in the back of the truck and head it on into town.

32
33 But, you know, the history of Cordova
34 is they're very proactive. We saw a need for the moose
35 and we went out and we filled that need, and it's
36 worked very well. And with this Federal subsistence
37 hunt, it's a pretty good deal. And I make no apologies
38 to the rest of the State for what we've done here. But
39 I'll challenge them to do the same thing in their own
40 areas.

41
42 Our Tribe is opposed to changing this.

43
44 When we put that Federal hunt in, I
45 actually had a Fish and Game biologist, and it wasn't
46 Crowley, it was some other guy, he came up to me and he
47 said, I don't think you know what you've done here. He
48 said, these people think that they own these moose, and
49 I said, hey, I own these moose. I planted them. He
50 didn't even know I was involved in that.

1 So that's about all I've got.
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Bob. Any
4 questions for Bob.
5
6 (No comments)
7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob, if I remember
9 right from my wife talking about it, the moose were
10 raised right in back in the old post office. Your dad
11 was there. And the kids would stop there on the way
12 back and forth from school, and all that kind of thing.
13 I mean, it was really a community effort to raise those
14 moose to put them out there.
15
16 MR. HENRICHS: It was, and some years
17 they were there, and some years they were down by the
18 old roundhouse. One year they were in Mina Young's
19 barn. They just in different places over the years.
20 And you'd have to, you know, feed them, bring milk to
21 them twice a day, and then put some feed out. And then
22 in the day time you'd let them out and let them browse
23 on the natural browse. And then you'd have to keep the
24 dogs away. But that was a lot of fun. We didn't know
25 we were making history when we did it.
26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Or making conflict.
28
29 MR. HENRICHS: Oh, there's always
30 conflict. That's just part of life.
31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Bob. I
33 think Bill's got a question for you.
34
35 MR. STOCKWELL: Just curiosity. How
36 many years did you bring the calves over here, did
37 Mudhole fly them in?
38
39 MR. HENRICHS: It was probably about
40 seven or eight years in the early 50s. I think '58 was
41 the last year we planted any.
42
43 MR. STOCKWELL: Thank you.
44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Mr.
46 Henrichs.
47
48 (No comments)
49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Well, that

1 seems to conclude our public testimony unless there's
2 somebody else out there that still wishes to testify
3 and wants to quickly put one in.

4

5 (No comments)

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If not, we're going to
8 go on to Council deliberation. And a motion to accept
9 WP08-11 is in order.

10

11 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman. I move
12 to adopt Proposal 08-11.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second.

15

16 MS. WAGGONER: Second.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
19 seconded to adopt WP08-11, and the maker of the motion
20 has the first opportunity to speak to it.

21

22 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah. Mr. Chairman.
23 Well, I've said probably enough on this subject.

24

25 I think there's been overwhelming
26 public testimony that is opposed to this proposal.
27 Both the Native Village, Advisory Committee, and
28 several interested individuals from the community all
29 spoke against it. I think it's pretty evident that
30 there's a very high demand for a majority of these
31 moose to stay in town. And I also think that there's
32 ample opportunity for State residents to hunt in other
33 portions of Unit 6. Almost three-quarters of the
34 remaining unit is available to all residents of the
35 State through registration hunts. So I think by
36 maintaining the level that we have closest to town for
37 subsistence, I still believe that we are not taking way
38 from someone's ability anywhere else in the State to
39 harvest one of these moose through registration tags.

40

41 So that's all I have.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tom. And I
44 think you brought out a point there that I never had
45 considered before. And that is that all of the rest of
46 the hunts are registration hunts. Anybody can register
47 from any place in the State as long as there's moose
48 available. And this is the only drawing hunt in Unit
49 6.

50

1 MR. CARPENTER: That's correct. And,
2 you know, depending on the -- in Bering River there is
3 a five antlerless statewide drawing. I don't believe
4 that's in effect this year, and I don't believe it was
5 in effect last year, but I have drawn that tag a time
6 or two. And most of the time it is Cordovans that draw
7 that tag, but there is ample opportunity throughout the
8 rest of the unit.

9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tom.

11
12 Does the second have anything that
13 they'd like to say to the motion.

14
15 MS. WAGGONER: Yeah. Just kind of
16 going back through this list over here.

17
18 We definitely heard overwhelming
19 evidence from the tribe and community members and the
20 advisory council, that basically the current process is
21 working.

22
23 You know, meeting the demand, you know,
24 900 applicants for 104 Federal permits, probably won't
25 be seen even if you have a 75 -- maintain a 75 moose
26 harvest. But the system is working to provide the most
27 opportunity for the residents of Cordova in this area.

28
29 I question the biological validity of
30 concerns of the population and carrying capacity in
31 setting a set number of permits and not having, you
32 know, a percentage of the allocation. And, you know,
33 at some point if the -- you know, being able to change
34 that regulation for requiring permits.

35
36 But based on testimony that everything
37 works just fine, why would the State want to try and
38 change something that's already, you know, working, so
39 let's not try and fix something that doesn't need
40 fixing.

41
42 So I would be voting in opposition to
43 this proposal.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tricia.
46 Bill.

47
48 MR. STOCKWELL: Thank you, Mr.
49 Chairman. Yeah. I brought up to several people about
50 making part of the thing, the road system that's not in

1 Federal lands part of the cow hunt. There seemed to be
2 no interest in that, so i'll drop that subject.

3

4 The advisory committee and all the
5 testimony has been opposed to this.

6

7 There appears to be -- this is not a
8 conservation issue in any manner. It's strictly an
9 allocation issue.

10

11 And with that, I'm going to be opposed
12 to this proposal. Thank you.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Bill. Mr.
15 Henrichs.

16

17 MR. HENRICHS: Yeah. This -- actually
18 this moose hunting has become part of Cordova's culture
19 that's developed since we planted these moose out here.
20 And like I say, it's not just putting meat on the
21 table, it's the whole thing, you know, people working
22 thing. It brings the people together.

23

24 And I am certainly opposed to this
25 motion.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Mr.
28 Henrichs.

29

30 Doug.

31

32 MR. BLOSSOM: Yeah, Mr. Chair. I want
33 to first apologize to the area. I didn't ask any
34 questions, because I totally agree with the plan you
35 know have.

36

37 So I will be opposing this.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Greg.

40

41 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah. I just want to
42 make a couple comments.

43

44 I'm also going to oppose it. I don't
45 believe that if it's not broke, like Tricia said, we
46 don't need to fix it.

47

48 I'm very passionate about moose
49 hunting. I come from an area in Ninilchik that, you
50 know, we have a very hard time even getting very little

1 locally also. But I see this subsistence working here.
2 I mean, this is a prime example of how I think it
3 should work. And so I'm opposed to the change at this
4 time.

5
6 The only comment I would make is I
7 think Robert should send a few of those cows back to
8 the Kenai.

9
10 (Laughter)

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Greg.
13 Bill.

14
15 MR. STOCKWELL: But I think those cows
16 came from the Railroad system, so they ought to come
17 back to Unit 7. Thank you.

18
19 MR. CARPENTER: Question.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question's been
22 called. All in favor of Proposal WP08-11 signify by
23 saying aye.

24
25 (No aye votes)

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

29
30 IN UNISON: Aye.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion fails
33 unanimously.

34
35 And I think that we can say for sure
36 that while I think there was evidence that it was
37 working in both -- it would work in both directions,
38 that this would have been detrimental to the
39 subsistence needs. And that our decision does not
40 violate principles of -- recognized principles of
41 wildlife conservation. It's actually working.

42
43 So with that, we are going to go on to
44 Proposals 13 and 14. And with this, we'll have our
45 introduction to it.

46
47 MS. WILLIAMS: Good morning, Mr. Chair
48 and members of the Council. I'm Liz Williams with the
49 Office of Subsistence Management.

50

1 And the analysis for Proposals 13 and
2 14 is on Page -- starts on Page 76 in your books.

3
4 And Proposal 13 was submitted by Robert
5 Cyr and Proposal 14 was submitted by Dean Wilson. Both
6 proposals request a change in salvage requirements for
7 brown bear in Unit 11, and for that reason we combined
8 them.

9
10 Federal public lands in Unit 11 are
11 comprised of Wrangell-St. Elias National Park, which is
12 about 65 percent of the unit -- of the Federal lands in
13 the unit, and the preserve, the Wrangell-St. Elias
14 National Preserve, which is 24 percent of the Federal
15 lands, and a very small portion of the Chugach National
16 Forest, which is about 2 percent of the Federal lands
17 in Unit 11. Proposal 13 requests that for the period
18 of August 10th through December 31st only the skull and
19 hide of a brown bear must be salvaged. The proponent
20 states that brown bear meat harvested in fall is not
21 fit for human consumption, and that people don't
22 harvest brown bear under Federal regs, because of the
23 current salvage requirements.

24
25 The proponent states that adoption of
26 this proposal would help raise some numbers of
27 ungulates, which suggests that part of the intent of
28 this proposal might be predator control. If predator
29 control is the intent of the proposal, it falls outside
30 of the purview of the Federal Subsistence Board, but it
31 does fall within the purview of Federal land management
32 agencies as described in the predator management policy
33 adopted by the Federal Subsistence Board in 2004. And
34 I have copies of that policy here with me if you
35 haven't seen it, that basically says the Board can't do
36 anything about predator control, but it's up to the
37 local management agency.

38
39 The other proposal, Proposal 14,
40 requests that only the hide and the skull of a brown
41 bear must be salvaged for the duration of the season.
42 The proponent states that traditionally the local AHTNA
43 people have not harvested brown bear meat for human
44 consumption. The hide and other parts have been
45 traditionally used for clothing, handicrafts, tools,
46 and for making other traditional items.

47
48 Section 803 of ANILCA provides the
49 basis for Federal subsistence regs, and it states that
50 subsistence uses means the customary and traditional

1 uses by rural Alaska residents of wild renewable
2 resources for direct personal or family consumption as
3 food, shelter, clothing, tools or transportation.
4 Harvesting brown bear for use as food, shelter,
5 clothing and tools as suggested by the proponent of
6 Proposal 14 is consistent with ANILCA 803 if the
7 practices are customary and traditional.

8
9 The ethnographic literature and the
10 public testimony we've heard in the past regarding
11 brown bear in Unit 11 point to a variety of uses and
12 beliefs of brown bear throughout the region. Practices
13 and beliefs guiding the harvest of brown bears and the
14 consumption of the meat appear to vary through the
15 AHTNA community. It may depend on your clan. It seems
16 like some people eat bear meat, some people don't. And
17 we also heard some interesting testimony yesterday
18 about another proposal that may be applicable to this
19 one as well.

20
21 None of the ethnographic information or
22 public testimony that we found indicates that the
23 practice of harvesting brown bear only for skull and
24 hides is customary and traditional. This doesn't mean
25 it doesn't exist, but we didn't see it.

26
27 The ethnographic literature and the
28 Southcentral RAC transcripts of the past do indicate
29 that it is customary and traditional for some units --
30 some people of Unit 11 to harvest brown bear and brown
31 bear fat and meat for food, excuse me. And that the
32 non-edible parts of these bears are used to make other
33 items.

34
35 In the past, the Southcentral Council
36 has supported the notion of the full utilization of
37 most animals harvested under subsistence regulations,
38 including the non-edible parts as handicrafts. They
39 have not in the past supported this use for brown bear,
40 mostly black.

41
42 Also when the brown bear handicraft
43 idea started to show up in our meetings in 2002, one of
44 the first ones was to decide if bears should be
45 reclassified as furbearers. And this Council voted
46 against it based on the belief that some of the people
47 who were members of the Council at the time had. And
48 this is on Page 78 in your book, some of the transcript
49 citations, that brown bears should not be the same as
50 furbearers.

1 The Federal season for brown bear in
2 Unit 11 runs from August 10th through June 15th with a
3 harvest limit of one bear. Federal regulations state
4 that if you take brown bear for subsistence, you have
5 to salvage the hide and the edible meat, except in some
6 units, mainly because of the Western Alaska Brown Bear
7 Management Area, you don't have to take the hide
8 because of cultural issues, and sometimes you don't
9 have to take the skull either, because it's customary
10 to leave it in the field. But they're all consistent
11 that you do have to salvage the meat under Federal
12 subsistence regulations.

13

14 The State of Alaska brown bear hunting
15 regulations in Unit 11 are much more liberal than in
16 many areas of the State. In Unit 11, the brown bear
17 hunting season is August 10th through June 15th for
18 both residents and non-residents with a harvest of one
19 brown bear every regulatory year. Brown bear hunters
20 are not required to salvage the meat of bears taken in
21 Unit 11 under State regs, although the skull and the
22 hide need to be sealed within 30 days of the kill.
23 These regulations also apply to Wrangell-St. Elias
24 National Preserve lands, which are 24 percent of the
25 Federal lands in Unit 11.

26

27 It appears that it is a customary and
28 traditional practice in Southcentral Alaska to harvest
29 brown bears throughout the year, and that they were and
30 are harvested for their meat and fat for human
31 consumption, and also for their other parts, but
32 perhaps not solely for hides and skulls. It's likely
33 that in fall brown bear meat may not be considered
34 palatable by some people, although this may depend on
35 whether the bear is harvested in highland or lowland
36 areas. And even though the meat may not be palatable
37 in the fall, for many who eat it, brown bear fat is
38 preferable in the fall.

39

40 So Section 803 is not intended to
41 mandate that people eat everything they harvest.
42 However, the Southcentral RAC transcripts and the
43 ethnographic record don't indicate, at least as we
44 could see, that it was customary or traditional to
45 harvest brown bear only for their skulls and hides in
46 the fall.

47

48 So our OSM preliminary conclusion is to
49 oppose Proposals 13 and 14.

50

1 Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any
4 questions. Bill.

5

6 MR. STOCKWELL: Yeah. I've got a
7 question on the intent of the statute. Do these two
8 proposals violate the intent of ANILCA that for
9 subsistence uses you need to harvest the animal for
10 consumption?

11

12 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman. Larry
13 Buklis, Office of Subsistence Management.

14

15 ANILCA provides for customary and
16 traditional uses. And if those customary and
17 traditional uses of an animal aren't to consume and
18 make use of all parts of the animal, then current
19 practices would be consistent, would allow for that
20 partial use. So ANILCA doesn't mandate that the whole
21 animal is completely used. It requires that customary
22 and traditional uses are provided for. That's why
23 Liz's analysis tries to get at what have been the
24 customary and traditional uses of this animal in this
25 area.

26

27 MR. STOCKWELL: And those are that
28 there was some harvest of meat consistent with the
29 brown bear harvest in this area, correct?

30

31 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, Mr. Stockwell. And
32 the other parts were also used, but it varied among
33 peoples and their beliefs.

34

35 MR. STOCKWELL: Thank you.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Bill.

38

39 Larry, I thought you brought out a good
40 point there that, and we do have subsistence animals
41 that are taken just for their hide. I don't know if
42 anybody eats a wolverine, for example, but in this case
43 here, what we're talking about is our past record that
44 we have established on brown bear is that some people
45 eat it, some people don't eat it, but we are looking at
46 our customary and traditional ideas of what we have
47 seen in the past in Unit 11. Right?

48

49 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, Mr. Chair.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Are there any other
2 questions for her. Ricky.

3
4 MR. GEASE: So I'm just a little
5 confused. Clarification. So customary and
6 traditionally some people eat the meat and then some
7 people didn't, is that what you're saying?

8
9 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes. That's correct.
10 In the transcripts of the past, it sounded like
11 according to whatever clan you're in, you may or may
12 not eat meat. There's one citation where a former
13 Council member, Fred John, talked about his mother was
14 from a clan, I think, where you did eat brown bear
15 meat, and his father was from a clan where you didn't.
16 And not that people are held to what happened in the
17 past, but it seemed like there was quite a lot of
18 deviation and diversity among the local people of this
19 region as to how and what you did with bear.

20
21 MR. GEASE: May I continue or -- so if
22 there's traditionally in the past people have either
23 eaten it or not eaten it, how does enactment of this
24 regulation prevent either of those traditions from
25 continuing?

26
27 MS. WILLIAMS: I don't think the people
28 -- what we found is that we couldn't find anybody that
29 harvested a bear precisely just for the hide, so that's
30 what we were kind of looking for. And that's -- just
31 it's not written doesn't mean that that didn't happen.
32 We're just saying we didn't see that. So the people
33 that maybe harvested bear in the past who didn't eat
34 it, maybe gave it to people who did. I don't know. I
35 kind of leave that to the Council to decide. But I
36 don't think one precludes the other. And we heard
37 testimony yesterday that some people harvested bear
38 hides in the spring.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tricia.

41
42 MS. WAGGONER: If this proposal were to
43 pass, we're basically only talking that it would open
44 up opportunity to only salvage the hide and the skull
45 within the park lands, since the opportunity already
46 exists under State regulation on State/private lands
47 and within the preserve. Is that correct?

48
49 MS. WILLIAMS: I believe so. And it
50 would also -- let's see. Yeah, I believe that's

1 correct.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Can I ask you a
4 question then. Is basically what Tricia is asking is
5 that we would be making a Federal season parallel with
6 the State season that is currently in place, that would
7 allow the subsistence hunter to do the same thing that
8 the State hunter's currently allowed to do, which is
9 just to salvage the skull and the hide?

10

11 MS. WILLIAMS: That's correct.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If I understand right
14 or if I remember right, on brown bear, the state hunter
15 isn't even required to salvage the meat in the spring
16 hunt?

17

18 MS. WILLIAMS: I believe that's correct
19 as well.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But they're not asking
22 that we change the spring hunt for subsistence hunters?

23

24 MS. WILLIAMS: No, Mr. Chair, they are
25 asking for the fall harvest.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All right. Thank you.
28 Tricia.

29

30 MS. WAGGONER: And I may have read this
31 wrong, because to me it was -- so Proposal 13 is
32 requesting August 10th to December 31 for the fall.
33 Proposal 14 says the duration of the season. So 14
34 would basically align the Park land with the.....

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: State regulations.

37

38 MS. WAGGONER: State regulations, yes.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right.

41

42 MS. WILLIAMS: Excuse me, that is
43 correct. I was thinking about one proposal and not the
44 other. Sorry

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, me, too. Thank
47 you, Tricia.

48

49 Any other questions.

50

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: State of Alaska.

4

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

6 The Department does not support these proposals. We
7 believe as has been discussed that the opportunity to
8 harvest brown bears without salvaging the meat outside
9 of Wrangell-St. Elias National Park is currently
10 provided in State regulations. So we don't believe a
11 change is needed to the Federal regulations to
12 accommodate what is being sought in these proposals.
13 Hunters could simply -- they have that same opportunity
14 in the State regulations.

15

16 So for that reason, we just urge
17 hunters who are hunting outside of the national park to
18 hunt under the State regulations.

19

20 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
21 Preliminary Comments to the Regional Advisory Council.

22

23 Wildlife Proposals WP08-13 and 14:

24

25 WP08-13 and 14 liberalize the brown
26 bear salvage requirements in Unit 11.

27

28 Introduction:

29

30 Federal subsistence regulations require
31 that the edible meat of harvested brown bears must be
32 salvaged for human use. These proposals would remove
33 this requirement in Unit 11, either for part of the
34 season, August 10 through December 31, as proposed in
35 WP08-13 or for the entire season, August 10 through
36 June 15, as proposed in WP08-14. The proponents state
37 that brown bears traditionally were not harvested for
38 their meat in this area and that the meat of the brown
39 bears is inedible during the fall when brown bear diet
40 consists primarily of salmon.

41

42 Impact on Subsistence Users:

43

44 Both Federally-qualified and State
45 subsistence users can harvest brown bears on State land
46 and on Federal land outside of Wrangell-St. Elias
47 National Park in Unit 11 under State regulations rom
48 August 10 to June 15 and are not required to salvage
49 the meat. Very few brown bears are harvested in Unit
50 11 under either Federal or State regulations, so an

1 exception to the statewide requirement in the Federal
2 regulations that the edible meat of brown bears be
3 salvaged is unnecessary.

4

5 Opportunity Provided by State:

6

7 State regulations do not require the
8 salvage of meat from brown bears harvested in Unit 11,
9 but the hide and skull must be sealed. The 10 month
10 season and one brown bear per year harvest limit apply
11 to all Federal lands in Unit 11 except for the
12 Wrangell-St. Elias National Park.

13

14 Recommendation:

15

16 Oppose. The Federal subsistence
17 regulations require that the edible meat of brown bears
18 be salvaged in all areas of the state. If Federally-
19 qualified subsistence users want to harvest brown bears
20 and not salvage the edible meat, State regulations
21 provide that opportunity during a long season (August
22 10 to June 15) and with a one brown bear per year bag
23 limit.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Terry. If
26 I can see, the only difference that would be in place
27 if this went through, even if the parts called to be
28 salvaged would be the same as the State, under Federal
29 regulations, these parts would then be available for
30 sale where under State regulations they're not. Am I
31 correct on that?

32

33 MR. HAYNES: That would be true if the
34 proposal to allow the sale of brown bear handicrafts is
35 adopted by the Federal Board for this area.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right. That's what I
38 was wondering. So that would be the base -- if that
39 proposal passed, that would then be the biggest
40 difference between the State regulations, and if this
41 passed as a Federal regulation.

42

43 MR. HAYNES: I believe that's true.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Doug.

46

47 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chair. Terry, if you
48 feel they should eat all the meat of a brown bear, why
49 doesn't the State adopt that regulation, too?

50

1 MR. HAYNES: Through the Chair. The
2 Federal regulations established statewide that the meat
3 of brown bears harvested under the Federal subsistence
4 regulations should be salvaged. The State regulations
5 don't require that. So I'm just saying that the
6 opportunity for rural residents to harvest bears
7 outside of the national park in Unit 11 without
8 salvaging the meat is available under State
9 regulations.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Terry.

12

13 And, Doug, just as a clarification on
14 that, because I know we've gone through it in the Board
15 meeting, and we've gone through it in other places, one
16 of the reasons that the meat of the brown bear had to
17 be salvaged was kind of a precautionary thing to
18 prevent harvesting brown bears for the parts for sale,
19 to prevent, oh, what do you call it, not over-
20 exploitation, but basically the idea of, you know,
21 building a commercial industry around just harvesting
22 the brown bear. And so by having the meat having to be
23 salvaged, that was a precautionary measure to keep the
24 harvest down. But it's not necessary.

25

26 Doug.

27

28 MR. BLOSSOM: Yeah, Mr. Chair. We
29 already voted against doing that, so I don't think that
30 comes into play.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Correct me if I --
33 well, we'll get to that on discussion. I don't think
34 we can ask Terry that one. Okay.

35

36 So any other questions for Terry.

37

38 MS. STICKWAN: A question. So the
39 State regulation says you don't have to harvest the
40 meat. Is that because there's too many bears in Unit
41 11? Is that why that was passed?

42

43 MR. HAYNES: Through the Chair. I
44 don't believe that the State regulations have ever
45 required the harvest -- or required the salvage of brown
46 bear meat generally. There are some subsistence brown
47 bear hunting areas in the State where salvaging the
48 meat is a requirement, I don't know that State
49 regulations have ever required the salvage of brown
50 bear meat in Unit 11.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Terry.
2 Yeah. I was under the impression, too, that like you
3 said, other than some specific subsistence hunts, brown
4 bear meat didn't have to be salvaged any place in the
5 State under State regulations.

6
7 Any other questions for Terry.

8
9 (No comments)

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Terry. Do
12 you have any other comment.

13
14 MR. HAYNES: No. Thank you.

15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Do we have any
17 Federal, State or tribal agency comments on this
18 proposal.

19
20 (No comments)

21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With that,
23 InterAgency Staff Committee comments.

24
25 (No comments)

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: None. Fish and Game
28 Advisory Committee comments. Do we have any? Donald,
29 any Fish and Game Advisory Committee comments?

30
31 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair. There's none.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Summary of
34 written public comments.

35
36 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair. You will find
37 your summary of written public comments starting on
38 Page 81. We received written public comments from
39 AHTNA, and Copper River Native Association, both on 13
40 and 14.

41
42 For Proposal 08-13, AHTNA, Inc. opposes
43 the proposal. And Copper River Native Association
44 opposes Proposal 13.

45
46 And for Proposal 08-14, the Copper
47 River Native Association supported Proposal 14, very
48 few people hunt in Unit 11 due to accessibility and
49 they support Proposal WP08-14. AHTNA, Inc. supports
50 the proposal.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So they
2 basically oppose 13 and supported 14.

3
4 MR. MIKE: That is correct, Mr. Chair.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And the reason was
7 that, if I understand right, is that 13 required the
8 salvage of the meat in the spring season and 14 didn't?

9
10 MR. MIKE: That is correct, Mr. Chair.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. At this
13 point we have public testimony, and I think Mr. Jackson
14 is the only one we have on line for public testimony.

15
16 MR. JACKSON: Good morning. Thank you
17 for allowing me -- my name is Nick Jackson. I'm from
18 Copper Basin area.

19
20 And I just want to have a little input
21 on this proposal that was before you, 13 and 14. You
22 know, I just want to go back a little bit to when I was
23 growing up as to how bear was harvested was during the
24 winter when -- actually the people were out hunting.
25 You know, they'd spot a bear den and they just mark it,
26 and then things were low, meat wise during the winter,
27 they went back and den them. You know, take them by,
28 you know, just chopping a hole in the den and use the
29 ax to, you know, kill them. And that's how they were
30 harvested. They did it when -- during the hard times,
31 you know, when moose wasn't available and so that's how
32 it was harvested.

33
34 But now you don't see that no more.
35 People don't do that no more. And it's not allowed
36 anyway in the Federal, State regulation on denning.

37
38 But black bear they use black bear
39 pretty much because of the fat and the meat. They eat
40 black bear most of them that I know, but brown bear is
41 something that, you know, they just used in a hard time
42 situation, not something that they prefer.

43
44 So that's all I wanted to say. And if
45 you have any questions.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Nick, did they harvest
48 -- in your memory or from what you've heard from other
49 people, did they harvest brown bears strictly for the
50 hides and the ornamentation, or was brown bear like you

1 said just basically taken when times were hard and it
2 was taken for food?

3

4 MR. JACKSON: Yeah, they used the skin,
5 you know, and they used to sell it at one time, and it
6 was harvested just for the skin, but they don't --
7 probably late -- early 40s I guess when they didn't
8 sell it after.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.

11

12 MS. STICKWAN: Do you remember if you
13 heard stories about them using the claws for ornaments?
14 Brown bear? Did the chiefs use those for ornaments?

15

16 MR. JACKSON: No, I haven't seen that
17 as I was growing up then. That's all I can say.

18

19 MS. STICKWAN: Well, have you heard
20 stories about it?

21

22 MR. JACKSON: Well, I heard about it,
23 but I never seen it.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions
26 for Nick. Tom?

27

28 (No comments)

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Nick, thank you muchly
31 for your information, your insights, and the history
32 that comes with it. Good hunting.

33

34 MR. JACKSON: Yeah.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With that, we
37 will go on to Regional Council deliberation,
38 recommendation and justification. And we can either
39 make this as a motion to accept both WP08-13 and 14 or
40 we can make it specific to one. If we make it specific
41 to one, it automatically cancels out the other. So if
42 somebody wants to put a motion on the table at this
43 point in time, we can do some discussion.

44

45 MR. GEASE: I have a question.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Ricky.

48

49 MR. GEASE: Reviewing the public
50 comment, they're the same group of people who were

1 opposed to one and supportive of the other, so is it
2 better to keep them separate or to.....

3

4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, if we on -- if
5 we vote on one and we accept it, that automatically
6 cancels the other. If we vote on one and vote it down,
7 then we'll have to vote down the other one, too. So
8 there's two proposals here. Or we can combine them as
9 one proposal and make an amendment to combine them, you
10 know, to answer the questions that are raised in one
11 and the other. The difference is the requirement to
12 salvage the meat in the spring season versus not having
13 to salvage the meat at all.

14

15 Tom.

16

17 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman. I move
18 to adopt Proposal 08-14.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: There's a motion on
21 the table to adopt WP08-14. Do I hear a second.

22

23 MR. GEASE: Second.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
26 seconded to adopt WP08-14. Discussion. Tom, you made
27 the motion.

28

29 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah. You know, just
30 going through both the proposals, Proposal 08-13, there
31 was no support for that proposal and so the Copper
32 River Native Association and AHTNA both supported
33 Proposal 14.

34

35 The one question I had was I was
36 looking in the general provisions of the Federal
37 subsistence regulations under bears, and correct me if
38 I'm wrong, but this would be the only unit in the State
39 under Federal regulations where you wouldn't have to
40 salvage meat, am I correct? And so we would be setting
41 a little bit of precedent there.

42

43 I thought it was interesting that there
44 were actually -- there were 11 units in the State where
45 you had to harvest the meat, but not the skull or the
46 hide. So, you know, there's quite a bit of difference
47 between Federal and State regulations there.

48

49 So just to bring up that, and I guess
50 I'll wait and hear a little more from Gloria, and maybe

1 she has some discussions that they had.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.

4

5 MS. STICKWAN: What I remember during
6 the meeting when we had the meeting on these proposals
7 was that there was a discussion on mainly that there
8 was hardly any moose and calves. The calves this year
9 are being taken by bears, and there's no predator
10 control allowed in the unit under Federal management.
11 And so that's why they supported it. Because the
12 caribou and the moose calves are really low over there,
13 and the Mentasta herd over there is in the hundreds, I
14 think 300, and so that's why they supported only
15 salvage, because they're concerned that there's no
16 predator control and it can't be allowed under Federal
17 management. And that's why they supported 14.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Gloria.

20 Doug.

21

22 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chair. Could I
23 please have Liz Williams sit up here and I could ask
24 her a question? Yeah. Mr. Chair.

25

26 Liz, on Page 81 where they gave the
27 support -- reasons for this No. 14, as I heard you say
28 it, we have no authority to do it for predator control?

29

30 MS. WILLIAMS: That's out of the
31 Federal Subsistence Board's jurisdiction, yes.

32

33 MR. BLOSSOM: Well, Mr. Chair, I think
34 we have to consider it as eating the meat or not and
35 not -- even though I agree that I wish we could do
36 predator control, we can't. So we need to be careful
37 there.

38

39 Thank you.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Doug. Ken.

42

43 MR. LORD: Mr. Chair. Ken Lord with
44 the Solicitor's Office. Just a slight clarification.
45 The Board has a policy of not doing predator control,
46 which is a little different than saying it's out of its
47 jurisdiction. Its policy is that it will leave
48 predator control decisions to the managing agencies and
49 to the State.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.

2

3 MS. STICKWAN: I was just wanted to
4 repeat what Nick Jackson said, that brown bear was used
5 only when starvation occurred, that normally, you know,
6 they didn't really take brown bear. I think they used
7 more black bear than brown bear. I believe that's what
8 Nick was saying. So historically, you know, we didn't
9 bother brown bears, because it was -- they had great
10 respect for it. And we're not even supposed to be
11 talking about it, especially me, since women weren't
12 supposed to talk about brown bear.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Tom.

15

16 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah. I guess just to
17 get back to something that is part of Doug's question
18 and maybe something that Ken said. Even though the
19 Board doesn't have a policy of dealing with predator
20 control, I believe the national parks have a -- is it a
21 nationwide policy of not accepting predator control
22 management within park boundaries? So even if we were
23 to try and consider it for that reason, it wouldn't
24 apply to hard park?

25

26 MS. CELLARIUS: Mr. Chair. Mr.
27 Carpenter. Barbara Cellarius, Wrangell-St. Elias
28 National Park and Preserve. And that is correct, that
29 in our national management policies, we've got a policy
30 of not doing predator control on Park Service managed
31 land, and not allowing others to do it.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Barbara.

34 Any questions for Barbara. Tricia.

35

36 MS. WAGGONER: Actually I think this
37 might be for Ken. I was under the an understanding
38 that the State manages the resource and the Federal
39 subsistence program manages the allocations, the
40 methods and means. And I think somewhere along there,
41 there's kind of distinction, so if it's predator
42 control or -- you know, that that's more in the State's
43 purview than this Council's purview.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think Ken would
46 probably agree with you in that, but I'm not positive.

47

48 MR. LORD: No. In fact the managing
49 agencies, the Federal land managing agencies do conduct
50 -- or do make predator control decisions all the time.

1 It is within the purview of the Federal Government to
2 conduct predator control of Federal public lands. It's
3 just that the Board has made a decision that it would
4 better for the agencies to make those decisions.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tricia.

7
8 Bill, do you want to ask him something?

9
10 MR. STOCKWELL: Yes. And to follow
11 that along, those agencies would not deal with
12 proposals through the subsistence system for predator
13 control on Federal lands, correct?

14
15 MR. LORD: That is correct.

16
17 MR. STOCKWELL: Thank you.

18
19 MR. LORD: They would have to go
20 directly to the agency.

21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Ricky.

23
24 MR. GEASE: Just a clarification. On
25 non-subsistence -- are there any non-subsistence hunts
26 on national park lands elsewhere in the country? Just
27 here. Okay. And then the only hunts here are for
28 subsistence?

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The only hunts on --
31 and correct me if I'm wrong on this, Barbara, but the
32 only hunts on national park land are subsistence hunts,
33 but on national park preserve lands, there are sport
34 hunts that are open to other people?

35
36 MS. CELLARIUS: That's correct in
37 Alaska. For the Lower 48 I shouldn't speak, because
38 I'm not entirely sure. They don't have subsistence in
39 the Lower 48. I think there are a few cases where
40 there may be a harvest when you have a surplus. But
41 it's not something I really know about, so we should
42 just talk about Alaska from that standpoint. And in
43 Alaska, it's only subsistence on what's designated as
44 national park.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: As national park.
47 Okay.

48
49 MR. GEASE: Further clarification then.
50 On those people who can go hunting outside of

1 subsistence purposes on the preserve, what are their
2 requirements? Are there requirements to salvage meat,
3 hides, skulls? What are the requirements? Are there
4 any?

5
6 MR. CARPENTER: State regulations.

7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: State regulations,
9 Ricky.

10
11 MR. GEASE: Okay. And those State
12 regulations say that there are no requirements then,
13 right?

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Just the skull and the
16 hide.

17
18 MR. GEASE: Okay. Thank you.

19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Liz, you've got
21 something more to add?

22
23 MS. WILLIAMS: For brown bear.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: For brown bear.

26
27 MS. WILLIAMS: I was just going to let
28 the Council know that I have copies of the Board's
29 predator control policy if anybody wants it.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: One more?

32
33 MR. GEASE: The State hunts on preserve
34 lands, were those set up in guise of predator control,
35 or are they just regular hunts that people can do, go
36 shoot a brown bear, and you only have to take the hide
37 and the skull.

38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right.

40
41 MR. GEASE: Okay. And that has nothing
42 to do with predator control?

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No.

45
46 MR. GEASE: Thank you.

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think Gloria brought
49 up -- I'll just make a comment. I think two things
50 that have been brought up. I think Gloria brought out

1 one of the things that's always been a consideration of
2 this Council every time we've got talking about brown
3 bear. And that's matter of respect and the various
4 cultural aspects that are in Unit 11 and 13 amongst
5 communities up there. And that's always been one of
6 the things that's come up every time we've discussed
7 handicrafts on brown bear is the fact that different
8 groups of people up there have different levels of
9 respect for them, but all of them seem to have
10 respected the brown bear, and nobody wanted to promote
11 any kind of wasteful practices.

12
13 And as far as a hunt that has -- I'll
14 tell you right now the fact predation control was even
15 mentioned in connection with this proposal will
16 automatically mean -- I'll give it 99 percent chance,
17 that the Board will turn the proposal down. The Board
18 has had a policy, if it's predator control under the
19 guise of subsistence, not to accept the proposal. And
20 I'm afraid that that's what we would run into here.
21 But it still doesn't mean that we don't have -- that we
22 can't put it forward if we feel like it should be put
23 forward.

24
25 Tricia.

26
27 MS. WAGGONER: Are there any other
28 subsistence areas in Alaska where brown bear meat is
29 not required to be salvaged?

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No. Tom.

32
33 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah. Mr. Chairman. I
34 think you're right. I think if we were going to
35 support this proposal, we were need to stress that we
36 are supporting the proposal based on the fact that
37 AHTNA people traditionally haven't harvested the brown
38 bear meat, because I don't think we can't support it
39 based on solely on the fact that it's to be used as a
40 matter of predator control, because I think you're
41 right. I don't think it has much chance of being
42 passed. So if we are going to support it, I think we
43 need to supply the facts on the record as to why we're
44 going to support it, and I guess I'm looking for those
45 answer right now.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Showalter.

48
49 MR. SHOWALTER: Yes. The way I read
50 this, this Proposal 14 isn't in there for predator

1 control. It's an informational item on there, and it
2 says in addition and due to. So the way I read it,
3 it's -- if you just salvage the hide and skulls, and
4 that isn't for predator control. So that -- to me
5 that's just an informational item in there.

6

7 Thank you.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Ricky.

10

11 MR. GEASE: Do we have any numbers of
12 the number of qualified subsistence users in Unit 11
13 who have taken bears in the Preserve portion of it
14 under State regulations?

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I don't think we have.
17 I would doubt if the State would have that available at
18 this point in time. It could probably be gotten.

19

20 MR. GEASE: Do we have numbers on the
21 number of bears taken in the preserve portions of the
22 park?

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, in preserve
25 portions of the park. I'm sure the State does. Terry,
26 do you have any information on that?

27

28 MR. HAYNES: Through the Chair. I
29 don't have that information with me, but my
30 understanding is that the brown bear harvest in Unit 11
31 are very low.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Extremely low.

34

35 MR. HAYNES: And I don't have those
36 numbers. We could certainly get them at some point
37 today, but I remember looking at that information in
38 the past and there just isn't much brown bear harvest
39 at all.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's an extremely low
42 number, Ricky. It's not a very -- there's not very
43 many guides operating in there that go after brown
44 bear. And there's just not very many locals that --
45 you know, it's a few a year and that's about it.

46

47 MR. GEASE: So my question would be, is
48 if this regulation passed, would there be a
49 conservation concern on brown bears?

50

1 MR. HAYNES: No, I don't believe so. I
2 just -- we just don't think it's unnecessary to do this
3 in the Federal regulations. If there was an issue
4 about brown bear hunting in the park, where I imagine
5 there are even brown bears being taken in the hard park
6 portion of Unit 11. But the current State regulations
7 provide what the proponent is seeking outside of the
8 hard park lands in Unit 11. So we just say why create
9 an unnecessary duplicate regulation.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So, Terry, the only
12 conservation concern would be is if this would promote
13 hunting brown bears simply for handicraft purposes.
14 And the only place that -- if that was an issue, the
15 only place that would have the potential to increase
16 the harvest would be in the hard park proper which has
17 basically a negligible take on brown bears at this
18 point in time?

19

20 MR. HAYNES: Yes.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bill.

23

24 MR. STOCKWELL: Thank you, Mr.
25 Chairman. I was looking at Fred John's testimony
26 that's on Page 78, and there it pretty much indicates
27 that bears were eaten, and like he says, they're not
28 rabbits and squirrels, so people shouldn't just be
29 salvaging the hides off of them.

30

31 And also, on the written public
32 testimony, both the Copper River Native and AHTNA talk
33 about predator control, and whether that's their main
34 point not, I can't figure out from the working that's
35 here, but it's definitely there for everybody to see.
36 And, as you said, predator control is not something the
37 Board wants to deal with as subsistence.

38

39 So I think with those things, that I'll
40 be opposing this proposal.

41

42 Thank you.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other discussion.

45 Tom.

46

47 MR. CARPENTER: I guess I was reading
48 that on Page 78, too, what Mr. John said. and I guess
49 maybe I just need a little clarification. In Dean's
50 proposal, he wants the hide and skull of the brown bear

1 to be salvaged, and it says for the duration of the
2 season. So does that mean that he wants the entire
3 year for no salvage, or just -- so he was including
4 that with what the previous proposal -- okay. I see.

5
6 And I guess what I was trying to get
7 at, was, you know, it appears to me, I mean, Mr.
8 Jackson spoke about the need in lean years for bears to
9 be eaten in the spring time. Right here on Page 78 Mr.
10 John describes local practices. The first three words
11 are we eat bear. Those that eat bear probably just eat
12 them in the springtime. And a lot of that is, you
13 know, everybody that lives around places where there's
14 fish and bears knows that the falltime and brown bears
15 are little iffy. I mean, I personally have never eaten
16 a falltime bear, but I've sure smelled one, and they
17 aren't the most appetizing things in the world.

18
19 So, I mean, to -- and I guess I'm
20 curious to hear maybe what Gloria has to say, but could
21 we -- to be somewhat consistent with subsistence and
22 somewhat consistent with some of the people that have
23 testified here and in this.

24
25 Would an amendment be appropriate that
26 the meat be required to be harvested in the springtime
27 but not in the falltime, and would that be something
28 that would be okay with the people of the region or do
29 you think that it's just totally inappropriate? And do
30 you think that that is absolutely what Dean was not
31 trying to get at? I guess I'm just trying to -- so I'm
32 looking for a comment there, I guess.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria, do you have
35 any comment on that one.

36
37 MS. STICKWAN: You heard Nick said they
38 -- in the springtime is when they want nutritionally,
39 and I would go along with that. But I don't know if it
40 still wouldn't pass with the Board, you know, just
41 because it's -- but I would go along with that.

42
43 MR. CARPENTER: I guess just to follow
44 up, Mr. Chairman, I guess I'm trying to look at the
45 idea that we would completely eliminate the salvage of
46 the meat would be a statewide precedent. And I think
47 when you take proposals in front of the Board, they're
48 going to look at those with a little more scrutiny,
49 because it is a first time event. I think we'd need to
50 completely eliminate the idea, or the thought of

1 predator control in our analysis. But I do think that
2 this would satisfy the people in the falltime when
3 they're out in moose camp or wherever, that if they did
4 harvest a bear, a brown bear in the fall under
5 subsistence regulations, that they wouldn't have to
6 harvest the meat then. But if they wanted to go out in
7 the spring, they would still have the ability to still
8 do it, because it would be required. So I guess I
9 would have to figure out what the dates are exactly in
10 the book here, but I guess an amendment would be
11 possible to move this along.

12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Terry, can I ask you a
14 question. Tom brought up a good point there and that
15 was the taking of a subsistence hunter of a brown bear
16 while out moose hunting in the fall. In Unit 11 that's
17 currently allowed under State regulations, but is a tag
18 required in Unit 11? Do you have to pre-buy a tag to
19 take a bear in Unit 11 so that if you were out moose
20 hunting and one came into your camp and you took it,
21 you'd be required as a subsistence hunter to salvage
22 the meat, or could you take it under State regulations
23 and just salvage the hide and the skull and not be
24 required to have thought of it ahead of time had have
25 tag?

26
27 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. No resident
28 tag is required for brown bear hunting in Unit 11. And
29 if a hunter wants to salvage the meat under the State
30 regulations, the hunter's free to do so. Not required
31 to.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Not required to. So
34 basically the opportunity to take a bear if a bear
35 presented itself in your moose camp or your back yard
36 or your fish camp or something like that, is available
37 under State regulations, and the availability of just
38 salvaging the hide and the skull is available.

39
40 MR. HAYNES: That's correct, Mr.
41 Chairman.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

44
45 MS. STICKWAN: I have a question.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.

48
49 MS. STICKWAN: Not for him.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Not for him? Okay.
2
3 Sorry. Thank you, Terry. That was my
4 impression, too, so I just wanted to make sure on that
5 one.
6
7 Gloria. Gloria first.
8
9 MS. STICKWAN: So what Tom's proposing,
10 that would pass by the Federal Board then? Would it be
11 okay not to salvage the meat during -- what's the
12 proposal?
13
14 MR. CARPENTER: During the fall.
15
16 MS. STICKWAN: During the fall.
17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Tom would
19 basically be aligning himself with Proposal WP08-13,
20 which would be to say that in fall you didn't have to
21 salvage the meat.
22
23 MS. STICKWAN: I'm just wondering what
24 the Board would do that. That is what I'm wondering.
25
26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I myself personally
27 think that the Board would vote it down simply because
28 of the fact that there's no place else in the State
29 that doesn't have to salvage brown bear meat on a
30 subsistence hunt.
31
32 MS. STICKWAN: But I heard them just
33 say that if you didn't, because it's a non-traditional
34 use, that they would go along with that. That's what I
35 understand, if that's the way it was used. And we only
36 used it during starvation, and it had to be used.
37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's possible that the
39 Board would go along with that.
40
41 MS. STICKWAN: Well, that's my question
42 for the Federal people.
43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that's why if we
45 pass this and take it on to the Board.....
46
47 MS. STICKWAN: Could we ask them?
48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:it's their
50 responsibility to make.....

1 MS. STICKWAN: Can we ask them?
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Can we ask them? You
4 can't ask them ahead of time.
5
6 MR. CARPENTER: No, she means.....
7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, yeah. Larry,
9 year.
10
11 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman Larry
12 Buklis, OSM.
13
14 I would just note that the proposal as
15 submitted by Mr. Wilson doesn't reference predator as a
16 purpose for the proposal. I think you're seeing it in
17 comments on the proposal. How the Board and other
18 public commenters at the Board meeting would
19 characterize the proposal and its intent is beyond our
20 control, but the proponent isn't saying it's for
21 predator control. He is not saying it is for that.
22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right. Tom.
24
25 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah. I think that's
26 -- number 1, that's why I moved to adopt Proposal 14,
27 because I agree with the language more in Proposal 13,
28 he does talk about in his description of why he wants
29 this regulation changed that if it would increase the
30 ungulate population, which in my mind is predator
31 control disguised.
32
33 But I guess getting back to what I was
34 talking about before, although under State regulation
35 you don't need a tag in Unit 11 in the preserve, you
36 could harvest a brown bear without purchasing a tag and
37 without salvaging the meat. That doesn't apply to
38 people in the hard park. And a lot of these people
39 that live up here are hunting in the hard park. And I
40 don't know how many bears up there get harvested in the
41 hard park, but if a guy like Dean is sheep hunting, and
42 he goes way back in there, if he harvests a Dall sheep
43 is on his way out, and he sees this wonderful bear and
44 he wants to harvest it, under Federal regulations, he'd
45 have to haul the meat out of that bear, too. So I'm
46 not sure what his intent is, but I think that during
47 the fall season when he was sheep hunting, if he did
48 harvest a sheep and was coming out, he could
49 potentially harvest that brown bear and not have to
50 salvage that meat, because it was the falltime. So I

1 do think that it is something that the Board would
2 consider based on that principle and that principle
3 alone. So that's where I was actually getting at. I
4 was looking at more of the people in the hard Park that
5 live up in Unit 11 versus everybody else.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, does anybody
8 wish to offer an amendment to this proposal that we
9 have on the table at this point in time, or any further
10 discussion on it.

11

12 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah. Mr. Chairman.
13 I'd offer up an amendment to Proposal 14 that would
14 require that the hide and
15 skull of a brown bear be salvaged year-round, and that
16 the meat of the brown bear from August 10th to December
17 31st, that it must not be salvaged during that period
18 of time.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It does not have to.

21

22 MR. CARPENTER: Does not have to be
23 salvaged during that period of time.

24

25 MR. GEASE: I'll second.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So basically we
28 have motion on the table that aligns Proposal 14 with
29 Proposal 13. So if we handle it, we'll be handling
30 both proposals at the same time. We have a first,
31 second. Would you like to speak to your motion.

32

33 MR. CARPENTER: And I think I amended
34 Proposal 13 based on what I said earlier, that in
35 Proposal 14 there was no talk of enhancing the ungulate
36 population, and in Proposal 13 there is. So I think we
37 are addressing the individuals that have the ability in
38 Unit 11 and 12 to hunt in the hard park, to when
39 they're in moose camp or up sheep hunting or up goat
40 hunting in the fall, that they would be able to harvest
41 a brown bear without having to salvage the meat, but in
42 the springtime when it has been traditionally -- the
43 meat has been traditionally used from a brown, as said
44 by Mr. Jackson and Mr. John in testimony, that the meat
45 of the brown bear would have to be salvaged when it's
46 sweeter. So that's why I made the amendment.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The second concurs.

49

50 MR. GEASE: I concur.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any more discussion on
2 the amendment. Bill.

3
4 MR. STOCKWELL: Did I hear wrong, or
5 did the lady from the Park Service say that in the
6 parks you're required to harvest the meat as part of
7 the park regulation?

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No.

10
11 MS. CELLARIUS: (Shakes head no)

12
13 MR. STOCKWELL: Okay.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Any other
16 discussion on the amendment. Gloria.

17
18 MS. STICKWAN: I think it goes along
19 with our C&T, the way we used bear traditionally, and
20 it's not going to be detrimental to area, since there's
21 hardly any people hunting brown bear anyway.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All in favor of the
24 amendment -- the question's available if somebody wants
25 to call it. My fault. I can't call the question.

26
27 MR. ENCELEWSKI: I'll call the
28 question.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question's been
31 called. All in favor of the amendment signify by
32 saying aye.

33
34 IN UNISON: Aye.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
37 saying nay.

38
39 (No opposing votes)

40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries
42 unanimously. Do we have any further discussion on the
43 motion. Tricia. As amended.

44
45 MS. WAGGONER: As amended. I think
46 we're sending a mixed message as a Council. We -- as a
47 Council, this Council opposed the sale of handicrafts
48 and basically said that it was not customary and
49 traditional to utilize brown bear fur in Unit 11 for
50 handicrafts. And now we're turning around and sending

1 the message that traditionally it's customary and
2 traditional to not salvage the meat, but salvage the
3 fur. And I'm looking for justification of that
4 opposing viewpoint of the two proposals and this
5 Council's view point.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tricia.
8 Doug.

9

10 MR. BLOSSOM: Yeah. Mr. Chair. The
11 problem I have is right here in the book. We had our
12 history people tell us that it's only used for meat,
13 you know, and the other parts. It's never separated.
14 And so it says that ethnographic sources indicate that
15 the brown bear were and are traditional food items for
16 their meat and fat, and it talks about here that they
17 weren't used for the other purpose. So how do you
18 convince the Board that we go along with that. So
19 until I can hear someone give me a good reason why we
20 need to change our opinion, I'm still going to say
21 we've got to eat the meat.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Doug. Mr.
24 Jackson did testify that at least prior to 1940 brown
25 bear hides were taken and sold, so.....

26

27 MR. BLOSSOM: But they ate the meat.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But I didn't hear that
30 exactly that they ate the meat on the ones that they
31 took for sale. But that was my impression. I have the
32 same problem Tricia has. We've discussed brown bear
33 time and time before in this Council, and we've been
34 very conservative on it. And we've recognized that you
35 don't just take a brown bear for handicrafts. We've
36 supported the idea that you take it for meat and
37 handicrafts like the law is in the rest of the State.
38 And I would have real difficulty with this proposal,
39 and as the Chair I would probably abstain.

40

41 Tom.

42

43 MR. CARPENTER: Well, I would like to
44 defend my amendment to the proposal. I think it's very
45 consistent with what we've done in the past, and I
46 think it's very consistent with the public testimony
47 that we've heard. First of all, we -- this Council has
48 disapproved of brown bear and using the parts for
49 handicrafts for sale. For sale. Not for personal use,
50 for sale. It's also been very consistent that people

1 have testified before this Council, and it's in the
2 Staff analysis here, quoted by Mr. John several time,
3 first of all, that bear is typically eaten in the
4 spring by people in this area. If you go to another
5 paragraph where it says, at the meeting Mr. John also
6 noted that in his culture that we used to use bear skin
7 for dances when we'd go to other villages.

8
9 So I do think there is evidence that
10 the bear parts were used for personal reasons or
11 between members of the tribe, not necessarily for sale,
12 which is consistent with what we've said. And I also
13 feel that it's consistent that the bear meat has
14 typically and traditionally been harvested in the
15 springtime.

16
17 So that's my defense.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tom. Bill.

20
21 MR. STOCKWELL: Yeah. I'm going to
22 rebut that. I have the same problem that Doug has, me
23 and Tricia, that we're kind of contradicting ourselves.
24 Except in the park itself, there's ample opportunity
25 for people to take the bear using State regulations if
26 the just want to take the hide in the fall. And where
27 there's no permit required, so all you need is your
28 general hunting license, which a person would have
29 under subsistence anyhow.

30
31 And there's the issue of going before
32 the Board with something new that's not in any other
33 unit anywhere in the State.

34
35 And there's still like -- I don't care
36 whether it's not in the proposal, but it's going to be
37 in the record that there's still a discussion of
38 predator control within the issue.

39
40 So with that, I'd have a real difficult
41 time supporting this proposal. I'll be opposed to it.
42 Thank you.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tricia first and then
45 Gloria.

46
47 MS. WAGGONER: I would ask the Board to
48 take note that Proposal 12 was -- the proposal was
49 regulations can be used to make handicrafts for
50 personal use or sale. So right now, the way I read it,

1 it's not -- you know, since that's not -- I don't even
2 know if they can make handicrafts from the bear. If
3 it's legal.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.

6

7 MS. STICKWAN: Well, earlier you said
8 something about wolverine. They said something about
9 wolverine not being used for meat. Couldn't that same
10 principle be applied here, and disallowed under
11 Federal, not to use the meat of wolverine, but take it,
12 and couldn't that same principle be used for bear? Or
13 is that different? A different regulation that --
14 that's my question for the Federal Government, somebody
15 from Federal management.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It definitely can be
18 applied for it, because it's just that if we can show
19 that it was customarily and traditionally taken just
20 simply for the hide like the wolverine was, and wasn't
21 eaten, you know, then it would definitely be
22 applicable.

23

24 MS. STICKWAN: Well, I heard Nick say
25 that it was used only when it was absolutely needed to,
26 that they didn't use it for mean, brown bear, because
27 they had respect for it. It was customary to use it
28 when people starting, when they absolutely had to have
29 meat. It wasn't traditionally used. And that's one of
30 the criteria under -- well, it's not criteria, but it's
31 C&T uses, and that should be taken into consideration
32 as well as the, you know, the meat salvage part.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Ricky.

35

36 MR. GEASE: As the second for the
37 amendment and the motion, I'm going to speak in defense
38 of it. In terms of -- it does seem to me that there
39 were customary and traditional uses of the fur and the
40 skull, and it doesn't seem like it's been traditional
41 to eat the meat the fall. I don't know, most people
42 are not salvaging the meat in the fall or using it for
43 food. So I would agree with Tom's comments in terms of
44 your hunting in the fall and you did come across an
45 animal that you would like to take for personal use or
46 trade, but not for sale, but there are other uses
47 besides sale for parts of brown bear besides the meat,
48 and I would think that that.....

49

50 The other point being is that you can

1 do that in the preserve, on the State lands, but not on
2 the park lands, and this would extend that regulation
3 onto the park lands for qualified subsistence users,
4 and not anybody qualified for State regulations.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So basically this
7 would extend the opportunity for qualified subsistence
8 users.

9
10 MR. GEASE: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)

11
12 MR. CARPENTER: Yes.

13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Gloria.

15
16 MS. STICKWAN: I don't see us setting a
17 precedent here. We're just apply one C&T rather than
18 the salvage. We're not really saying we're going
19 against salvage, we're just saying that we're applying
20 the C&T more than the salvage requirement. I don't see
21 us setting a precedent.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Tom

24
25 MR. CARPENTER: Just one more question.
26 Or one more statement I guess. I mean, I had the same
27 concern when I looked at the regulations, and there was
28 nowhere else in the State that didn't require the
29 harvest of the meat. So I was worried about setting a
30 precedent I guess and having the Board look upon it as
31 a bad position.

32
33 But I think this Council's been kind of
34 proactive in the past, and if we felt that within a
35 region itself, or within a community or a group of
36 communities that something was important to them, and
37 that is the way that they traditionally have done
38 things, I think the Board has shown to this Council
39 that it is willing to support us.

40
41 And I use the example of the designated
42 hunter provision under the Federal system that
43 currently statewide you are allowed to harvest more
44 than one animal at a time, except for Unit 6 moose,
45 goats, black bear and beaver, in which we specifically
46 asked the Council to set precedence, because that is
47 what the people of this community wanted. And I think
48 they backed us up, and they showed that they are
49 willing to do that, if we could prove to them that it
50 was something that the people of the area wanted.

1 So I do think that this is something
2 that this is something that the Board will consider,
3 and I think we are extending opportunity to the people
4 that have the ability to hunt in the hard park, a
5 greater ability to harvest bears without having to
6 harvest the meat in the falltime when they are
7 concentrating their subsistence activities on other
8 species.

9
10 And I do disagree with Bill, that I
11 don't think that this proposal speaks anything to the
12 idea of predator control. I think the comments that
13 were sent in maybe used the idea, but I don't think
14 that the proposal as written mentions it anywhere. I
15 think the previous proposal, Proposal 13 is the one
16 that speaks to ungulate enhancement. So I don't think
17 that the Board would take that into consideration.

18
19 So anyway, I'm not sure what the votes
20 going to be here, but if there's no further discussion,
21 I'd call the question.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I only have one
24 comment, Tom, and that is we've heard from the State
25 that this is no conservation concern item either, so
26 that the amount of bears involved are not a
27 conservation concern either in the park or out of the
28 park.

29
30 So with that, the question's been
31 called. If there's no further discussion that somebody
32 wants to give.

33
34 (No comments)

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. The question's
37 been called. All in favor of the proposal signify by
38 saying aye.

39
40 IN UNISON: Aye.

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

44
45 MR. BLOSSOM: nay

46
47 MS. WAGGONER: nay

48
49 MR. STOCKWELL: nay

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have to have a
2 show of hands? Nays.
3
4 (Show of hands)
5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Ayes.
7
8 (Show of hands)
9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries with
11 one abstention. As I said before, as the Chair, I will
12 abstain on that one there, and I will present the
13 Council's recommendation to the best of my ability.
14
15 And at this point in time, if there's
16 anybody that's on the nay side that would like to
17 register a minority opinion with Donald, that would be
18 totally acceptable. Does anybody have a minority
19 opinion.
20
21 MR. STOCKWELL: I've already stated my
22 minority opinion. I think it's on the record.
23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's in the record.
25 Tricia.
26
27 MS. WAGGONER: Yeah. I just -- again
28 while I totally agree with the concept, I still feel
29 this Council is sending a mixed message, and that on
30 Federal lands within Unit 11 that we continue to
31 mandate full utilization of the animal.
32
33 Thank you.
34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tricia.
36 Doug.
37
38 MR. BLOSSOM: Yeah. Mr. Chair. Just
39 one short comment I made earlier is that I think if we
40 pass this, which you did, then we should have revisited
41 No. 12 as to how we voted on it. But anyway, I hope it
42 goes, but I'm afraid the Board's going to shoot it
43 down.
44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Than you muchly, Doug.
46 Okay. With that, we're going to go on to Proposal
47 WP08-15.
48
49 And I don't know about anybody else,
50 but I would use -- that clock can't be right. Is it 20

1 to 12 right now?

2

3 MR. CARPENTER: Yes.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I could use a five-
6 minute break at this point in time if I'm the first
7 back in line back there.

8

9 (Laughter)

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And then we'll be back
12 and we'll try to get WP08-15 done before lunch time.

13

14 (Off record)

15

16 (On record)

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'd like to call this
19 spring meeting of the Southcentral Federal Regional
20 Subsistence Advisory Council back into session. And in
21 deference to Cooper Landing which we told we would take
22 theirs after we took No. 11, we're going to go to WP08-
23 22a, which you'll find on Page 126. And at this time
24 we'll have our introduction to the proposal and our
25 analysis.

26

27 MS. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
28 My name is Helen Armstrong from the Office of
29 Subsistence Management.

30

31 Proposal WP08-22a begins on Page 127.
32 And it was submitted by Karl W. J. Romig and requests a
33 positive customary and traditional use determination
34 for residents of Cooper Landing for moose in Units 7,
35 15A and 15B. The proposal also requested seasons and
36 harvest limits which are analyzed in the analysis for
37 Proposal WP08-22b which will follow the analysis for
38 22a.

39

40 The existing regulations for C&T are
41 that for Unit 7 moose, that portion draining into Kings
42 Bay, there's a C&T determination for residents of
43 Chenega Bay and Tatitlek. For Unit 7 remainder,
44 there's no Federal subsistence priority, so no one has
45 C&T. For Unit 15, it's rural residents of Ninilchik,
46 Nanwalek, Port Graham and Seldovia. That's all of Unit
47 15.

48

49 The proposal then would be that Unit 7
50 would say rural residents of Cooper Landing. And then

1 Unit 15 would be divided into Unit 15A and B, rural
2 residents of Cooper Landing, Ninilchik, Nanwalek, Port
3 Graham and Seldovia. And for Unit 15C, there would be
4 no change, only residents of Ninilchik, Nanwalek, Port
5 Graham and Seldovia.

6

7 And I want to make a note here, it's
8 also in the analysis, but if you had your proposal book
9 and you were looking at that, in the proposal book it
10 actually says 15A, B and C. And we contacted the
11 proponent and he did not intend for it to be all of 15.
12 There was a little bit of confusion in how it was
13 written. And that it was only for 15A and 15B.

14

15 A little bit of regulatory history.
16 I'm not going to go in all the details, but when the
17 Federal Subsistence Management Program was established
18 in 1990, the State C&T determinations were adopted.
19 And at that time the State recognized the communities
20 of Nanwalek and Port Graham as having customary and
21 traditional use of moose in an area in the extreme
22 southwest unit of 15C, but the road-connected portion
23 of the Kenai Peninsula, which is most of Unit 7 and 15
24 was determined by the State to be a non-subsistence
25 area. So as a result, when the Federal program adopted
26 the C&T, Units 7, 15A and 15B had a no subsistence
27 determination for moose.

28

29 In July of 1995 the Federal Subsistence
30 Board made a positive customary and traditional use
31 determination for moose for Unit 15 for residents of
32 Port Graham, Nanwalek, Seldovia and Ninilchik, but the
33 Board deferred making customary and traditional use
34 determinations for Hope and Cooper Landing.

35

36 Then in May of 1996, after a Federal
37 process of a lot of data gathering, public hearings,
38 some court decisions, the Board made the customary and
39 traditional use determinations again for Unit 15 for
40 Nanwalek, Ninilchik, Port Graham and Seldovia. And
41 then decided again to defer the decisions for the rest
42 of the Kenai Peninsula until rural determinations were
43 made.

44

45 The Board then addressed C&T
46 determinations for moose in Unit 15 again in 2003, but
47 again deferred making them until the completion of a
48 report by the Institute for the Social and Economic
49 Research on rural determination methodology and the
50 subsequent review of rural determinations as required

1 by regulation on a 10-year basis. So that was in 2003.

2

3 In 2006 the Board made its final rural
4 determinations in 2006, but it has not yet considered
5 the deferred issues that have been deferred since 1996.

6

7

8 Through this proposal, the customary
9 and traditional use determinations status on Cooper
10 Landing is being addressed.

11

12 As you all know, Cooper Landing is a
13 small, unincorporated community within the Kenai
14 Peninsula Borough with an estimated permanent year
15 around population of 357 in 2006. I'm not going to go
16 through all the history of Cooper Landing. It is in
17 the analysis, but I'll just -- suffice it to say that
18 Russian explorers from the Russian America Company in
19 search of gold were the first non-indigenous people to
20 arrive in Cooper Landing in 1850. Joseph Cooper from
21 Ninilchik settled there in 1880 and the community was
22 eventually named after him. And by 1990, the Dena'ina
23 who had inhabited Cooper Lander since before the
24 Russian explorers had arrived, they were struck by a
25 series of diseases and also affected by declining fur
26 prices, forest fires and reduced salmon runs due to
27 cannery operated fish traps at the mouth of the Kenai
28 River, and by 1990, there were no -- or weren't very
29 many Dena'ina left in the Cooper Landing area.

30

31 I'm going to go quickly through some of
32 the eight factors. I'm not going to go through all of
33 them. They are in the book and in the administrative
34 record, but we have a lot of proposals to deal with
35 today. So if you have questions about any of the eight
36 factors, I'm happy to answer them. I'm just going to
37 focus on some of the high points.

38

39 There's no question that moose have
40 been historically taken by Cooper Landing residents and
41 the Dena'ina before them.

42

43 In 1990 the Cooper Landing population
44 was estimated to be 243, and the estimated community
45 take of moose was about 10 animals, averaging 19 pounds
46 of mean per capital. The ADF&G harvest ticket database
47 from 1983 to 2006 recorded a total of 147 moose
48 reported harvested in the entire State by Cooper
49 Landing residents, with a range of 3 to 13 moose a
50 year, averaging about 6 moose per year. And there is a

1 table that shows the harvest and where they were.

2

3 The areas that Cooper Landing residents
4 harvest moose on the Kenai Peninsula from the harvest
5 ticket database, they generally -- actually there's
6 also a map in the proposal analysis. The moose are
7 harvested on the Kenai Peninsula from Tustumena Lake
8 north to Turnagain Arm in Units 15A, 15B and 7. The
9 area along the Seward Highway, all the way to Portage
10 and up to the 20-Mile River in Unit 7 is also used.

11

12 The harvest database shows that 47
13 percent of moose harvested by Cooper Landing residents
14 from 1983 to 2006 were from Unit 7, 10 percent were
15 from 15A, and 8 percent from Unit 15 B. The remaining
16 recorded harvest were outside of Units 7, 15A and 15B.
17 Cooper Landing residents harvested an average of
18 approximately three moose a year from Unit 7 from 1983
19 to 2006, and an average of less than one moose per year
20 in 15A and 15B.

21

22 If the proposal were adopted, a
23 positive customary and traditional determination for
24 the residents of Cooper Landing for moose in Unit 7,
25 15A and 15B would qualify them to harvest moose under
26 Federal subsistence regulations. If the proposal were
27 rejected, Cooper Landing residents would only be
28 allowed to harvest moose under State regulations. If
29 there are conservation concerns, these would be
30 addressed in Proposal 22b through the implementation of
31 seasons, harvest limits, and means of harvest, but not
32 a factor in making a C&T determination.

33

34 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
35 support Proposal WP08-22a. The justification is that
36 Cooper Landing moose harvests generally exhibit the
37 eight factors of customary and traditional use
38 determinations for using moose in Units 7, 15A and 15B.
39 The ADF&G harvest ticket database demonstrates that 47
40 percent of moose reported harvested by Cooper Landing
41 residents is from Unit 7 with 10 percent from 15A and 8
42 percent from 15B. Mapping of subsistence use areas
43 confirms that these areas are used by Cooper Landing
44 residents.

45

46 Thank you, Mr. Chair. That concludes
47 my presentation. I'm happy to take questions.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any
50 questions. Ricky. Gloria. I didn't see your hand up.

1 MS. STICKWAN: I was just wondering why
2 these proposals were deferred by the Federal Board?

3
4 MS. ARMSTRONG: They were deferred
5 because there was some discussion about whether or not
6 they were actually a rural community or not. There was
7 enough discussion about it that I think the Board
8 choose to defer them at that time.

9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Currently they've been
11 defined as a rural community?

12
13 MS. ARMSTRONG: Yes, I'm sorry. They
14 are rural. Otherwise we wouldn't be doing this.

15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And they have other
17 C&Ts at this point in time, too?

18
19 MS. ARMSTRONG: Yes, they do.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Ricky.

22
23 MR. GEASE: A question. You had
24 mentioned that Hope and Cooper Landing had been
25 deferred for moose. Why are we just taking up Cooper
26 Landing and not as a unit?

27
28 MS. ARMSTRONG: That's a really good
29 question. The proposal was for Cooper Landing, it
30 wasn't for Hope. And I think if next year we don't get
31 a proposal from Hope, we will take up Hope. But it
32 actually was something that wasn't really apparent to
33 us I think until the proposal book had already been put
34 out. And we have to have a proposal in the Proposal
35 book so it goes to the public so we can do it at a
36 later time.

37
38 I don't know if Larry wanted to add
39 anything to that.

40
41 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman. Larry
42 Buklis, OSM.

43
44 Consistent with what Helen is saying, I
45 believe it was this proposal for Cooper Landing
46 submitted to us that we began to analyze it. In the
47 course of that review, we discovered that the former
48 request had been put aside, and so we're working on the
49 request in hand. And if we don't get a new proposal
50 from Hope, we'll have to revisit what we had put aside

1 and whether it should be brought back.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Larry, can I ask you a
4 question. This was a user-generated proposal, wasn't
5 it, this was not a Staff-generated proposal.

6

7 MR. BUKLIS: Correct. This is a user-
8 generated proposal, and it is not the Staff bringing
9 back something that had been deferred. But in pursuing
10 this new request, discovered we have put aside or
11 deferred something in the past, or the Board did. The
12 program, the Board did. And we as Staff to the Board
13 had not kept a ready reference to check back in on
14 that. And so this has reminded us of that suspended
15 work.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Larry.
18 Bill.

19

20 MR. STOCKWELL: I'd just like to make a
21 comment, just to complete the record. Actually the
22 March 28th -- I mean, February 28th to March 2nd
23 meeting of the RAC in 1995, the RAC did approve C&T for
24 Cooper Landing for 7 and 15A and B, and also for Hope
25 at that time. And if some people remember, stuff hit
26 the fan rather severely. The Feds came to Cooper
27 Landing and held a meeting on June 6th, 1995, and
28 listened to local comments. The Federal Chair ran the
29 meeting. And we had 50 people came to the meeting,
30 about 10 testified, most of them opposed it. And then
31 when it went back to the Federal Board, the Federal
32 Board deferred it for Cooper Landing and Hope. And
33 there was also a meeting in Hope and the people in Hope
34 were opposed to the proposal, too. So that's why it
35 was deferred. And I think you and I might be the only
36 two in there that were involved in it at that time,
37 Ralph.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think so, too, Bill.
40 But the question I'm going to ask you then, has the
41 opinion in Cooper Landing -- you know, the testimony at
42 that meeting in Cooper Landing was predominately
43 against C&T, but at that time Cooper Landing was
44 against C&T in principle, not just specifically for
45 themselves. Has that opinion changed, because I notice
46 that we did give C&T on salmon in the Kenai River.

47

48 MR. STOCKWELL: Right. Let me.....

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Would we have the same

1 results if we went there today?

2

3 MR. STOCKWELL: I'll give you a little
4 background. In the last month or so, we have an email
5 tree in Cooper Landing. One of the ladies is the
6 community crier. And I posted a couple notes on there
7 about this process going on. And also our Chamber of
8 Commerce puts out a monthly newsletter, and it was
9 posted in the monthly newsletter. So hopefully the
10 word got out.

11

12 Let's see. For phone calls, I got four
13 phone calls -- excuse me, I got eight phone calls,
14 four opposed and four support. I got 10 emails, 9
15 opposed and 1 support. And then I added in the A.C.
16 record, which was 2 opposed and 7 support, which give
17 me a total of 15 oppose and 12 support.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And these are all
20 Cooper Landing residents.

21

22 MR. STOCKWELL: As near as I could
23 figure, those were all Cooper Landing residents. I did
24 get some emails from people that I know are not Cooper
25 Landing residents, and they said, thank you very much,
26 and they were glad that somebody was looking at the
27 process. So I didn't count them in. These are people
28 that live there, the people I know.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Man, that sounds
31 like.....

32

33 MR. STOCKWELL: So basically what
34 they're telling me is they're the same as Cooper
35 Landing always is and we're going to hear from Ben in a
36 bit, who's Karl Romig's brother, and Ben's completely
37 opposed to it, and Karl put it in, so this is typical
38 Cooper Landing.

39

40 (Laughter)

41

42 MR. STOCKWELL: So now if you can tell
43 me where we go from here, I don't know.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I was going to say,
46 Bill, it sounds like Cordova and the road.

47

48 MR. STOCKWELL: Yeah, so just a little
49 background for everybody, and I think we need to listen
50 to the whole process.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. I think that
2 was very good background. And that also enters into
3 why the Board deferred it at the time.

4

5 MR. STOCKWELL: Yes.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It was controversial.
8 It was not sought, and basically was opposed by the
9 community. And yet, you know, just like you said, our
10 Council at that time recommended it, because it met all
11 of the charac -- it met all of the criteria, but the
12 local people didn't want it.

13

14 MR. STOCKWELL: Yeah. I'd just like to
15 say, C&T, it's pretty hard to say that people in Cooper
16 Landing haven't historically eaten moose, you know, for
17 as long back as they can find the archaeological
18 records.

19

20 Thank you.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Bill. And
23 I think that's one thing that we need to remember, that
24 what we're dealing with on this one is C&T, not harvest
25 and bag limits, and there is a difference between
26 setting up a season and setting up bag limits, and/or
27 saying that somebody is quality for C&T.

28

29 So thank you. Any other comments.

30

31 (No comments)

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any more questions.

34

35 (No comments)

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. And thank
38 you, Bill for that insight, and thank you for your
39 presentation.

40

41 Ricky.

42

43 MR. GEASE: Just a point of process
44 question. Then if this Council in the past has already
45 forwarded two recommendations to the Board to support
46 findings for C&T, do we have to take action right now?
47 Because it was the Board's action to defer, not the
48 recommendations that this RAC put forth.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If we were dealing

1 with the deferral, Ricky, we wouldn't have to take
2 action. But we're not dealing with the deferral, we're
3 dealing with a proposal that's in front of us that's a
4 new proposal. So we have to take it. We can defer our
5 action, but we have to take action on this. I think as
6 a point of order, we have to take action on this
7 proposal that's before us, because this is a new
8 proposal by a new proponent. And it is a little bit
9 different than the other ones that we deferred, because
10 the ones we deferred were both Cooper Landing and Hope
11 together.

12

13 Bill.

14

15 MR. STOCKWELL: I was just going to say
16 that because it's deferred, if we're going to take up
17 the issue of the bag limits and so on, then they have
18 to have a C&T before we take that up, and there's not
19 -- because it's deferred, there's no C&T on the table
20 for us at this time.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Okay. With
23 that, we'll go on to the State, Alaska Department of
24 Fish and Game.

25

26 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
27 Although our written comments that you have don't state
28 a specific position on this proposal, the Department
29 agrees that the available data support making a finding
30 that the residents of Cooper Landing have customary and
31 traditional uses of moose in Units 7, 15A and 15B.

32

33 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
34 Preliminary Comments to the Regional Advisory Council.

35

36 Wildlife Proposal WP08-22a:

37

38 Establish a customary and traditional
39 use for moose in a portion of Unit 7 and in Unit 15 for
40 residents of Cooper Landing.

41

42 Wildlife Proposal WP08-22b: Open the
43 moose season in Unit 7 Remainder, adjust the season
44 dates and harvest limits in parts of Unit 15.

45

46 Introduction:

47

48 The proponent seeks approval for
49 residents of Cooper Landing to be recognized in Federal
50 regulations as having customary and traditional use of

1 moose in Units 7 and 15. The proponent seeks
2 additional hunting opportunity under Federal
3 regulations.

4

5 Impact on Subsistence Users:

6

7 If both proposals are adopted, the
8 number of rural residents eligible for Federal
9 subsistence moose hunts in Units 7 and 15 increases.
10 It is unclear how or if moose hunting patterns in
11 Cooper Landing would be affected in practice, but
12 additional harvests on low-density moose populations
13 could eventually require more restrictive regulations.

14

15 Opportunity Provided by State:

16

17 State regulations allow moose hunting
18 by residents and nonresidents in Unit 7 and in most
19 parts of Unit 15. The Portage Glacier and Resurrection
20 Creek closed areas in Unit 7 are not open to moose
21 hunting.

22

23 Conservation Issues:

24

25 The Remainder of Unit 7 has a low
26 density moose population, and bull:cow ratios currently
27 are at desired levels for long-term management.
28 Establishing new Federal hunts, increasing the number
29 of rural residents eligible for these hunts, and
30 allowing harvest of any bull may detrimentally affect
31 this moose population and jeopardize sustained yield
32 management.

33

34 Other Comments:

35

36 The affected moose populations in Units
37 7 and 15 are low density and subject to high winter
38 mortality. The State hunts in which Cooper Landing
39 residents typically participate in Unit 15 occur before
40 the rut and have antler restrictions that protect the
41 middle age class of bulls. Some Cooper Landing
42 residents may opt for the more liberal Federal hunts if
43 Proposal WP08-22b is adopted, and their success rates
44 may improve as a result. Adoption of WP08-22b also
45 would open a Federal season in Unit 7 Remainder, which
46 currently is closed. State regulations currently allow
47 hunting in this area, but limit harvest to bulls with
48 spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 3 or more
49 brow tines on at least one side. The proposed Federal
50 season would be for any bull. This more liberal

1 Federal harvest limit also has the potential to
2 increase harvest levels in a low-density moose
3 population.

4
5 The Federal Staff analysis in the OSM
6 Preliminary Conclusion addresses some but not all of
7 these concerns.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Terry. Any
10 questions for Terry. Thank you. Ricky.

11
12 MR. GEASE: Does the Department have
13 any data on Hope, or is it outside the scope?

14
15 MR. HAYNES: Through the Chair. We do
16 have data on Hope, but that has not been on the table
17 for this round of proposals, so we haven't evaluated
18 any information for Hope, but there is resource harvest
19 and use data available for Hope that can be evaluated
20 whenever that issue comes up.

21
22 MR. GEASE: Thank you.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions
25 for Terry.

26
27 (No comments)

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Terry, I was just
30 going to ask you a question on it. Because the C&T is
31 -- is the C&T in your opinion for all of Unit 7 or is
32 it all of Unit 7's remainder, not counting Kings Bay,
33 the way the proposal is written up here. When you
34 looked at it, did that come to your attention, or did
35 that -- I mean, were we just figuring that if Cooper
36 Landing had C&T for Unit 7, it would include Kings Bay
37 or was it aimed at -- like the way it's written here,
38 it's on the remainder, rural residents of Cooper
39 Landing.

40
41 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. I was
42 looking at that right before I came to the table, and
43 the way I read the proposed Federal regulation on Page
44 127, that by deleting remainder from the language, that
45 the finding would be for all of Unit 7 including Kings
46 Bay. You know, the C&T analysis doesn't really get
47 into great detail about exactly where some of the moose
48 hunting occurs within Unit 7, and as you know, we all
49 have concerns about the low moose numbers in the Kings
50 Bay portion of Unit 7, and there are obvious

1 limitations on moose hunting in that area. But that's
2 a separate issue.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. That could be
5 addressed under seasons and bag limits, not under C&T.
6 Okay. Well, that was kind of -- that was the way I
7 read it, too. But I wanted to make sure that that was
8 an understanding, that the way this is written, it
9 applies to all of Unit 7, that the remainder had been
10 crossed out.

11

12 MR. HAYNES: And, Mr. Chairman,
13 obviously that's how I'm reading it, and it would be up
14 to the Office of Subsistence Management to verify
15 whether that's their interpretation.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, I hear a
18 positive head shake from the Office of Subsistence
19 Management. Am I correct on that?

20

21 MS. ARMSTRONG: That's right.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Thank you.
24 Thank you, Terry.

25

26 MR. HAYNES: Thank you.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With that we go
29 on to other Federal, State and tribal agency comments.
30 Do we have any.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none, we'll go
35 on to InterAgency Staff Committee comments. Do we have
36 any.

37

38 (No comments)

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No. Fish and Game
41 Advisory Committee comments. We have some written
42 ones, don't we, for that?

43

44 MR. MIKE: Yes we do, Mr. Chair, and
45 they're located in your blue folder. I guess we can
46 recognize Ed Moeglein from the Kenai-Soldotna Fish and
47 Game Advisory Committee. Are you going to be speaking
48 on Proposal 22?

49

50 MR. MOEGLEIN: I don't care to speak on

1 22a, you know, as far as the C&T. I would like to
2 speak on b.

3

4 MR. MIKE: Can you come up to the mic?

5

6 MR. MOEGLEIN: Thank you. Mr. Chairman
7 and Board members. The Kenai-Soldotna A.C. has no
8 problem with the a portion of this proposal. Ours is
9 more directed towards the bag limits and seasons and
10 conservation issues.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. And that's
13 the Kenai-Soldotna Fish and Game Advisory Committee.

14

15 MR. MOEGLEIN: Fish and Game Advisory
16 Committee.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Do we have any
19 other ones, Donald.

20

21 MR. MIKE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. In your
22 folder there's a blue comment from the Central
23 Peninsula Advisory Committee, commenting on Federal
24 Subsistence 2008-2010 wildlife proposals. And the
25 Central Peninsula voted zero for and nine against as
26 amended. And the proposal was amended to only take
27 action on the harvest limit section of the proposal.
28 The amendment passed on a six/three, three no votes.
29 Those in favor of the amendment felt that the
30 Subsistence Board should be the ones to determine
31 customary and traditional use. Those opposed felt the
32 residents of Cooper Landing did not meet the C&T
33 criteria to have a customary and traditional use
34 determination for Unit 7 and 15 moose. The amended
35 proposal that only addressed the harvest limits to
36 allow one bull by Federal registration permit only for
37 Unit 7 remainder and Units 15A and 15B failed zero yes,
38 nine no. All A.C. members and all members of the
39 public were adamant that the harvest of subsistence
40 moose would be only one antlered with spike fork or 50-
41 inch antlers with three or more brow tines on either
42 antler, by Federal registration permit only.

43

44 That concludes the A.C. comments, Mr.
45 Chair.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bill.

48

49 MR. STOCKWELL: Yeah. Also in the
50 written public comments there's an A.C. comment from

1 Homer that they're opposed to the proposal. Now,
2 whether that -- they put it into both sections, I'm not
3 sure if it applies or not.

4
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I read -- well, we'll
6 get that when we get to the written public comments
7 right here. But we'll discuss that shortly.

8
9 Donald.

10
11 MR. MIKE: I'm sorry.

12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have any written
14 public comments.

15
16 MR. MIKE: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair. Bill
17 Stockwell, Mr. Stockwell, reminded me that the Cooper
18 Landing Fish and Game Advisory Committee submitted a
19 comment, and I passed out a comment for every Council
20 member. It's got a file copy on it. So their comments
21 are entered into the record.

22
23 And you'll find your written public
24 comments starting on Page 136. There were four written
25 public comments received.

26
27 One submitted by the Homer Fish and
28 Game Advisory Committee. They opposed the proposal.
29 And the Homer Fish and Game Advisory Committee, that
30 adequate opportunity for Federally-qualified
31 subsistence moose hunters can be achieved under the
32 current State moose season in GMU 7 and 15. The
33 current State season provides over 30 days of moose
34 hunting opportunity.

35
36 Mr. Paul Wiest of Moose Pass opposes
37 Proposal 22b or any modifications thereof that would
38 give the residents of Cooper Landing or any other
39 community on the Kenai Peninsula a legal right to
40 harvest any bull moose. Units 7 and 15A and B will
41 conclude that our moose population has been on the
42 decline in these units and rapidly trending downward.
43 There should be no modification whatsoever to the
44 current harvest restrictions until the general moose
45 population's demonstrated or at least proven to have
46 increased to levels of say 15 to 20 years ago. And
47 every effort must be made to reestablish the herd.

48
49 Mr. Shawn McDonald of Moose Pass
50 opposes Proposal 22b and 22a for a special subsistence

1 harvest in Unit 7 for Cooper Landing residents only.
2 It appears that there are no current population numbers
3 for moose in this area. He goes on to say that
4 residents of Moose Pass object to Cooper Landing
5 residents being given priority access to resource over
6 me. The subsistence status of Moose Pass residents is
7 in review and is likely to change this year. Until
8 that has been determined, no action should be taken on
9 this proposal. Unit 7, the moose population is in
10 serious decline at this time due to undetermined
11 factors and no additional pressure should be put on the
12 breeding stock until the resource has had time to
13 recover.

14

15 And Bruce Jaffa of Moose Pass opposed
16 Proposal 22b. This application to establish a true
17 subsistence hunt should be tabled at this time. The
18 data and science referred therein is questionable.
19 Statements regarding the stability of the local moose
20 populations are not borne out by other available data.
21 Harvest numbers are falling, suggesting that the local
22 population is facing challenges and is not in current
23 condition to extend harvest pressure.

24

25 Mr. Chair. That summarizes the written
26 public comments.

27

28 Thank you.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Donald. If
31 I understand these written public comments correct,
32 they almost all deal with opportunity and moose
33 population numbers and composition and stability, but
34 none of them deal with C&T.

35

36 MR. MIKE: Right.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And so they actually
39 don't apply to this first portion of our discussion,
40 but they do apply to our next portion the discussion.

41

42 Ricky.

43

44 MR. GEASE: A point of order question.
45 When -- is it just regular procedure to consider
46 proposals on the assumption that C&T would pass, or is
47 better to defer proposals until a C&T would be passed.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's my opinion, and I
50 may corrected on this by Ken Lord if he's here, or

1 somebody, that if there is no C&T, then we can't
2 consider it as a proposal for a season and a bag limit
3 for a subsistence hunt, unless it would be statewide,
4 which means that statewide -- and if there there's no
5 C&T, then everybody in the state's eligible for the
6 subsistence hunt. But we can't limit it to any
7 population of people and make a hunt set up for anybody
8 if there's no C&T. C&T has to come first. Am I
9 correct on that, Ken.

10

11 MR. LORD: Mr. Chair. For the Board
12 decision-making process, that's correct. But in your
13 case I would suggest that even if you decide against
14 C&T that you still make a recommendation on harvest and
15 bag limits so that if the Board disagrees with you on
16 C&T, it will have that recommendation on the rest of
17 it.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Okay. Does
20 that answer your question then, Ricky? From there.
21 Greg.

22

23 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, it's a little
24 confusing to me, because I know we had a proposal for
25 resident species we couldn't address, because we didn't
26 have C&T on it, so they wouldn't take it up at the last
27 RAC meeting.

28

29 MR. GEASE: It was my understanding,
30 too, when the initial discussions for fish were going
31 on on the Kenai Peninsula is that before any proposal
32 would be talked about, the C&T determinations would be
33 made. And I just want to make sure that there's some
34 consistency in the thought process here between the
35 wildlife proposals and the fishery proposals.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That was my
38 understanding also. But, see, but before the Board
39 would pass -- we could make a recommendation on seasons
40 and bag limits, but if the Board doesn't pass the C&T,
41 the Board won't consider it. That's basically what
42 happened there, wasn't it?

43

44 MR. ENCELEWSKI: They wouldn't even
45 address.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The Board wouldn't or
48 the RAC wouldn't?

49

50 MR. ENCELEWSKI: The RAC.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The RAC wouldn't.
2 Okay. Tom.
3
4 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah, I tend to agree
5 with Greg and Ricky that until a C&T recommendation
6 from the RAC has been -- if we find here that Cooper
7 Landing wouldn't have a C&T, then I think consistency
8 would show that we wouldn't even deal with the next
9 proposal.
10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think what Ricky was
12 asking though was if there isn't a Board finding of
13 C&T, do we act on the next proposal.
14
15 MR. CARPENTER: Well, I would say that
16 if we do find at this meeting that there is a positive
17 finding for Cooper Landing, that we would have to take
18 up the next proposal and recommend to the Board yea or
19 nay on a season and bag limit so that they could --
20 they would first find if our C&T finding is good, and
21 if they pass that, then it's up to them if they open
22 the season or not. Ours are just recommendations. But
23 I think that we have to recommend positively first.
24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Ricky.
26
27 MR. GEASE: Well, it's just my
28 recollection when we did the fisheries stuff that --
29 and in terms of consistency, that there were no
30 proposals that were considered, they were deferred
31 until the Board decided whether there was a C&T. And
32 then after that decision was made, it went back to the
33 public process. Once the public understood that there
34 was a C&T for an area, then it would welcome proposals
35 that would go through the whole public process. And I
36 think that's maybe one of the reasons why you didn't
37 see anything from Hope, because they're still thinking
38 that they're deferred.
39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pat.
41
42 MS. PETRIVELLI: I'd just like to
43 interject a little. First, just to second Ken's
44 recommendation that you go ahead and make the
45 recommendation on the harvest after the C&T. But the
46 Kenai Peninsula rivers, those were exceptional case.
47 And the Board didn't -- they wanted to take a careful
48 step-by-step thing. And that whole process started in
49 the year 2000. And they wanted to have all the studies
50 in place. And they waited for the C&T because of the

1 amount of controversy generated.

2

3 I think the moose harvest for the Kenai
4 Peninsula, that era has passed already, and Ralph and
5 Bill went through that with the hearings and
6 everything. Because I think we've had numerous
7 proposals even changing the season and limits, and we
8 look at what the extra subsistence season has meant to
9 the moose harvest, which is a harvest of what, maybe 22
10 moose. I think the times of uproar has changed on
11 that. And so I think if you make recommendations to
12 the Board, you can do the C&T and the seasons and
13 harvests at the same time, and the Board would consider
14 both, you know.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.

17

18 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah, I guess I would
19 just comment. I understand what you're saying now. I
20 think you feel the same way. I think maybe we haven't
21 been consistent.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Or we wouldn't be
24 consistent.

25

26 MR. CARPENTER: Or we wouldn't be
27 consistent. Because I do know for a fact that there
28 have been C&Ts issued in this area, and at the same
29 meeting the RAC also recommended to the Board that a
30 season be open. And I believe, if I recall correctly,
31 there was a recommendation or a request for C&T, I
32 think it was Chistochina for Cook Inlet and the Copper
33 River for fisheries at one meeting. And I believe also
34 at the same meeting we recommended that they have a
35 season. So I think maybe as a RAC we need to decide
36 how we're going to proceed, because I think we've done
37 it differently. At least when I've been on the RAC.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Larry.

40

41 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman. Larry
42 Buklis, OSM.

43

44 I think there's a range of experience,
45 because there's a range of situations. If there is an
46 existing -- a fishery was brought up. If there's an
47 existing Federal subsistence fishery with a number of
48 communities and villages involved, and a community or
49 village asks to be added, proposes to be added to the
50 standing C&T list, say in the Copper River drainage,

1 then there may be a proposal simply for C&T to add them
2 to the pool of eligible users. In that case, all you
3 and the Board are facing is a C&T request. That's the
4 proposal. If they were added to the list of communities
5 and areas eligible, then you would look to the existing
6 season that exists for eligible fishers and you'd have
7 a season. They may not be asking for any adjustment in
8 that season.

9

10 Then sometimes you and the Board are
11 faced purely with a harvest regulation. A community
12 with C&T standing is asking for a change in the season,
13 so that's all that's on the table.

14

15 And finally, sometimes both are on the
16 table in a proposal, and we divide it into an A portion
17 and a B portion. That's our way of dividing the issue
18 raised into the C&T part and the taking part. What
19 you've got here is 22a and b. The a and b is our way
20 of handling the issue. It came in as a proposal, we
21 gave it No. 22, then we subdivided it into a portion,
22 which is C&T, and the b portion. But Mr. Romig made
23 one proposal, to add Cooper Landing and adjust some
24 seasons. He or she or the community could have asked
25 for simply adding to the list of communities, end of
26 request. But he's asking for addition to the list of
27 places and a change in seasons. And so that's why it's
28 been divided this way.

29

30 So there's a range of experience, and
31 what you've heard from other agency commenters about
32 the Kenai is correct. It was a deliberative process.
33 We were introducing or re-introducing Federal fisheries
34 in the Kenai Peninsula area after many decades of not
35 being present. And that's different than the situation
36 your facing with moose on the Kenai Peninsula.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Larry, could you -- in
39 your memory, and could you correct me if I'm wrong, if
40 I remember right, the proposals that we were dealing
41 with on the -- that Greg was talking about, those came
42 in as separate proposals. They came in as a separate
43 proposal for C&T and they came in as a separate
44 proposal for a season and a bag limit. And if I
45 remember right, we didn't deal with the season and the
46 bag limit because we didn't have a C&T at that point in
47 time. But they were separate proposals. They were not
48 an integrated proposal asking for both. In fact, I'm
49 not sure that they weren't even from separate parties,
50 but I'm not positive on that.

1 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman. I've worked
2 on some of those issues as an analyst back at the time,
3 and I don't remember the details of how they were
4 submitted. I think the relevant point here though,
5 since Kenai fisheries has been brought up, is however
6 they were proposed by the proponents, Mr. Gease is
7 right in remembering that C&T was made a first area of
8 treatment, not only a and b portion, but within the
9 cycle of review. We wanted to clarify what was the C&T
10 before we were going to entertain further proposals and
11 analysis on taking regulations. We had to sort of
12 resolve the C&T determination clearly before we could
13 move into the harvest regs. I don't remember the
14 details of how the submissions had been made though.

15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Ricky.

17
18 MR. GEASE: A follow up question. Then
19 making us project one year into the future, if this
20 Council forwards onto the Board a positive
21 recommendation for C&T for 7, 15A, 15B, and we forward
22 some season, bag limit proposals, and the Board also
23 acts on it, then all Hope would need to do is to say
24 that they would want to be added to the list of
25 communities with C&T on 7, 15A, and 15B, is that
26 correct?

27
28 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman. That's
29 correct, if they didn't have any alternative view on
30 seasons.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If all they wished to
33 do was to be added to an existing season with their
34 C&T.

35
36 MR. BUKLIS: Correct.

37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Thank you.

39
40 Any other questions. Bill.

41
42 MR. STOCKWELL: I'd just add a comment.
43 Then the way it was done the last time around was the
44 RAC did make the C&T determinations, and then made a
45 harvest determination for Cooper Landing in Unit 15 and
46 then, of course, when it got to the Board, the Board
47 deferred the C&T, and they never took up the harvest.
48 They just took up the C&T. So that was the way it was
49 done the first time around.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: By deferring the C&T,
2 they had no reason to work on harvest.
3
4 MR. STOCKWELL: Yeah. That's correct.
5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Thank you,
7 Bill. Thank you, Larry.
8
9 Doug.
10
11 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chair. Ricky. I
12 think the other thing that we have followed in the past
13 is if an area doesn't ask for C&T, we don't do it. If
14 they come and ask us, then we can discuss it and go and
15 that's what we've done while I've been on the Board, is
16 if someone comes and asks for it, then we -- like
17 Cooper Landing come and asked for it, so we took it up.
18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think we've done
20 that in the majority of the cases. There have been
21 cases that the OSM has brought before us that we've
22 acted on C&T that the parties themselves hadn't asked
23 for, and we've done some group C&Ts. I know we did
24 some group C&Ts up in the Copper River basin where we
25 said that, you know, when we were going Copper River
26 stuff, that all the roadside communities along there,
27 if two of them were eligible, the rest of them were
28 eligible also. So we've done that, but not always done
29 that.
30
31 Okay. With that, we have concluded our
32 written public comments, and now do we have any public
33 testimony on this one, other than what you said that
34 wasn't C&T that you wanted to talk to, you wanted to
35 talk to -- so can we get Karl?
36
37 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair. That would be
38 Mr. Ben Romig.
39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes.
41
42 MR. MIKE: He wanted to speak on the
43 season part rather than C&T.
44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: He wants to speak on
46 the season part of it. Okay.
47
48 Okay. So we need a motion on the table
49 then so we can discuss WP08-22a.
50

1 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman. I move
2 to adopt Proposal 08-22a.
3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second.
5
6 MR. STOCKWELL: Second.
7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
9 seconded to adopt WP08-22a.
10
11 Discussion. Ricky.
12
13 MR. GEASE: I don't mean to be
14 contentious or anything, but if something was deferred,
15 it means that the original decision is still here. So
16 wouldn't we just be reaffirming a decision of the past
17 that this Council has already made.
18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Larry, could you
20 answer that question for us.
21
22 MR. BUKLIS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I
23 would concur with your assessment earlier. This is a
24 new proposal on its own merits. And action taken by
25 the Council and the Board later on this proposal might
26 make moot the formerly deferred proposal situation. At
27 least for Cooper Landing. And then we'd have to
28 investigate what remained to be done that might have
29 been deferred for Hope.
30
31 But I would recommend you deal with the
32 issue at hand and let that have whatever bearing it has
33 on the deferred work.
34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Larry.
36
37 Does that answer your question on that,
38 Ricky.
39
40 Anybody have more comments, discussion
41 on this. Bill.
42
43 MR. STOCKWELL: I don't think there's
44 any way you can say that people haven't been eating
45 moose in Cooper Landing. And so I can't see how not to
46 support the C&T. So I'd like to call the question if
47 we don't have any more discussion.
48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, James had his
50 hand up first.

1 MR. SHOWALTER: Yes. On the Cooper
2 Landing on the C&T. Okay. Apparently the way I read
3 it, they don't have a determination for moose at this
4 time and they're requesting it from the RAC here, is
5 that correct?

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's a Roger.

8
9 MR. SHOWALTER: Okay. So I'm sure
10 they've gone, or have will have to go through the eight
11 steps, is that it, for C&T for moose, and I would think
12 they would have to go through that prior to the RAC
13 making this determination before they get a
14 determination on the Board.

15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think that they will
17 have to go through it again in front of the Board. If
18 we look at our analysis, we'll see that the eight
19 criteria have been met, and just like the Fish and
20 Game said, there probably is no controversy over the
21 fact that they have used it in the past, and that they
22 are qualified for C&T. Whether they're qualified for
23 season or bag limit, that's a question, but I think
24 that the -- I think like the recommendations, like Fish
25 and Game, and like the analysis says, I think they've
26 met their eight criteria. And maybe not each of the
27 criteria, but as much as we require for any other
28 community.

29
30 The question's been called. If there's
31 no further -- if somebody's got anything further they'd
32 like to add, we'll have the question on it.

33
34 On C&T for Cooper Landing in Unit 15A
35 and B and Unit 7. All in favor signify by saying aye.

36
37 IN UNISON: Aye.

38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
40 saying nay.

41
42 (No opposing votes)

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries
45 unanimously.

46
47 Okay. Now we go on to the hard part,
48 WP08-22b.

49
50 Do we need a break at this point in

1 time. Do we or don't we. Somebody said yes.
2
3 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yes, Tina needs a
4 break.
5
6 REPORTER: Thanks a lot.
7
8 (Laughter)
9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Let's take us a five-
11 minute break just so people can.....
12
13 MR. STOCKWELL: So let me ask you this.
14 If the guy that wrote this proposal wouldn't have asked
15 -- slashed that one line through, we wouldn't even have
16 to deal with this part of the proposal, because there's
17 already a season?
18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, because there's
20 already a season, 15A and B, a subsistence.....
21
22 MR. STOCKWELL: Then why do we have to
23 deal with it if there's already a season.
24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But not in 7.
26
27 (Off record)
28
29 (On record)
30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: With this we'll call
32 the spring session of the Southcentral Regional Federal
33 Subsistence Advisory Council back into session.
34
35 And at this point in time we're looking
36 at WP08-22b. And we'll have a presentation on that.
37
38 MR. RISDAHL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
39 Members of the Council. My name is Greg Risdahl. I'm
40 the wildlife biologist here presenting Wildlife
41 Proposal 08-22b.
42
43 It's really quite complicated, but I'll
44 try to make it as simple as possible. And when we get
45 to the conclusion, I think we'll eventually find that
46 it isn't as difficult as maybe it seemed when we were
47 analyzing it.
48
49 At any rate, Wildlife Proposal WP08-22
50 as you know was submitted by Karl Romig of Cooper

1 Landing. By the way, this is on Page 141 of your
2 books. We divided it into two parts. The first part
3 you heard was addressed in WP08-22a, and you voted to
4 recognize a positive customary and traditional use
5 determination for moose in Unit 7 for the folks of
6 Cooper Landing.

7
8 The second part in this proposal
9 requested a number of things, beginning with the
10 establishment of a moose season with special provisions
11 in Unit 7 remainder from August 10 through September
12 20, and October 10 through November 10 by registration
13 permit.

14
15 The second thing it requests is opening
16 an October 10 through November 10 season in Unit 15A
17 with a one bull harvest limit by Federal registration
18 permit.

19
20 The third thing it does is it changes
21 the antlered bull restriction during the current August
22 10 through September 20 season in Units 15A and 15B to
23 one bull from the current antler restriction of spike
24 fork, 50-inch or three plus brow tines on at least one
25 antler.

26
27 The fourth thing it does is it changes
28 the late season dates in Unit 15B from October 20 to
29 November 10 to an earlier date beginning on October 10
30 and going through November 10.

31
32 The fifth thing it does is it changes
33 the antlered bull restriction in Unit 15B during the
34 late season, the October 10 through November 10 season,
35 to an any bull season.

36
37 In addition, the proponent's request in
38 effect also opens the Skilak Loop Wildlife Management
39 Area for moose hunting in Unit 15A to Federally-
40 qualified subsistence users from August 10 through
41 September 20 for one bull by Federal registration
42 permit.

43
44 The proponent states this regulation
45 would reestablish the customary and traditional
46 subsistence use of moose for residents of Cooper
47 Landing. The adoption of Proposal 22b is contingent on
48 the Federal Subsistence Board recognizing a customary
49 and traditional use determination for moose for the
50 residents of Cooper Landing as addressed in 22a.

1 If Proposal 22b is adopted the harvest
2 regulation for moose in Units 15A and 15B will change
3 and therefore it will also affect the communities of
4 Ninilchik, Nanwalek, Port Graham and Seldovia who
5 already have a positive customary and traditional us
6 determination for moose in these units.

7
8 Just very briefly, Federal public lands
9 comprise approximately 77 percent of the lands in Unit
10 7. Those lands available for subsistence use in Unit 7
11 include the Chugach National Forest and the Kenai
12 National Wildlife Refuge, and that's about 50 percent
13 for the Forest Service and 5 percent's for the refuge.
14 Other Federal public lands in Unit 7 are the Kenai
15 Fjords National Park, which are closed to all
16 subsistence users.

17
18 In addition, 53 percent of the lands in
19 Unit 15 are managed by the Kenai National Wildlife
20 Refuge.

21
22 Customary and traditional use has been
23 gone over in 22a, so I won't go over that. And the
24 regulatory history has been fairly well addressed in
25 that proposal as well, so I'll go ahead and skip that
26 portion of this analysis, and go straight to current
27 events.

28
29 In the spring 2007 meeting at the
30 Federal Subsistence Board in Anchorage, the Board heard
31 testimony on Unit 15B and 15C late fall Federal moose
32 hunting season. Proposal WP07-22 requested the
33 elimination of the Federal late hunt, or cap the number
34 of permits at 10 for Federally-qualified subsistence
35 users. The Federal Subsistence Board rejected this
36 proposal, not wanting to eliminate the late fall
37 Federal subsistence moose hunt only after one season,
38 especially since out of 46 permits issued, only 2 bulls
39 were taken by 36 hunters. In addition, no evidence was
40 presented to the Board in either 2006 or 2007 that
41 there had been any adverse effects on the moose
42 populations in either Units 15B or 15C.

43
44 Moving on to the biology of this area,
45 in Unit 15 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game's
46 management objective is to maintain a healthy
47 population of moose with a minimum bull/cow ratio of 15
48 bulls per 100 cows. There's never been a comprehensive
49 survey of moose in Unit 7, but based on limited
50 composition surveys by the Fish and Game Department,

1 along with some harvest reports, indications are that
2 the moose population has remained relatively stable
3 during the past decade. Composition counts in 2003
4 showed approximately 24 bulls per 100 cows and 27
5 calves per 100 cows. There are an estimated 700 to
6 1,000 moose in Unit 7.

7
8 In Unit 15A, the Alaska Department of
9 Fish and Game's management objective was to maintain a
10 minimum post-hunting season sex ratio of 15 bulls per
11 100 cows. The Kenai National Wildlife Refuge in
12 contrast has established a minimum goal of 25 bulls per
13 100 cows for most refuge lands, with the exception of
14 the Skilak Loop Wildlife Management area where the
15 management objective is set at 40 bulls per 100 cows.

16
17 The 2005/2005 fall sex and age
18 composition survey for Unit 15A, not counting the
19 Skilak Loop Wildlife Management area, showed a bull/cow
20 ratio of 26 bulls per 100 cows, which is slightly
21 higher than the long-term bull/cow ratio of 24 bulls
22 per 100 cows. The cow/calf ratio in 15A in 2005/2006
23 when the most recent survey was done was 18 calves per
24 100 cows, and that compares to the long-term cow/calf
25 ratio of 28 calves per 100 calves. So it was down
26 considerably at that last survey.

27
28 Moving on to Unit 15B, the Alaska
29 Department of Fish and Game's management objectives
30 there in the west portion of Unit 15B are to maintain a
31 population of moose with a bull/cow ratio of 15 bulls
32 per 100 cows while providing maximum opportunity to
33 sportsmen. The State's management objectives for Unit
34 15B east, which is considered a trophy management area,
35 are to maintain a population of moose with a bull/cow
36 ratio of 40 bulls per 100 cows, and an opportunity to
37 harvest a large antlered bull under aesthetically
38 pleasing conditions. There have been no aerial surveys
39 conducted in Unit 15B since 2001.

40
41 In Unit 15C, the Alaska Department of
42 Fish and Game's management objectives are to maintain a
43 minimum post-hunting season sex ratio of 15 bulls per
44 100 cows. 15 to 20 bulls per 100 cows, excuse me. The
45 most recent survey conducted took place in 2003/2004
46 where 1,059 moose were counted, including 895 adults
47 and 164 calves. The survey was conducted too late in
48 the season to calculate a bull/cow or a calf/cow ratios
49 however. It is believed that the moose population in
50 15C will likely continue to increase in the near future

1 as hardwood browse is generated in response to 86,000
2 acres of woodlands that have burned since the year
3 2000.

4

5 Moving on to harvest history. In Unit
6 7, the average total State harvest reported from 1996
7 through 2007 was 46 moose per year, so they're not
8 taking a lot of moose out of Unit 7. Annually
9 approximately 19 Cooper Landing residents have taken
10 an average of 3.5 moose per year in this unit during
11 that time period. Residents of Cooper Landing have
12 harvested about 7.7 percent, or approximately 3 to 4
13 moose out of the 45 moose taken annually in Unit 7.

14

15 The State also issues 25 permits for a
16 late season drawing hunt in Unit 7, which includes the
17 northwestern part of Unit 7 and northeastern portion of
18 Unit 15A from October 10 through November 10. So the
19 State has a late season hunt that begins October 10 in
20 this area. However, the annual report of harvest for
21 the permit hunt is typically only one to two bulls per
22 year.

23

24 In Unit 15A -- actually approximately
25 half of the entire moose harvest on the Kenai takes
26 place in Unit 15A. From 1992 to 2007, about 97 percent
27 of the hunters participating in the State general
28 hunting season in Unit A were residents of Alaska.
29 Likewise, an average of about 95 percent of the moose
30 are taken by Alaska residents.

31

32 In Unit 15A, the State also conducts a
33 late season drawing hunt that runs from October 10
34 through November 10, so there's a late season hunt there
35 as well that the State manages. The success rate in
36 this late season hunt is around six to seven percent,
37 again with only about one bull on average taken each
38 year.

39

40 In Unit 15B, about 10 percent of the
41 Kenai Peninsula's total moose harvest takes place. In
42 Unit 15B west, a general harvest area under State
43 regulations, hunters have taken an average of about 40
44 bull moose per year from 1998 until the present time.

45

46 In Unit 15B east, the drawing permit
47 area for trophy bulls, the season runs from September 1
48 through September 20 and then there's a week where
49 there's no hunting taking place, and then it begins
50 again September 25th and runs through October 15th. So

1 you have a hunt running during the rut and after the
2 rut as well for trophy bulls in Unit 15B east. On
3 average, about 35 hunters per year take 15 moose.
4 That's been about the last decade.

5
6 During this same time period, Federal
7 subsistence hunters have harvested on average one moose
8 per year by Federal registration permit during the
9 August 10 through September 20 season in Unit 15B.

10
11 During the first Federal late season
12 moose hunt which begins on October 20th and runs
13 through November 10 in Units 15B and C, 62 Federal
14 subsistence permits were issued. 39 permit holders
15 reported they hunted, and 2 moose were harvested for an
16 overall success rate of 3 percent.

17
18 Beginning in 2007, a single permit
19 allowed Federal subsistence permit holders to hunt both
20 the early and late seasons in Units 15B and 15C. A
21 total of 108 Federal subsistence permits were issued
22 for the combined seasons, however, only about 59 permit
23 holders hunted moose, which is simply one less than
24 hunted in 2006. A total of six moose were harvested
25 during the early season, and two were taken during the
26 late season in 2007.

27
28 In Unit 15C about 40 percent of the
29 moose are harvested on the Kenai Peninsula. This unit
30 contains a combination of State Tier II drawing permit
31 and general harvest areas. Most harvest in Unit 15C
32 takes place during the general hunt when an average of
33 257 moose per year are taken by over 1200 hunters.

34
35 The 2006/2007 harvest actually declined
36 by about 23 percent from 2005/2006 and was about 17
37 percent below the long-term average.

38
39 Only four Tier II permits have been
40 given out per year in Unit 15C, and the harvest under
41 this system has been about one bull per year.

42
43 In addition, since 2002, 50 drawing
44 permits have been given out on an annual basis in the
45 Homer area for cow moose, which has resulted in an
46 average harvest around 25 cows per year.

47
48 As far as the Federal hunting seasons
49 go, the Federal subsistence registration permit hunters
50 in Unit 15C have harvested an average of approximately

1 two moose per year since 1996. From 1996 through 2007,
2 approximately 43 Federal subsistence permits were
3 issued per year in Unit 15. About 30 of these permit
4 holders reported that they hunted each year. An
5 average of 4.3 moose were harvested since this hunt
6 began in 1996.

7

8 Okay. Finally we're getting to the
9 effects of the proposal. If the proponent's proposal
10 were adopted, it would change the number of Federal
11 subsistence regulations for moose in both Units 7 and
12 15. These changes would include:

13

14 Number 1, establishing a Federal open
15 season in Unit 7 remainder. And I say Unit 7
16 remainder, because there actually is an open Federal
17 season in Unit 7 right now. It is in the Kings Bay
18 area, although currently the season is not open. But
19 there is an established season there.

20

21 The second thing this proposal would do
22 if it were adopted, it would allow an any bull hunt in
23 Units 7, 15A and 15B. It would open the Skilak Loop
24 Wildlife Management Area to subsistence moose hunting.
25 It would establish an early fall season in Unit 7 that
26 would run from August 10 though September 20. It would
27 establish the Resurrection Creek and Portage Glacier
28 closed areas in Federal regulations. They already
29 exist in State regulations. Starting the late season
30 hunt in Unit 15B on October 10th instead of the current
31 October 20th. And it would establish a late season
32 hunt in Unit 7 remainder as well as in Unit 15A that
33 would run from October 10 through November 10 instead
34 of the October 20 starting date.

35

36 If Proposal WP08-22a is adopted, Cooper
37 Landing present -- excuse me, Cooper Landing residents
38 would have the opportunity to take any bull moose in
39 Unit 7 remainder by Federal registration permit from
40 August 10 through September 20, and October 10 through
41 November 10. The any bull aspect of this part of this
42 proposal is of biological concern in Unit 7 given the
43 limited moose population, the limited amount of moose
44 habitat, and the low bull/cow ratio.

45

46 The population of Cooper Landing is
47 about 357 people based on the most recent census
48 information. Each year an average of 19 Cooper landing
49 residents harvest on average 3 to 4 moose per year in
50 Unit 7 under State regulations. With the proposed

1 moose season and an any bull opportunity, it is
2 expected that there would be an increase in the number
3 of Cooper Landing residents that hunt moose in Unit 7.
4 Likewise, it is expected that the success rate of
5 Cooper Landing residents in Unit 7 under an any bull
6 regulation would increase, because the current
7 regulation is the spike fork or 50-inch or three-plus
8 brow tines or larger on one antler.

9
10 The proposal seeks to establish an
11 August 10 through September 20 moose season on Federal
12 public lands by Federal registration permit in Unit 7.
13 An August 10 starting date is 10 days before the State
14 general harvest season and would provide a meaningful
15 priority to Federally-qualified subsistence users.
16 Establishment of a new regulation like this in Unit 7
17 would be consistent with the modifications that have
18 been made by the Federal Subsistence Management Program
19 for other areas of the Kenai Peninsula and Unit 15.

20
21 The proposal also seeks to establish a
22 Resurrection Creek and portage Glacier closed areas
23 into Federal regulations. The descriptions of these
24 closed areas in the proposal are consistent with those
25 that already exist in State regulations in Unit 7.

26
27 Moving on to effects to the Skilak Loop
28 Wildlife Management Area. The Skilak Loop Wildlife
29 Management Area management plan was actually updated in
30 2007. The proposal as it stands now would be
31 inconsistent with the refuge management plan and be of
32 concern because of the low numbers of moose in Unit
33 15A.

34
35 If Proposal WP08-22a is adopted, Cooper
36 Landing would be added to the four communities that
37 currently already have a positive customary and
38 traditional use determination to hunt moose in Units
39 15A ad 15B. And those we all know are Nanwalek, Port
40 Graham, Seldovia and Ninilchik. There are
41 approximately 1,792 people living in these five
42 communities. From 1990 to 2006 the population in these
43 communities has increased by 25 percent, although
44 harvest trends by Federally-qualified subsistence users
45 plus Cooper Landing residents have been steady in Unit
46 15.

47
48 The proposal would change the antler
49 restrictions in Units 15A and 15B from the one antlered
50 bull, spike fork or 50-inch to any bull. With any bull

1 opportunity, it is expected that most Federally-
2 qualified subsistence users would choose to hunt on
3 Federal public lands with the Federal permit. An any
4 bull opportunity would thus result in an increase
5 likely in the number of individuals from all five
6 communities that hunt in Units 15A and 15B, and a
7 subsequent increase in the overall moose harvest.

8

9 The success rate of Federally-qualified
10 subsistence users is also expected to increase because
11 of the more liberal any bull regulation.

12

13 The spike fork, 50-inch, or three brow
14 tines on at least one antler restrictions were put in
15 place specifically to protect the over-harvest of
16 breeding age bulls and thus maintain the entire moose
17 population in general.

18

19 The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals --
20 I'm going through all this stuff in a sense to show
21 that the Federal Subsistence Board has looked at all of
22 this information and the regulatory history. They've
23 discussed this stuff over and over and over, and they
24 came to some conclusions, and we have included those
25 conclusions in our analysis here to show where they
26 came from and why they did what they did.

27

28 The Ninth Circuit Court of appeals held
29 that in deciding to apply the spike fork, 50-inch
30 antler restriction to subsistence hunters, the Board
31 took into account biological data suggesting that
32 despite the recovery in bull numbers, allowing
33 subsistence users to hunt any bull would reverse the
34 gains and jeopardize subsistence opportunities over the
35 long term. The court decided that the Federal
36 Subsistence Board's interpretation of the term priority
37 as determined by ANILCA was reasonable and meant to
38 balance the competing aims of subsistence use,
39 conservation and recreation while at the same time
40 providing subsistence users with a meaningful
41 opportunity. The Ninth Circuit Court also held that
42 the Board considered the relevant factors in concluding
43 that the restrictions on subsistence users are
44 necessary to protect the continued viability of the
45 bull moose population in Game Management Unit 15.

46

47 Since 1996, an average of 30 Federally-
48 qualified subsistence users from four communities with
49 a positive C&T use determination for moose have
50 harvested fewer than one moose per year in 15A,

1 slightly over one moose in Unit 15B, and slight over
2 two moose per year in 15C for a total of about four
3 moose per year during the early August 10 through
4 September 20 season. Only two moose were harvested in
5 2006 and two in 2007 during the late season that runs
6 from October 20 to November 10. There is no late
7 season currently in Unit 15A.

8

9 Adding Cooper Landing to the list of
10 communities that have a customary and traditional use
11 determination for Unit 15 would add hunters to those
12 already eligible to hunt under the Federal Subsistence
13 regulations and would likely increase the harvest.

14

15 The proposal seeks to start the late
16 season moose hunt in Unit 15B on October 10th instead
17 of October 20th, and expand it to include Units 7 and
18 15A as well. Starting the late season 10 days earlier
19 in Unit 15B and opening a late season in Units 7 and
20 15A would allow hunting during the peak of the breeding
21 season for moose in these units. Bull moose are more
22 vulnerable to being taken by hunters during the rut.
23 The October 20 through November 10 season in Units 15B
24 and C was recommended by the Council and adopted by the
25 Board in 2006 specifically to avoid disrupting rutting
26 activities.

27

28 In addition, while the October 20
29 through November 10 late season was implemented in
30 Units 15B and C, it was not allowed by the Federal
31 Subsistence Management Program in Unit 15A, because of
32 easy road access, declining quality of moose habitat
33 overall, and a general decline in the moose population.

34

35 Proposal WP08-22b seeks to establish,
36 finally, a late fall moose season from October 10
37 through November 10 in Unit 15A and Unit as noted
38 above. The State currently provides for a drawing hunt
39 that overlaps part of this area, Unit 15A and part of
40 Unit 7 outside of the Resurrection Creek closed area,
41 with the season running from October 10 through
42 November 10.

43

44 The Council and Board have not
45 supported a late season hunt in 15A or in that portion
46 of 15A where the state drawing permit hunt is held.
47 Since those earlier Council and Board decisions, the
48 quality of the moose habitat and size of the population
49 have continued to decline. In addition, there are
50 concerns about a late season hunt in the remainder of

1 Unit 7 for the same reasons as in Unit 15A, because of
2 easy road access, trails, limited moose population, low
3 bull/cow ratio and that type thing.

4
5 All that said, the OSM preliminary
6 conclusion then is to support this proposal with
7 modifications. And just to summarize it all,
8 essentially we are suggesting that we leave these
9 regulations, harvest limits exactly as they are in
10 Units 15A and 15B, maintain the no open season status
11 in Skilak Loop Wildlife Management Area, while at the
12 same time establish an August 10th through September 20
13 season with the antler restrictions in Unit 7 remainder
14 as well as the special provisions for the closed areas
15 that the proponent asked for in Unit 7 remainder.

16
17 And the justification goes along with
18 all of the effects that I mentioned, and I've pretty
19 well covered that. So if you have any more questions
20 -- if you have any questions, please don't hesitate to
21 ask.

22
23 Thank you.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I've got one question,
26 Larry. After we just went through this, it's pretty
27 obvious then that this Proposal WP08-22a/(b), or just
28 22b, whatever we want to call it, was not a proposal
29 that just affected Cooper Landing. If the Board passed
30 this proposal, even if they didn't give Cooper Landing
31 a season, it would change the seasons and bag limits
32 and restrictions on Ninilchik and Nanwalek and Port
33 Graham, and other communities that have C&T. So we
34 pretty well had to handle this part of the proposal,
35 whether we went C&T or not, because it was affecting
36 other communities that already have C&T. So it's not
37 quite the same situation where we were just -- we were
38 dealing with one that depended on C&T for Cooper
39 Landing, because his proposal affected other
40 communities and other communities were included in it.

41
42
43 So with that, I thank you for that
44 explanation that you gave how this does affect -- and
45 if -- when I'm looking at what you've got right here,
46 am I correct in assuming that what you're showing is in
47 15A and B you're maintaining the current status and
48 putting in those closed areas in Unit 7 and making a
49 season in Unit 7? Is that pretty much what I see on
50 this preliminary conclusion?

1 MR. RISDAHL: Yes, Mr. Chairman. That
2 is correct. We would suggest leaving the current
3 management regime in Units 15A and B, that is the
4 seasons exactly as they are. The season dates as well
5 as the antler restrictions. In other words not go to
6 the any bull. But we would suggest maintaining the
7 spike fork, 50-inch or three plus brow tine restriction
8 in those areas. And then in Unit 7 go ahead and open
9 up the season so that it runs uniformly with those in
10 Units 15A and 15B and also have the same antler
11 restrictions in that season, as well as incorporating
12 the State's closed seasons as suggested by the
13 proponent in Unit 7 remainder.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And this would then
16 affect -- do Nanwalek, and this is -- I should know
17 this, but I'm just going to ask you to put it on the
18 record, do Nanwalek, Ninilchik, and Port Graham, if I
19 remember the communities that are involved currently
20 have C&T in Unit 7?

21
22 MR. RISDAHL: Actually, no. The only
23 one of the communities that would have C&T in Unit 7
24 would be Cooper Landing. They currently do not have
25 C&T in Unit 7. They only have it in 15.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So that part of this
28 proposal would only be applicable if Cooper Landing was
29 given a C&T. The other part would have been -- the
30 other changes would have been applicable even if Cooper
31 Landing hadn't been given a C&T if we would have dealt
32 with -- if we had stuck with the original proposal.
33 But it wouldn't have affect 7, it would just have
34 affected 15A and B.

35
36 MR. RISDAHL: That is the way I
37 understand it. We've kind of batted that around a
38 little bit, but the fact that this individual asked for
39 these season changes in areas where there currently are
40 communities with positive customary and traditional use
41 determination for moose, we felt that, you know, we
42 should address it, because it is bringing into
43 something -- bringing into the proposal more than just
44 the C&T issue for Cooper Landing in Unit 7. It does
45 affect those other communities in Unit 15A and 15B.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: In other words, it
48 would have been nice if this would have been three
49 proposals.

50

1 MR. RISDAHL: In a sense, yes. Thank
2 you.

3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. I think I
5 understand and what your recommendation is basically if
6 that recommendation was followed, then the need for
7 looking at -- the need for looking at conservation
8 concerns and other things has already been dealt with
9 in 15A and B, and what we really need to concentrate --
10 if we would follow that recommendation, we would really
11 need to concentrate on what the conservation concerns
12 and effects would be in Unit 7 itself.

13
14 MR. RISDAHL: Yes, Mr. Chairman. That
15 essentially is what the bottom line would be here,
16 because we are not suggesting to change anything. And
17 the Council and the Federal Subsistence Board have gone
18 over the discussions considerably in years past about
19 how they should manage those moose in the Unit 15A and
20 15B, and they came up with the conclusion that using
21 the antler restriction, the spike fork, 50-inch, the
22 three brow tines or better was conservative, but it was
23 a good way to manage that herd in light of the
24 burgeoning population of the people on the Kenai and
25 the impact on the resource.

26
27 So the way it stands now, really only
28 you need to consider the impacts to the moose
29 population in terms of conservation in Unit 7. And we
30 know already that -- we have a record of the amount of
31 hunting essentially that's taking place on -- in Unit 7
32 by the folks of Cooper Landing, and if you don't change
33 the antler regulations, then really that probably isn't
34 going to change that much.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That was my next
37 question. Especially in the late seasons we have such
38 a low success rate. I mean, in Unit 7 the late season
39 harvest that they have there, current success rate's
40 around seven moose I think, if I remember right. I
41 don't remember what percentage that is. But in the
42 other late seasons that you talked about, we were
43 looking a success rate of six to seven percent.
44 Basically one moose or two moose. Is there any reason
45 that the success rate is that low?

46
47 MR. RISDAHL: Well, Mr. Chairman,
48 that's a very good question. And I've actually -- you
49 know, I've talked with buddies, you know, that hunt,
50 and I really can't tell you the reason. I'm pretty

1 familiar with the Kenai Peninsula and I can say that if
2 I was hunting, I would probably be very tenacious and I
3 would make sure I'd get a moose, but maybe that doesn't
4 always happen. Maybe it becomes more difficult in the
5 fall, those animals move to places where they're not
6 available. Some of the folks here, Greg, Mr.
7 Encelewski, he might have a better idea of what goes on
8 there Ninilchik, for example.

9
10 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Well, what goes on in
11 Ninilchik is I take mine early in the State season.
12 But, I mean, a lot of people do. That is a good point.
13 I mean, the late season's there, but, you know, people
14 are just getting used to it and starting to use it, and
15 it's, you know, a little harder hunt.

16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Thank you for
18 answering my questions.

19
20 Bill, I think you have a question.

21
22 MR. STOCKWELL: Yeah. I'd just like to
23 bring up the Unit 7. I the analysis here, it talks
24 about the moose population in Unit 7 being stable but
25 fairly low due to several biological reasons, habitat
26 and low bull/cow ratio. And then you go on to say that
27 if you open it to subsistence, it would probably
28 increase the number of people in Cooper Landing hunting
29 in Unit 7. I think this morning we listened to
30 Cordova, once they had the hunt here, it increased the
31 usage and people using it. And just do you have any
32 good feel on the conservation issues in Unit 7 and the
33 moose population and what it can support? I'm going to
34 ask the State the same thing.

35
36 MR. RISDAHL: Mr. Stockwell through the
37 Chair. Basically what -- the way we looked at this was
38 we know about how many hunters have been utilizing Unit
39 7 to hunt in. I mean, that information is available on
40 the internet.

41
42 MR. STOCKWELL: Right. Yeah.

43
44 MR. RISDAHL: We know what their
45 harvest success ratio is, and we know that this is
46 taking place under the current antler restriction
47 regime. If we implement a Federal registration permit
48 system that has the same antler restriction, we don't
49 expect that to change much, because there's no real
50 reason to draw more people there, because it hasn't

1 made it any easier. It's not an any bull harvest
2 permit then. It's an antler restriction bull harvest.

3
4 If there was some additional reason to
5 attract more people there, then we might say, yeah,
6 there's a very strong likelihood that more people would
7 -- or if we changed the antler restriction to any bull,
8 that would be a good reason in itself to attract more
9 people, but we're not suggesting that here.

10
11 MR. STOCKWELL: But we're making a
12 priority for the people in Cooper Landing that they
13 never had, so.....

14
15 MR. RISDAHL: We are recognizing the
16 fact that these people have been hunting there, and
17 probably deserve to have that recognized, that C&T.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Can I ask you --
20 Ricky, can I ask him a question first on what Bill's
21 asking?

22
23 But there is a priority, because the
24 season is opening 10 days earlier than the State hunt?

25
26 MR. RISDAHL: Yes, Mr. Chairman. That
27 is correct. The Federal season does open 10 days
28 before the State season.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So that could increase
31 the take slightly?

32
33 MR. RISDAHL: Yeah. That is true.
34 That is a good point. That is a good point. I missed
35 that, Mr. Stockwell. That's a good point.

36
37 MR. STOCKWELL: Yeah. My point was did
38 -- when you do this, you're going to -- it's going to
39 be -- like they did they did here in Cordova, people
40 came up this morning and said, I never hunted before,
41 but this became available, and it was a really great
42 thing, and people are going to join in. And my concern
43 is that with the low population in Unit 7, we're not
44 going to -- we're only going to attract the people in
45 Cooper Landing, but we're going to attract more of them
46 to go hunting, so that's just was my question actually.

47
48 MR. RISDAHL: Mr. Chairman. Mr.
49 Stockwell. You know, the estimated population in Unit
50 7 is around 700 to 1,000 moose. And it's really kind

1 of limited to the drainage bottoms, you know, it's not
2 great moose habitat in some of that rugged mountainous
3 country. And we also knew that out -- what is it here,
4 19 Cooper Landing residents have been harvesting moose
5 in Unit 7 during the last decade or so, and they've
6 been taking three to four moose per year. So it's not
7 a large number, but when you look at the total number
8 of moose coming out of Unit 7, they're taking 7 to 8
9 percent of the moose, which is 45, 46 moose. So that
10 number may increase a little bit if you give them an
11 extra 10 days.

12
13 MR. STOCKWELL: Also, just for the
14 record, the people in Cooper Landing are very concerned
15 about the number of moose. We're not seeing moose
16 around hardly at all. I don't know where they're
17 going. And talking with people in Moose Pass and so n,
18 we just don't see what we did before. So I kind of
19 wonder about the count numbers.

20
21 Thank you.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Ricky.

24
25 MR. GEASE: Yeah. A couple quick
26 points. Do you have the -- for the 10 days that it's
27 open in Unit 15 for subsistence hunters, how many --
28 what percentage of moose are taken during that initial
29 10-day period of time. And then the second question
30 is, what are the State regulations in Unit 7 for bow
31 and arrow hunting? When's the season for that prior to
32 the beginning of the moose hunt?

33
34 MR. RISDAHL: Mr. Gease through the
35 Chairman. I don't have the information about the
36 hunting chronology for the Federal subsistence hunters
37 in the Federal hunts at the moment with me, but we can
38 get that. Actually that information is available. Off
39 the top of my head, from what I'm remembering, it's
40 fairly spread out. People do try to get their moose
41 early, but because the harvest has been so low, you
42 know, an average of four moose per year in all of Unit
43 15A and B where they do have subsistence hunting going
44 on, it really hasn't been a whole big issue. But
45 typically if you look at the State harvest, a large
46 percentage of the harvest does take place during that
47 first week of the season. And that's just kind of --
48 that's hunter behavior, that's a real common thing.
49 But because the Federal subsistence program has not had
50 a lot of moose taken in it during the 10 years that

1 it's been around, we haven't -- I guess I just didn't
2 think of that as a major issue at this point. But it
3 is a good point to bring up.

4
5 You asked about bow and arrow hunting
6 in Unit 7 under the State regulations.

7
8 MR. GEASE: I guess there is none.

9
10 MR. RISDAHL: And I'm looking right
11 now, because personally I do not know that. I don't
12 see anything here that shows that there's a bow and
13 arrow permit, but maybe ask the State when they get up
14 here.

15
16 MR. GEASE: I guess there is none.

17
18 MR. STOCKWELL: Just in 15.

19
20 MR. GEASE: That's just in 15? Okay.

21
22 MR. STOCKWELL: I think so, but I don't
23 have a reg book.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any other
26 questions.

27
28 (No comments)

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It was kind of your --
31 the reason you didn't look at anything was because it
32 was kind of your impression that with four moose taken
33 through the whole season, it would be pretty hard to
34 have much of an impact in the first 10 days?

35
36 MR. RISDAHL: Yes, that's true, Mr.
37 Chairman. Getting a pattern out of four moose per year
38 in such a large area is -- you know, it's kind of
39 meaningless I would say.

40
41 Thank you.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions
44 for him before we bring the State up.

45
46 (No comments)

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

49
50 MR. RISDAHL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman

1 and Council.

2

3

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: State of Alaska.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: His mistake.

MR. HAYNES: And there's some

information that we would have brought up in the context of discussing that proposal, some of which would be relevant here.

If both proposals, 08-22a and 22b are adopted, and either 22b as proposed or as modified in the preliminary conclusion, the number of rural residents eligible for Federal subsistence moose hunts in Unit 7 and 15 will increase. It's unclear how or if moose hunting patterns in Cooper Landing will be affected in practice, but additional harvest on low density moose populations could eventually require more restrictive regulations. The remainder of Unit 7 has a low density moose population and bull/cow ratios currently are at desired levels for long-term management. Establishing new Federal hunts, increasing the number of rural residents eligible for these hunts, and allowing harvest of any bull as proposed in the proposal may detrimentally affect this moose population and jeopardize sustained yield management.

So we don't know exactly how adopting the proposal either as it's proposed or as modified will affect hunting behavior in Cooper Landing. What we do know is that adding hunters who would be eligible for the late season Federal hunt in Unit 15B compounds concern that our Department has had and expressed to you over the last couple of years.

We aren't so concerned about the impacts on the early season hunts, although as Mr. Stockwell has noted, they're seeing fewer moose in the Cooper Landing area. We are talking about low density populations.

1 But in the context of late season
2 hunts, and which we'll get into more discussion about
3 when we deliberate other proposals, I should point out
4 that the Department does plan to not have late season
5 hunts, the late season drawing permit hunts in Unit 7
6 and in 15A this year. We're going to -- the plan is to
7 close that late season hunt altogether. And then in
8 Unit 15B east, where we currently have a late season
9 archery hunt where there are a total of 50 permits, 10
10 permits for each of five areas defined within 15B, the
11 Department plans to reduce that to a total of 10
12 permits, 2 in each of these areas. So the Department,
13 and Thomas will be able to talk more about the reasons
14 for these plans to impose some restrictions on the late
15 season State hunts.

16

17 Having said all of that, we believe the
18 preliminary conclusion as proposed by Federal Staff is
19 much more acceptable than the proposal as written. It
20 retains the antler restrictions, provides some
21 consistency with the regulations in Units 7 and 15 by
22 having the same types of antler restrictions, and it
23 does retain the closure in the Kings Bay portion of
24 Unit 7, which we believe is important.

25

26 And with that, Thomas or I will try to
27 answer questions you might have.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Terry.
30 Doug.

31

32 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chair. Terry, tell
33 us about these bow hunts that you're going to reduce.

34

35 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I'll let
36 Thomas speak to those.

37

38 MR. MCDONOUGH: Mr. Chairman and
39 members the committee. My name is Thomas McDonough. I
40 work for Fish and Game, based in Homer. This is my
41 first time at a RAC meeting. I'm happy to be here and
42 meeting you all. I've got three kids under the age of
43 three, and I got seven hours of complete sleep last
44 night in my hotel room for the first time in years.

45

46 (Laughter)

47

48 MR. MCDONOUGH: So I'm happy to be
49 here. Mr. Chair. Member Blossom. In reference to
50 your question, in 15A we completed a population census

1 this February, and according to our preliminary
2 estimate, the population has continued to decline.
3 Based on that population decline, the State is not
4 going to issue any permits for the drawing DM522 hunt
5 in the eastern part of 15A, and that includes a portion
6 of Unit 7.

7
8 In 15B we don't have a lot of census
9 data, but a continued decline in the success rate of
10 drawing permit hunters seems to indicate a pretty clear
11 decline in the population of moose in 15B. This past
12 year had the lowest success rate of that drawing hunt
13 since the current season and bag limits have been in
14 place since 1983. The success rate was down to nine
15 percent.

16
17 And I think the State calculates
18 success rate a little different than the Federal
19 biologists. We only consider folks that actually go
20 afield to hunt, not the number of permits that were
21 issued.

22
23 So based on the decline in the harvest
24 success and the assumed decline in the population of
25 15B, we're going to reduce the late season allocation
26 of drawing permits from the past number of 50 down to
27 10 for the 2008 season. And our intent is to not issue
28 any late season drawing permits for 15B east in 2009
29 because of the decline in the moose population in 15B.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, Thomas, were
32 those late season ones all archery hunts?

33
34 MR. MCDONOUGH: Mr. Chair, no, none of
35 them are. They're all any weapon.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Then on the
38 question that Doug asked you about the.....

39
40 MR. BLOSSOM: Archery

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:about the archery
43 hunts, what has been the take on the archery hunts and
44 the success rate on that?

45
46 MR. MCDONOUGH: Mr. Chair.....

47
48 MR. BLOSSOM: Well, Mr. Chair, Terry
49 said that there was late archery hunts, and I wanted to
50 know about them, is that I asked. And I still want to

1 know about these late archery hunts.

2

3 MR. HAYNES: Maybe I misspoke.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. That's what I
6 was asking, too, and what kind of success rate they
7 had. That's the one that they're going to reduce from
8 50 to 10, right?

9

10 MR. MCDONOUGH: No. Mr. Chair. The
11 late season drawing hunt in 15B and the drawing hunt
12 DM522 in 15A are not archery hunts. They're any weapon
13 hunt.

14

15 MR. BLOSSOM: Very good. That's what I
16 wanted to get to.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. And the archery
19 hunts that you were talking about are not late season,
20 Terry, but they were going to be reduced from 50 to 10,
21 right?

22

23 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. I misspoke
24 on that count.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug.

27

28 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chair. Let's keep it
29 clear. Yeah, he made a mistake, there's no late
30 archery hunts, but Thomas is right, you're talking
31 about shooting hunts, and you're talking about in 15B
32 east you're going to reduce it from 50 to 10, is that
33 what I'm hearing?

34

35 MR. MCDONOUGH: For the permits for the
36 late season, September 26th to October 15th.

37

38 MR. BLOSSOM: How about the early 15B
39 east?

40

41 MR. MCDONOUGH: The early season, 15B
42 east, September 1 through September 20th, is going to
43 remain with 50 permits allocated for that hunt.

44

45 MR. BLOSSOM: Thank you.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tricia.

48

49 MS. WAGGONER: On the drawing and the
50 harvest hunts in both Units 7 and 15, do you have a

1 breakdown on those tags that are issued, how many are
2 residents and how many are non-residents?

3

4 MR. MCDONOUGH: Mr. Chair. You're
5 referring to the DM522 drawing hunt which includes 15A
6 and Unit 7?

7

8 MS. WAGGONER: I'm looking at the
9 drawing hunts and the registra -- the regular harvest
10 tickets. And what I'm asking is if it's a question of
11 concern in adding additional opportunity for rural
12 residents, but yet how many non-resident Alaskans are
13 harvesting moose in these areas? Because, you know, a
14 lot of these areas are opened up to both Alaskans and
15 non-Alaskans.

16

17 MR. MCDONOUGH: Mr. Chair. I regret
18 that I don't have those data at my fingertips. But
19 just off the cuff, a majority of the -- a vast majority
20 of the general season harvest is -- in Unit 7 is from
21 Alaskan residents, but as far as local residents, I
22 don't know offhand what that breakdown is. If that's
23 important, I could look into it and get it during a
24 break.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tricia.

27

28 MS. WAGGONER: Well, I'm just
29 questioning. I mean if we're saying we're going to add
30 five Cooper Landing residents to increase the hunting
31 pressure in the area, then I'm just looking at how many
32 non-residents are taking moose out of this area. And
33 if there's anyway to, you know, find out what that data
34 is. You know, if it's one a year, if it's none. But
35 if the opportunity's there, then I'm sure there's got
36 to be some non-residents taking advantage of it.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tricia, and by non-
39 residents, you mean non-Alaskans, don't you?

40

41 MS. WAGGONER: Yes, non-Alaskans.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Terry.

44

45 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. This won't
46 answer Tricia's question, but I think just to narrow it
47 down, your interest would be in the late season hunt in
48 15B which is the one that Cooper Landing would qualify
49 for, and where the State is going to be imposing some
50 restrictions on our -- we're going to be reducing the

1 number of permits available for the State hunt in 15B.
2 So if I understand your question correctly, if we could
3 answer that question, that would help you?

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tricia.

6

7 MS. WAGGONER: Well, what I heard from
8 you was that, no, back in Unit 7 there was a concern
9 from the State that adding that earlier subsistence
10 hunt may increase the number of people taking moose in
11 Unit 7 based on the increased subsistence users. And
12 I'm just wondering out of -- you know, specifically say
13 Unit 7, out of the moose that are taken in Unit 7, how
14 many go to non-residents, and weighing the difference
15 there in those numbers. I think the same concern goes
16 to Unit 15. And it's more of a general. I'm not
17 questioning the late hunt specifically.

18

19 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I was kind
20 of -- even though we haven't spoken for or against this
21 proposal, I had kind of narrowed down our major
22 concerns to the Unit 15B late season hunt, because we
23 -- currently there is a late season State hunt in
24 portion of Unit 7, but we won't be issuing permits for
25 that hunt this year. And then 15B will retain a
26 smaller number of permits for the State hunt. But we
27 understand your question, and we can try to track that
28 information down, certainly before the Board meeting.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Terry, can I ask you a
31 question, or Tom, whichever one wants to answer it.
32 With the -- recognizing the decline of moose in Unit 7,
33 and the intention of the Fish and Game to close down
34 the late drawing hunt in Unit 7, so which basically --
35 how many moose on the average are taken in that late
36 drawing hunt?

37

38 MR. MCDONOUGH: Mr. Chair. The late
39 season drawing hunt in 15B east?

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, in 7, Unit 7.

42

43 MR. MCDONOUGH: The DM522 drawing
44 season, which incorporates a portion of 15A and 7, 25
45 permits are issued, on average 18 people hunt, and the
46 harvest since it started in 1999 is less than 3 bulls a
47 year.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So we're not talking a
50 large impact on the population by closing that hunt,

1 not enough that if there was a significant increase in
2 the subsistence take, that that would make up for it
3 then, because we're only talking three bulls between
4 the two units.

5
6 MR. MCDONOUGH: (Nods affirmatively)

7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. I thought it
9 was a bigger take than that for some reason or another.

10
11 Any other questions for Fish and Game.
12 Bill.

13
14 MR. STOCKWELL: Thank you, Mr.
15 Chairman.

16
17 Thomas, when was the last surveys done
18 in Unit 7 for population?

19
20 MR. MCDONOUGH: Mr. Chair. Member
21 Stockwell. The Department did a number of composition
22 counts in Unit 7 over the winter of 2005/2006. And I
23 should say that Unit 7 is a difficult place to get a
24 good assessment of moose because of the timber and the
25 topography of the country, so there's never been a
26 moose census in Unit 7. So the Department has deferred
27 to conducting periodic and somewhat random composition
28 counts based on budgets.

29
30 And when that last series of
31 comprehensive [sic] counts were conducted over the
32 winter 05/06, we tallied 460 moose, so we know that's
33 at least a minimum number of moose in those count
34 areas. And we tried to focus on areas where we knew
35 there was at least some, you know, density of moose and
36 didn't survey areas we know that had very low
37 densities. And the bull to cow ratio was 23 bulls per
38 100 cows, and percent calves was 8 percent.

39
40 But I should say that it's quite
41 variable in different areas of Unit 7. There's
42 obviously areas that are a little bit better habitat
43 than others, and have a little bit higher densities
44 than other areas, so some areas have relatively high
45 bull to cow ratios, you know, over 40 bulls per 100
46 cows, some areas are quite a bit lower. For example,
47 one count area that's just north of Cooper Landing
48 proper and extends up Resurrection Creek Trail up to
49 Juneau Lake, that had 16 bulls per 100 cows, which is
50 within the minimum objectives of the Department of 16

1 bulls per 100 cows, but.....

2

3 MR. STOCKWELL: It's low.

4

5 MR. MCDONOUGH: It's low. And I should
6 say that even though the Department doesn't have good
7 census data to track population trends, you know, I put
8 a lot of weight into local knowledge of people that
9 have lived there for a long time. And I have not heard
10 anyone say that the population is on the increase in
11 Portions of Unit 7, so.....

12

13 MR. STOCKWELL: No. You, in fact --
14 have you heard mostly from people that are wondering
15 where the moose have gone?

16

17 MR. MCDONOUGH: Yeah. Both Seward
18 Advisory Committee and members of the community of
19 Seward and Moose Pass and the Cooper Landing residents
20 that I've talked to pretty much to a person say that
21 the moose population is down in Unit 7. And just a
22 general index is harvest take, assuming that the
23 hunting effort is somewhat consistent over years, and
24 in Unit 7 it has been relatively consistent with three
25 to 400 general season hunters. In the 70s they used to
26 take, you know, 100 or more moose, you know, given it
27 was any bull back then. But nowadays the yearly
28 harvest is under 50.

29

30 MR. STOCKWELL: Yeah, in the 70s you
31 had to be careful walking up and down Quartz Creek
32 Valley, so you could not trip over them. And now you
33 walk up and down there and you won't even find any
34 signs of moose anywhere.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug, you have
37 something.

38

39 MR. BLOSSOM: Yeah. Mr. Chair. I'm
40 going to address this to Thomas, because I think he
41 understands the area best. Thomas, do you have a
42 subsistence hunt in 15B east during your late hunt?

43

44 MR. MCDONOUGH: Mr. Chair. Member
45 Blossom. I don't think I understand the question. Are
46 Federally-qualified hunters allowed to hunt on the
47 refuge in 15B east? Yeah, they are.

48

49 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chair. You start
50 your late hunt, the one you're reducing from 50 to 10,

1 the 26th of September and it runs through October 10th.

2

3 MR. MCDONOUGH: 15th.

4

5 MR. BLOSSOM: During that time, are
6 Federal subsistence users allowed to hunt in that area?

7

8 MR. MCDONOUGH: Mr. Chair. Member
9 Blossom. As far as I know, yes.

10

11 MR. BLOSSOM: No.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Terry.

14

15 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. That late
16 season hunt is not closed to -- it's open to residents
17 and non-residents. The State's late season hunt is not
18 closed to Federally-qualified subsistence users. They
19 have to hunt on the State regulations. And maybe we're
20 missing the point of your question.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug.

23

24 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chair. You have an
25 early hunt in 15B east which goes from September 1 to
26 September 20. That one subsistence users are allowed
27 to hunt right along with the permit holders. September
28 26th through October 10th you have your late season
29 hunt for permits and subsistence hunters aren't allowed
30 during that time, if I'm correct.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think there's a
33 misunderstanding between you. He's right, subsistence
34 hunters aren't allowed under a subsistence permit
35 during that time, but a subsistence hunter could apply
36 for a State drawing permit, and that's what Terry's
37 saying.

38

39 MR. BLOSSOM: Yeah.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. But there is no
42 subsistence hunt going on at the same time as their
43 late season drawing hunt.

44

45 Okay. Other questions for Terry and
46 Tom. Ricky.

47

48 MR. GEASE: Focusing back on Unit 7, if
49 the -- you said that -- am I correct in saying that if
50 the season goes from August 10th to September 20th, and

1 the regulations that are amended in there, you did not
2 have conservation concerns with those regulations,
3 harvest regulations going in for Unit 7, is that
4 correct?

5
6 MR. HAYNES: I'll let Thomas follow up,
7 but I'll just point out that we -- you know, these are
8 low moose density moose populations. We don't know
9 what affect change in that regulation will have, but
10 our primary concern has been and continues to be on the
11 late season hunt, so we have less of a concern about
12 adoption of that earlier opening, the August 10 to 19
13 portion.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thomas.

16
17 MR. MCDONOUGH: Mr. Chairman, Rick
18 Gease. If the August 10th through September 20th
19 Federal season in Unit 7 had the antler restrictions,
20 that would help reduce some of the concern. If the
21 harvest during that Federal season was quite large, and
22 the over-all harvest of that Federal season and the
23 State season for some reason increased significantly,
24 we would want to take a good look at some of the
25 bull/cow ratios in some of these areas to make sure
26 that our minimum objective is met. But with antler
27 restrictions, I wouldn't think that the Federal season
28 would greatly increase the harvest take, but it would
29 just be another thing that we'd keep track of.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thomas, could I ask
32 you a question? While it wouldn't increase the harvest
33 take, theoretically probably wouldn't increase the
34 harvest take very much, it could shift the allocation
35 of the harvest take by having the extra 10 days for the
36 subsistence season, a higher portion of the harvest
37 take could end up in the subsistence community than in
38 that general community at this point in time then. Am
39 I correct in that?

40
41 MR. MCDONOUGH: I guess that's safe to
42 assume, that it potentially could happen.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Thank you. Any
45 other questions for him. I think that that's basically
46 the intent with trying to give a subsistence priority.
47 It's not so much to create a conservation concern by
48 increasing the take, but to, for all practical purposes
49 to shift a portion of the take to the subsistence
50 community. And I think that was the idea of the August

1 10th suggestion.

2

3 Okay. No other questions for them?
4 Terry had something.

5

6 MR. STOCKWELL: Excuse me. I think
7 that answered my question for the moment. Thank you.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What?

10

11 MR. STOCKWELL: I think that answered
12 my questions for the moment.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Terry.

15

16 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. I was just
17 going to point out that, yeah, you know, adopting a
18 season that provides additional opportunity for Cooper
19 Landing isn't likely to substantially increase the
20 harvest by Cooper Landing if it changed the harvest at
21 all. We just don't know if it may change where they go
22 to hunt and when they go to hunt. So that would just
23 be one thing to look at.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. That's one of
26 the things that we have done in the past is we've
27 always done these kind of things with the idea that all
28 of these things are to be watched and reviewed, and if
29 there's any problem, to be brought back to us, you
30 know, as soon as possible. And we expect that the
31 managers in charge, if there was an emergency situation
32 would act accordingly. So I don't feel like this would
33 cause any great conservation concern, simply because if
34 there was a big effect, it would be watched, but the
35 odds of it having a big effect wouldn't be very great.

36

37 So thank you on that.

38

39 Okay. At that point do we go on to
40 Federal, State, tribal agency comments. Do we have
41 any. The refuge manager.

42

43 MR. WEST: Mr. Chairman. Robin West
44 with Kenai National Wildlife Refuge.

45

46 And I just wanted to make a couple of
47 brief comments based on discussions in general that
48 were going on, and then some specific comments on the
49 proposal.

50

1 In answer to the questions about the
2 percentage of non-residents that hunt the Kenai, the
3 last data that I saw, and I don't remember the year,
4 but it was slight over 85 percent of the hunters in 15
5 were local or Alaskan. They weren't non-resident. And
6 it was a greater hunters in Unit 7. Again, I don't
7 remember what year that was, but that was State data.
8 So the preponderance of moose hunters on the Kenai
9 Peninsula are at least Alaska residents, whether
10 they're local residents or not, I don't know.

11
12 A comment also on the archery seasons,
13 and they're only in 15 as was stated, not in Unit 7.
14 It's only 15A and B. It's early, and very little of
15 the hunting occurs on federal public lands. We often
16 refer to it as the garden variety moose. The
17 preponderance of the take is spike fork, yearling
18 animals in people's back yards and near stores, and we
19 had three taken in my neighborhood, within a quarter
20 mile of my house last year that I was aware of, and
21 Fred Meyer parking lot and that kind of thing. So they
22 are in 15A and 15B, but they are well scattered out,
23 well sought after, and very little of that harvest,
24 even though there are a number of animals taken each
25 year, are taken in more remote Federal public lands.

26
27 And it was stated earlier, too, about I
28 guess the reallocation factor, and there isn't hard
29 data on that, but clearly like the harvest for archery,
30 there's kind of that early opportunity for the low
31 hanging fruit. Most of the animals taken on the
32 Peninsula are the yearling bulls, spikes or forks, the
33 majority. And people do scouting, and so the folks who
34 get to them first are the ones who get them.

35
36 That said, a certain percentage of
37 additional animals will be taken any time you add days
38 to a season, you know, substantially. So if you add 10
39 days, you can expect a few more animals to be taken.
40 But overall I think folks that are managing the area
41 just expect it to be shifting the opportunity and the
42 allocation. Folks getting an earlier start are more
43 likely to pick up the easier animals.

44
45 Specific to the proposal, for Cooper
46 Landing in Proposal 22, I certainly believe in the
47 customary and traditional use history of the area, and
48 therefore didn't speak to the (a) portion of the
49 proposal.

50

1 But the season and bag limits, most of
2 the things have already been said, I just want to
3 reiterate. As the proponent laid the proposal forward,
4 I had three major concerns, and that was the late hunt
5 in the rut period in an area where we have declining
6 moose populations, and the record is full of our
7 comments on that, so I won't go into it in any detail.
8 The any bull portion, a similar concern. And then the
9 proposal to hunt in Skilak Loop, which is about two
10 percent of the refuge that we have set aside under
11 other management plan and also has low moose numbers
12 right now.

13

14 So with the proposed modifications that
15 OSM made to the proposal that addressed those issues, I
16 think it does provide a good starting point anyway for
17 Cooper Landing, recognizes C&T and gives them a
18 preferential early hunt consistent with what other
19 qualified communities currently have in addition to
20 getting a shot into traditionally areas in Unit 7.

21

22 So I would support the modified
23 proposal that OSM put forward. Thank you.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any
26 questions. Doug.

27

28 MR. BLOSSOM: Yeah. Mr. Chair. Robin,
29 I've got a couple of questions, so maybe we can go on
30 it one at a time.

31

32 If we were to agree not to have the
33 October 10th and November 10th season in Unit 15A,
34 because the other rural areas don't have it now, would
35 that help solve some of your problem?

36

37 MR. WEST: Yeah. I mean, there were
38 three parts that I had concern with. The any bull, the
39 October 10th part and the Skilak Loop. So each one of
40 those were part of the concern. If the late hunt
41 wasn't considered, then part of my concerns would be
42 addressed. Two more would remain.

43

44 MR. BLOSSOM: Okay. So that's -- we
45 didn't give Ninilchik that area, 15A for that late hunt
46 because of a little concern for conservation.

47

48 The next thing, the other thing that
49 would be different would Cooper Landing would have
50 access to 15B east during that October 10th to November

1 -- or October 20th to November 10th. How many moose
2 were got last year in that portion of the Federal hunt?

3

4 MR. WEST: It was kind of several
5 questions I think there, Doug. What we're looking at
6 in terms of the proposal that Cooper Landing made
7 forward or the modified proposal that OSM had? Which
8 one are.....

9

10 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chair. The modified
11 one. The one where Cooper Landing wants to get in on
12 the 15B east hunt. So my question is, how many were
13 taken last year by the other rural residents that
14 qualified for that area during that time?

15

16 MR. WEST: All right. Under the
17 modified proposal it would be an October 20th opener.
18 It would be kind of a little later and avoid some of
19 the rut. That would be consistent with what Ninilchik
20 and folks have had for the last two seasons. And in
21 the first year there were two moose taken in the late
22 hunt by qualified subsistence users. One large bull,
23 one small bull. One in 15B, one in 15C. So only one
24 taken in 15B. Last year I know there were eight moose
25 taken total, and I know there were two large bulls
26 taken in the late season, but I don't know exactly
27 where they were taken. So we're not talking large
28 numbers.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bill.

31

32 MR. STOCKWELL: Thank you, Mr.
33 Chairman.

34

35 Robin, although your management line is
36 the Russian River, it's pretty close to Cooper Landing,
37 and I'm trying to get observations on the people's
38 feelings of moose populations basically in Unit 7. So
39 you're right next door, do your people have any kind of
40 a feeling on the number of moose they are seeing like
41 in the Russian River area, or in traipsing through the
42 Resurrection Trail system, that kind of thing?

43

44 MR. WEST: Sure, Mr. Chair. Council
45 members. Overall I think that it's fair to say that
46 most managers have seen a fairly long term and
47 consistent decline in moose numbers in much of Game
48 Management Unit 7 and in Game Management Unit 15A.
49 And, you know, I might add there's a number of reasons
50 for that likely. And for folks who have been around a

1 long time and have seen the good old days if you will,
2 it's probably pretty evident. And whether that was an
3 unnatural high or not is irrelevant to the point that
4 there are far fewer moose now than there were in the
5 50s, 60s and 70s.

6

7 And the four primary reasons that
8 managers generally consider, the biggest one is
9 habitat. All of that part of the country burned in
10 either '47 or '69. 300 and some thousand acres in '47,
11 and it is very poor moose habitat now, and really
12 hasn't burned again. And the '69 burn burned 86,000
13 acres across that country, and it was just super moose
14 habitat for years. And now it's grown up to where it's
15 fairly poor moose habitat, and the fuel loading isn't
16 there where it can burn again. So we're kind of at,
17 you know, a stalemate for a while on that particular
18 habitat change.

19

20 And the other three factors compared to
21 the good old days, certainly we've got more people and
22 more access and, you know, more harvest going on. And
23 that more access is also roads and vehicles, and there
24 are upwards of 300 moose killed on the roads each year
25 now. And a lot of those are cows, and that's affected
26 productivity of the herds in Units 7 and 15
27 significantly.

28

29 And then from the 30s and 40s and 50s
30 and 60s, predator numbers were low. Wolves were gone
31 until the 60s and bear numbers were depressed. And
32 wolves have come back and bear numbers are up, so we've
33 got, you know, bears taking animals that, you know.....

34

35 So those four factors together have a
36 far different face on the land than what people
37 remember 40s, 50s and 60s.

38

39 MR. STOCKWELL: Correct. Thank you.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Robin. Any
42 more questions for Robin.

43

44 (No comments)

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you muchly on
47 that.

48

49 Are there any other State, Federal or
50 tribal agencies that wish to comment at this point in

1 time. Tom.

2

3

MR. MCDONOUGH: Mr. Chair. My
4 colleague scurried over to his office and grabbed one
5 of our last management reports that shows the residency
6 breakdown of hunters in Unit 7 from the seasons 01/02
7 through 04/05. And it gives you a general idea of the
8 residency breakdown. In 2001 season the harvest was 55
9 animals in GMU 7, 5 were by non-residents, non-
10 Alaskans. Three were by Alaskans, but non-local of the
11 unit. And that general trend is similar for the other
12 years. But I'd be happy to read it into the record or
13 whatever you want to do.

14

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tricia, do you want it
15 read into the record.

16

MS. WAGGONER: No, I just wanted to
17 make sure. So it stays about 10 percent of the
18 harvest?
19

20

MR. MCDONOUGH: It looks like 5 out of
21 55 in '01, 6 out of 51 in '02, 2 out of 29 in '03, 4
22 out of 32 in '04.

23

MR. STOCKWELL: That's non-Alaskans?
24

25

MR. MCDONOUGH: Non-Alaskans, yeah.
26

27

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you muchly on
28 that. And thanks for getting that, Dave.

29

MR. STOCKWELL: Thanks.
30

31

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. If we have no
32 other Federal, State or tribal agency comments.

33

(No comments)
34

35

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: InterAgency Staff
36 Committee comments.

37

(No comments)
38

39

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: None at this point in
40 time. Fish and Game Advisory Committee comments. And
41 I believe we have some there. Would you like to come
42 up.
43

44

MR. MOEGLEIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
45

46

1 I do have a lot of numbers available here in going
2 through this. I would like to call attention to a
3 couple things. One, that we did submit some written
4 comments. I hope you folks have had a chance to read
5 those, and I won't read them into the record at this
6 time.

7

8 A lot of the information and harvest
9 numbers and census counts were in this publication.
10 And I gave some to a couple members to pass on to you
11 folks.

12

13 Some points of caution, at least what I
14 see as far as conservation issues, on harvest totals, I
15 guess I'll kind of speak to Unit 7 first as part of
16 this proposal. For Unit 7, harvest on the average, a
17 5-year harvest, has been like 36 between 1980 and 2006.
18 2005/2006, there was 38 animals harvested in Unit 7.
19 2006/2007 there was 30 animals harvested. And just
20 this last fall there was only 14 animals harvested in
21 Unit 7. So the harvest has dropped in half.

22

23 As far as permit hunts in Unit 7, there
24 was four animals -- or one animal harvested in
25 2006/2007, four in 2005/2006. So the harvest totals
26 have been really coming down.

27

28 They just completed a census in Unit
29 15A. Continuing a decreasing trend, they went in six-
30 square mile blocks. They flew up and down all the way
31 through 15A, and counting the whole area. So it was a
32 census count and not an estimate. They're looking at a
33 total herd size between 1350 animals in 2000 with a
34 point estimate at 1700 animals total in Unit 15A. They
35 noted that a lot of the population was in populated
36 areas: Nikiski, Kenai, Soldotna, Sterling. So they're
37 coming into town, and I think it's kind of showing a
38 trend of the predation, because as they're coming into
39 town, it seems like the bears are coming in with them.
40 And last year the City of Kenai I believe, six or seven
41 brown bears were killed within the City of Kenai.

42

43 We don't see a problem with a C&T
44 harvest in Unit 7 or 15A for Cooper Landing. We feel
45 that it's adequate to have that 10-day early start,
46 giving them a 42-day harvest season. Also they're
47 given priority on road kills. So far this year they
48 received two. I believe last year they received four.
49 And Ninilchik I believe received 14 or 15 last year and
50 have received two already this year. I mean, it's part

1 of the harvest, too, it's not wasted, but they're given
2 preference into it.

3
4 We do oppose a late hunt in Unit 7 with
5 the low numbers and the areas that would be exposed by
6 the highway. The Snow River Valley where it drops out
7 of Kenai Lake, the road highway travels along there.
8 In the late part of the season, in the rut, animals
9 congregate. You can see 30 animals all congregated
10 together right near the highway. And chasing those
11 around would take from their fat reserves and later on
12 may be fatalities in addition to the winter harvest.
13 The same thing is the Placer River along the highway
14 system there, along the railroad tracks. And the
15 Placer River is accessible by boat. And also Mystery
16 Creek Trail pipeline where Unit 7 and Unit 15A
17 interface along the Chikaloon Flats.

18
19 We have objection to the any bull. We
20 feel that the spike fork limits have done well as far
21 as management that way. We do not want to see anything
22 change from that.

23
24 And also the later hunts in 15B and C,
25 we believe that they should be cut back, as well as the
26 State should cut back because of the high predation,
27 low habitat area, and the local residency competition
28 for the same animals. We're a very high area of
29 hunters, sport, subsistence prior to ANILCA, and with
30 the census totals coming back in, going back to the
31 Fish and Game in our area and requesting that the late
32 hunts be canceled as well.

33
34 Thank you. Is there any questions.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Does anybody have any
37 questions. Ricky.

38
39 MR. GEASE: Just for the record then,
40 for the modified proposal that OSM has for Cooper
41 Landing for Unit 7, the early 10 days, and then
42 allowing the same regulations in Unit 15A and 15B as
43 the other qualified rural residents, you don't have a
44 conservation concern with that?

45
46 MR. MOEGLEIN: Well, people understand
47 that there's a preference for subsistence, and in Unit
48 15 it's already extended to Ninilchik. It would be
49 hard to divide it that way. But that 10 days we feel
50 that gives all subsistence people a meaningful

1 opportunity for subsistence, as well as with the
2 harvest from road kills. A lot of that area is low
3 lands. It's cow/calf area. There's a lot of spiked
4 fork animals there. They're usually killed in those
5 first 10 days. And that would make the biggest balance
6 change from a sport harvest or a local resident harvest
7 through subsistence harvest is that 10-day advance
8 period where they would be harvesting those animals in
9 advance. That would really give an advantage to the
10 subsistence harvest.

11

12 MR. GEASE: Thank you.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions.
15 Greg.

16

17 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Ed, I've just got one
18 question for you. I'd like you to clarify, you keep
19 talking about road kills. Do you consider that a
20 priority and a preference? I mean, you're adding it to
21 all your figures here. I've had some road kill that
22 there ain't much left of them.

23

24 MR. MOEGLEIN: This last year was the
25 first time in 17 years I didn't harvest a large game
26 animal, and that's what I'm doing right now is I'm
27 receiving road kill. Yeah, some of them are
28 slaughtered, some of them are in really good shape.
29 But we're allowed in the area that's Kenai/Soldotna
30 area immediately that we can get them, that the ones
31 that are killed in the Ninilchik area are preferenced
32 to Ninilchik. A lot of times half an animal isn't beat
33 up that bad. That's better than no meat at all.

34

35 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Well, I certainly
36 wouldn't turn down no meat. I'm not looking at it that
37 way, but I sure as hell don't consider it a hunt, and I
38 don't count it in the preference of hunting.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think I see what you
41 mean, Greg, that it doesn't -- It's not a meaningful
42 subsistence preference, but it's sure welcome.

43

44 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Absolutely.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bill.

47

48 MR. STOCKWELL: Yeah. I just wanted to
49 add on the road kill thing. I did have two people in
50 Cooper Landing, one of them said that they would --

1 they'd pass on subsistence, because they thought the
2 road kill made up for it, so just the opposite of that.
3 But I did have two people complain that the moose
4 populations are getting so low in our area they're not
5 even getting any road kill any more. And they've been
6 on the road kill list and haven't had any for the last
7 two or three years. Before that they were getting road
8 kill every year.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you again for
11 bringing those papers to our attention. It's not that
12 we haven't seen them before, it's just that a lot of
13 things that we bring up when we ask for them to be
14 repeated is because we want them on the record.

15

16 MR. MOEGLEIN: And also some of those
17 survey numbers were not available to OSM at this late a
18 date. This Unit 15A census was just completed, and
19 also harvest totals from Unit 7 were just released,
20 too.

21

22 Thank you.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Okay. Any
25 other Fish and Game Advisory Committee comments. Bill

26

27 MR. STOCKWELL: Excuse me. You all got
28 a copy -- I'm not on the advisory committee any more,
29 but I hope everybody got a copy of Cooper Landing's.
30 And that one, I did notice Central Peninsula took up
31 the issue, and they voted, it appears unanimously, to
32 not support the Cooper Landing's proposal. Unit 7 and
33 15B failed 0 to 9 no.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. I think those
36 would come under our written public comments.

37

38 MR. STOCKWELL: Oh, those -- okay.
39 These weren't the -- these are the written one.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We were just wondering
42 if you were going to present one for Cooper Landing.
43 But you said you're not on the advisory committee any
44 more?

45

46 MR. STOCKWELL: Yeah.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

49

50 MR. STOCKWELL: And Cooper Landing

1 supported the proposal 7 to 2 with 1 abstained.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With that we'll
4 go on to summary of written public comments. Donald.

5

6 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
7 summarized the written public comments on 22a, but just
8 to remind the Council, that there was public comments
9 received, and all opposed the proposal. And Mr.
10 Stockwell commented on Cooper Landing's vote on
11 proposal on harvest, and the vote of seven in support,
12 that the numbers of hunters is small enough that the
13 effect would be minimal. The vote was seven for and
14 two against and one abstained. And the Central
15 Peninsula Advisory Committee opposed the proposal in a
16 vote of zero to nine, that the harvest limit is to
17 allow one bull by registration permit.

18

19 Thank you, Mr Chair.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Donald.
22 Okay. Do we have any public testimony scheduled.

23

24 MR. MIKE: Yeah. Mr Chair. Mr. Ben
25 Romig is standing by. If we'll just stand down for a
26 couple minutes, we'll give him a call.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We'll be happy
29 to have him.

30

31 Doug.

32

33 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chair. Just for the
34 record, I was in attendance at the Central Peninsula
35 Advisory Committee, but I did not vote. I was there,
36 but I did not vote.

37

38 (Telephone call being made)

39

40 (Off Record)

41

42 (On Record)

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Our court reporter is
45 back, and on session now, so what I was saying is that
46 we're unable to get Ben Romig on the phone, and Bill
47 Stockwell was at the meeting with Ben and has had
48 conversations with Ben, and said that he would be
49 willing to try to convey to us what Ben's objections
50 were and what Ben would have liked to have got across

1 to us, and what he said at the meeting. Since we can't
2 contact him by phone, we're going to do that and go on
3 with this process.

4
5 With that, Bill, can you fill us in as
6 much as you can.

7
8 MR. STOCKWELL: Thank you, Mr.
9 Chairman. Just one corrections. I wasn't at the
10 meeting. It was a conversation I had with Ben after
11 the meeting. He called me specifically about this
12 issue, and he wanted to make sure that his feelings on
13 the issue were known. And I told him I'd do my best to
14 make sure that he could testify by phone, and obviously
15 we failed there, so -- but I did tell him that if we
16 didn't get ahold of him, I would try to get his
17 feelings into the record, and I'll do the best I can.

18
19 Ben Romig is Carl Romig's brother. Ben
20 was on the RAC back in 1995 when this process went
21 around the first time, and so he's quite familiar with
22 the process and what went on. He at this time relayed
23 to me that he is totally opposed to the proposal, and
24 wanted that passed on to the RAC. His reasonings were
25 that he didn't feel it was necessary for Cooper
26 Landing. There was the problems with the surrounding
27 communities, which are very similar to Cooper Landing,
28 but do not have a rural preference, such as Moose Pass
29 and Sterling. Which is not -- that's a Federal issue,
30 but, however, he wanted that passed on that it was his
31 concern.

32
33 And then his other concern was for
34 conservation, that our moose populations were very low
35 in Unit 7, and he didn't want greater pressure put on
36 them by having a subsistence hunt. And he didn't feel
37 that it was really that necessary, that people were
38 harvesting -- that people that wanted to harvest were
39 having enough opportunity for what moose that were
40 available to them.

41
42 So I think that pretty well covers his
43 points. He was going to have something made up for us,
44 and I was hoping -- he's lived in Cooper Landing all
45 his life. He was born there. And very familiar with
46 the population. I thought we could get some really
47 good information from him, and I'm sorry that we can't
48 pass that on, and I can't. But his feelings are almost
49 the same as mine, that the populations in Cooper
50 Landing are not at the point where we need any more

1 pressure on them from hunting.

2

3 And so with that, I think that pretty
4 well covers it. And if anybody's got questions for me,
5 I'll be glad to try to answer them for you.

6

7 Thank you.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Bill.
10 Thank you for conveying that. And I don't know if
11 anybody has anything specifically that they would like
12 to ask you about some of Ben's positions. Greg.

13

14 MR. ENCELEWSKI: I just kind of had one
15 general question. And that would be, you know, if they
16 did have the Federal hunt, do you think it would put
17 more pressure, or would it just shift the hunting to
18 the Federal portion of it?

19

20 MR. STOCKWELL: Wow. I think -- my
21 concern is that in Cooper Landing, I think if there was
22 -- the fisheries thing, people were kind of, you know,
23 gee, what's going to happen. But if you noticed, there
24 was 70 people in Cooper Landing that applied for
25 subsistence dipnet permits, and there was a fair amount
26 of harvest. I mean, it was great, people got the fish.
27 and actually there was more people fishing from Cooper
28 Landing than there was from Ninilchik.

29

30 And I think that people in Cooper
31 Landing -- people I've talked to, the ones that were in
32 favor of it, said, boy, this is going to be great.
33 Well, maybe I'll have a better opportunity to get a
34 moose. So I think it's going to attract people. Okay.
35 That's my personal opinion.

36

37 MR. ENCELEWSKI: That's what I wanted
38 to hear. Thanks.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Bill. Any
41 other questions.

42

43 (No comments)

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With that, it's
46 time to go on to Regional Council deliberations. If we
47 could have a motion on the table to entertain at this
48 point in time.

49

50 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman. I move

1 proposal 08-22b, move to adopt.
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: As written, as
4 modified?
5
6 MR. CARPENTER: As modified by OSM
7 Staff.
8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. There's been a
10 motion on the.....
11
12 MS. WAGGONER: Second.
13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:table to -- is
15 there a second. The motion is on table and seconded to
16 adopt WP08-22b as modified by the OSM.
17
18 Discussion. You can speak first, Tom.
19
20 MR. CARPENTER: I think I'll just
21 listen.
22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tricia.
24
25 MS. WAGGONER: I will vote in support
26 of 22b as modified by OSM. I believe that since there
27 is currently a take of moose by non-resident Alaskan
28 hunters within Unit 7 and 15, there is substantial
29 evidence that this hunt can support any additional
30 pressure from subsistence hunting.
31
32 I don't believe it would be detrimental
33 -- it would not be detrimental to subsistence hunters.
34 It would enhance the opportunity for subsistence
35 hunters from Cooper Landing to get additional moose.
36
37 And it would not violate any recognized
38 principles of wildlife conservation, because until the
39 State would change and say that there is a concern and
40 there is no non-resident hunting, then if we can shift
41 the allocation from non-residents to residents, I
42 believe we need to vote in favor of it.
43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: James.
45
46 MR. SHOWALTER: Yes. I'd vote in
47 favor, but I'd like to hear again if there is an antler
48 restrictions the same as other Federal subsistence
49 hunters.
50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's part of the
2 proposal, James.

3
4 MR. SHOWALTER: Thank you.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bill.

7
8 MR. STOCKWELL: Thank you, Mr.
9 Chairman. I'd like to make an amendment to the
10 modified proposal that's proposed by OSM, which is the
11 one we're working on. I'd like to remove Unit 7 from
12 the proposal totally and I would like to make
13 everything for 15A and B the same as it already is for
14 the others that have preference for 15A and B.

15
16 And the reason that I would like to
17 withdraw this is for two reasons. One is I think
18 there's enough opposition in Cooper Landing to this
19 hunt that adding 7 to it is going to cause another big
20 uproar like we had in the past. And I'm not personally
21 ready to go through that kind of an uproar over this
22 hunt. I think we can give the people in Cooper Landing
23 who want to hunt enough subsistence opportunity by
24 allowing them to just tag on to the 15A and B seasons
25 that are already in effect for Ninilchik and the other
26 communities. 15B is important to Cooper Landing if
27 it's going to be part of the subsistence, because
28 there's the part of 15B that's the opposite side of the
29 Russian River in the refuge, and that's always been a
30 favored place for people to hunt.

31
32 We do have definite conservation issues
33 in Unit 7. It's been brought up by local people.
34 There's been a lot of people who really feel that
35 there's just not much in the way of moose in Unit 7. I
36 think we have some real problems with moose
37 conservation. And I feel that this can add to those as
38 well as adding to the problems of local people being
39 opposed to the hunt. So I think we can make life
40 easier for the people in Cooper Landing, and we can
41 make life easier for ourselves by eliminating Unit 7
42 from the proposal. And I don't think this will really
43 impact the people who want to hunt from Cooper Landing
44 and give them subsistence priority. So that's my
45 amendment.

46
47 Thank you.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Thank you,
50 Bill. If I understand right, your amendment is to

1 remove Unit 7 from this proposal, an to make 15A and B
2 aligned with the other subsistence-qualified hunters.

3

4 MR. STOCKWELL: That's correct.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Is there a
7 second.

8

9 MR. SHOWALTER: I'll second it.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Huh?

12

13 MR. SHOWALTER: I'll second it.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: James will second it.

16 Okay.

17

18 MR. CARPENTER: I have a question.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: A question. Tom.

21

22 MR. CARPENTER: I just have a question.

23 I mean I understand what your concern is, Bill, but

24 this seems a little bizarre to me. It seems a little

25 bizarre to me that Cooper Landing, which is in Unit 7

26 doesn't want to have a season where they live, but they

27 want to have a season where they don't live.

28

29 MR. STOCKWELL: Right

30

31 MR. CARPENTER: That would be like

32 Cordova saying they don't want a moose season here,

33 they want to go to Valdez. You see from my perspective

34 it seems a little strange. And I guess the question I

35 really have is, is there anywhere else in the State,

36 does anybody know, that that is a fact, and is there

37 any precedent for the Board to give C&T for -- you

38 know, we basically gave C&T for all three of those

39 areas, but have they ever opened a hunt to a community

40 where they don't live. I just.....

41

42 MR. STOCKWELL: Just to answer that

43 question, in 1995 when they went through this process

44 the first time around when all of the hullabaloo broke

45 out, Cooper Landing and Hope were given hunts in 15A

46 and 15B, but they were not given hunts in Unit 7. So

47 that was done the first time around. So just as

48 history.

49

50 And, yeah, when you look at the Kenai,

1 you know, Nanwalek and Seldovia have a hunt in 15A
2 which is a lot further away. Actually, you've got to
3 remember that Cooper Landing abuts right onto the
4 refuge, you know, the refuge is our neighbor. It's not
5 very far from -- the last houses in Cooper Landing are
6 right on the border actually of 15. So it isn't that
7 farfetched that we are hunting pretty much in our back
8 yard by 15A and B, because B is just on the other side
9 of the Russian River.

10

11 But I agree with you, it is bizarre.

12

13 MR. CARPENTER: I guess a follow-up
14 question then. There is a State season in Unit 7,
15 correct?

16

17 MR. STOCKWELL: There is a State season
18 in Unit 7.

19

20 MR. CARPENTER: So do you not see it a
21 little odd that with a State season, that the State is
22 less restrictive to people that live in Cooper Landing
23 than the Federal season would be? And I guess the
24 other question I have is has Cooper Landing Advisory
25 Committee, that you know of, ever gone to the Board of
26 Game and said, please close the moose season down in
27 Unit 7, because we are worried about the moose
28 populations?

29

30 MR. STOCKWELL: No, the AC has not gone
31 to the Board or requested any closure on Unit 7.
32 Probably quite a few of those moose that are harvested
33 in Unit 7 by Cooper Landing people, the ones that are
34 harvested locally, are harvested right along through
35 the Cooper Landing area and along the river area, which
36 is predominantly State land. And, of course, the Kenai
37 River is a State park, so anybody that's along the
38 river area, those animals, until you get to the refuge
39 actually are -- there's a lot of private lands along
40 the lowlands along the river bottoms. And so I don't
41 know how many of those would be affected. Actually,
42 the Federal lands, of course, are all around us, and
43 any way you shoot, you're not very far away. Hard to
44 say.

45

46 I'm not sure that answers your question
47 either.

48

49 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Bill.
2
3 I just have a comment on it. I'm not
4 sure that making it easier on ourselves or on anybody
5 fits one of the three criteria that we discussed
6 yesterday that a proposal has to meet. Conservation
7 concerns.....
8
9 MR. STOCKWELL: And there are a lot of
10 conservation concerns for Unit 7.
11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Ricky.
13
14 MR. GEASE: In my questioning I was
15 very specific to Robin West and to those gentlemen from
16 the State, that if the OSM-modified proposals were
17 accepted, which is the proposal in front of us, were
18 there any conservation concerns. Neither one of the
19 three gentlemen expressed a conservation concern just
20 for the record.
21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. That was my
23 feeling also, Ricky.
24
25 Okay. With that, we have an amendment
26 on the table. Any other discussion on the amendment.
27 Greg.
28
29 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah. I guess I just
30 have to comment to your amendment. I'm going to have
31 to vote against it, because I think you have to include
32 your home area there first. But, anyway, I just
33 thought -- find it kind of bizarre, too, that you
34 wouldn't include 7 first.
35
36 MR. CARPENTER: Question on the
37 amendment.
38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We have an
40 amendment on the table to take the OSM-modified
41 proposal, remove Unit 7, and make 15A and B uniform
42 with all subsistence qualified -- with all qualified
43 subsistence users. Is that understood? Am I correct
44 on that one?
45
46 MR. STOCKWELL: Correct.
47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With that, the
49 question has been called. All in favor of the
50 amendment signify by saying aye.

1 MR. STOCKWELL: Aye.
2
3 MR. SHOWALTER: Aye.
4
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
6 saying nay.
7
8 IN UNISON: Nay.
9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I believe the nays
11 have it. We could go to a show of hands, or we could
12 go to a -- let's do it with show of hands. That's all
13 we need. All in favor of the amendment signify by
14 raising your right hand.
15
16 (Show of hands)
17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
19 raising the same hand.
20
21 (Show of hands)
22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. The amendment
24 fails. So now we have before us the modified
25 subsistence -- the modified OSM proposal.
26
27 Doug.
28
29 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chair. We're working
30 on this one that's on Page 139 and 140, is that
31 correct?
32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.
34
35 MR. BLOSSOM: I guess I would like to
36 make some slight amendments to that.
37
38 MR. GEASE: Weren't we on 161?
39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No. No. 161. My
41 fault.
42
43 MR. BLOSSOM: Okay. Well, that's
44 really short. Okay. So the amendments, we don't want
45 to take all these other closed areas that were
46 proposed.
47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We have before us the
49 proposal as modified on Page 161.
50

1 MR. BLOSSOM: Which isn't very long.
2 Okay.
3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, which is not very
5 long.
6
7 MR. BLOSSOM: Okay. My amendments are
8 that in Unit 7, the dates are August 10 to September
9 20, and in Unit 15A it's August 10 to September 20 with
10 no late season. In Unit 15B it's August 10 to
11 September 20, and also in 15B October 20 to November
12 10. So that would be the changes that -- the big
13 change here is that they never asked for 15C and I
14 don't think it -- so it should not come in. So 15B and
15 the late season in 15B is October 20 to November 10.
16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So you're basically
18 taking this proposal and just dropping 15C, right?
19
20 MR. BLOSSOM: Dropping 15C and dropping
21 the late -- making sure there's not late hunt in 15A.
22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. There isn't
24 any. But that's -- Okay.
25
26 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman.
27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.
29
30 MR. CARPENTER: Just a point of order.
31 The proposal that I made was the exact language on Page
32 161, which doesn't include 15C.
33
34 MR. BLOSSOM: But it does.
35
36 MR. CARPENTER: No, it doesn't. It
37 only includes 15A and 15B.
38
39 MR. BLOSSOM: Go to the back. Turn the
40 page.
41
42 MR. CARPENTER: No, this is the
43 proposal that I.....
44
45 MR. ENCELEWSKI: This is just the
46 Skilak.
47
48 MR. CARPENTER: That's just the Skilak
49 Loop down there.
50

1 MR. BLOSSOM: Okay. Okay. I just want
2 it clear.

3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So let's
5 clarify that then. So there -- this is only 15A, 15B,
6 the Skilak Loop season in 15A is no open season, 15C
7 does not apply to Cooper Landing, but remains the same
8 for other people like we've always had. And the late
9 season remains the same as it always has. Okay.

10
11 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman. Just to
12 be specific, let me read it into the record. It is to
13 establish an August 10th to September 20 season with
14 antler restrictions in Unit 7 remainder. Establish
15 special provisions in Unit 7 remainder. Maintain no
16 open season in the Skilak Loop Wildlife Management
17 Area. And retain the current antler restrictions and
18 seasons in 15A and 15B.

19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Thank you
21 muchly, Tom.

22
23 MR. BLOSSOM: Then I'll withdraw my
24 amendment. Fine.

25
26 MS. WAGGONER: Well, I think basically
27 based on the C&T that we discussed earlier for 15A and
28 15B, and we aren't really changing anything in 15. So
29 it's just giving them access to 15A and 15B. So it's
30 not changing the existing regs at all.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No.

33
34 MR. ENCELEWSKI: That's right.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bill.

37
38 MR. STOCKWELL: Clarification, and I
39 think Doug brought this up, too. Are we going to give
40 them the late season in 15B?

41
42 MR. BLOSSOM: Yeah.

43
44 MR. STOCKWELL: Yes, we are. Okay.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That season remains
47 the same.

48
49 MR. STOCKWELL: Remains the same.
50 Okay. Everything in 15A and B are the same as they are

1 now?

2

3 MR. CARPENTER: Yes.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yep. Any other
6 discussion, comments, changes, amendments.

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Question. Call the
11 question.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You're calling the
14 question, Greg?

15

16 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Sure.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. The questions
19 been called on the modified proposal as found on Page
20 161 as defined by Tom Carpenter to apply to Unit 7, and
21 with no changes to 15A and 15B, with the seasons
22 remaining the same as they have been. All in favor
23 signify by saying aye.

24

25 IN UNISON: Aye.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All in opposed signify
28 by saying nay.

29

30 MR. STOCKWELL: Nay.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries with
33 one nay. Would the minority like to state a comment on
34 it?

35

36 MR. STOCKWELL: Thank you. Yeah. My
37 reasons are two. I don't think it supports the desires
38 of the people in Cooper Landing. And, number 2, I'm
39 worries about conservation concerns for Unit 7.

40

41 Thank you.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

44

45 Okay. With that I need a break for a
46 second. I didn't get up over this last one. It is
47 already going on 4:30. There's a request that because
48 of things going on that we would quit a little bit
49 early today. Would this Council like to go on to
50 another proposal or two before we go or should we take

1 a couple short easy ones and then.....

2

3 MS. STICKWAN: Short easy ones?

4

5 (Laughter)

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Short easy.

8

9 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes. Tom.

12

13 MR. CARPENTER: I actually think that
14 Proposal 15 and 16 are pretty straight forward to me.
15 They're both rather short. I think we could get them
16 done both by 5:00 o'clock. I mean, I would prefer to
17 that. So that tomorrow when we deal with these moose
18 proposals, that we have most of the day, and hopefully
19 we could finish by tomorrow night.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Tom, can I ask
22 you a favor?

23

24 MR. CARPENTER: Sure.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: While I take a trip to
27 the back, would you start with opening up WP08-15.

28

29 MR. CARPENTER: Yes, I will, Mr.
30 Chairman.

31

32 Are you doing the analysis, Greg?

33

34 MR. RISDAHL: I promise to be shorter.

35

36 MR. CARPENTER: He's promised to be
37 shorter. We are going to bring to the floor Greg.
38 He's going to discuss Proposal WP08-15, beaver, Unit
39 11.

40

41 MR. RISDAHL: Mr. Chairman. Members of
42 the Council. For the record my name is Greg Risdahl.
43 I'm the OSM wildlife biologist here presenting this
44 Proposal WP08-15.

45

46 This proposal was submitted by Mr. Dean
47 Wilson, Jr., and requests an expansion of the beaver
48 trapping season for Unit 11 from November 10th through
49 April 30th to September 25th through May 31st, and
50 changes the harvest limit to no limit.

1 The proponent's intent is to provide an
2 additional opportunity for Federally-qualified
3 subsistence users to trap beaver for meat as well as
4 for their valuable pelts. The proposed regulatory
5 change would provide Federally-qualified users an
6 opportunity to trap beaver on Federally managed lands
7 and waters both before and after freeze up.
8

9 We've spoken about the amount of
10 Federal public lands in this area. About 81 percent of
11 the land is Federal. 79 percent are managed by the
12 Park Service, 2 percent by the Forest Service. Similar
13 to the muskrat proposal we looked at earlier, all rural
14 residents are eligible to harvest beaver in Unit 11;
15 however, under the Park Service regulations, only
16 qualified individuals who live in resident zone
17 communities are eligible to harvest beavers in the
18 national park proper, or those who possess a
19 subsistence eligibility permit granted by the park
20 superintendent.
21

22 We've been through the regulatory
23 history several times I'll skip through that.
24 Essentially the beaver season has remained unchanged
25 since 1990 when it was adopted from the State
26 regulations.
27

28 Similar to the muskrat proposal, we did
29 -- we spoke on earlier, the proponent for this proposal
30 contacted the OSM and asked to change or amend his
31 original proposal when he found out that he was unable
32 to harvest beaver, furbearers, with a firearm on Park
33 Service lands. So instead of expanding the Federal
34 beaver trapping season as he originally asked, he
35 suggested that be changed to the hunting season. In
36 other words, to change the June 1 through October 10
37 Federal subsistence beaver hunting season to September
38 25th through May 31st.
39

40 A very small amount about beaver and
41 their biology in this area. They're generally
42 considered to be common along road-accessible wetland
43 areas. Although beaver cache surveys are not conducted
44 in the area, field observations of impoundments and
45 food caches made during aerial big game surveys suggest
46 the beaver numbers are high in both unroaded and roaded
47 areas as well.
48

49 As noted earlier, there are fewer and
50 fewer individuals today trapping, although they're

1 getting the -- the average age of the trapper is older
2 and they have more years of experience than in the
3 past. However, results from trapper responses to
4 questionnaires suggest that prices paid for fur are not
5 that important to those individuals who continue to
6 trap today. In other words, most trappers do it
7 recreationally because they enjoy being outside.
8 Nevertheless, low fur prices have likely contributed to
9 the long-term decline in the overall numbers of
10 trappers.

11
12 Moving on to the effects of the
13 proposal. As noted earlier, this individual once he
14 found out that he was unable to harvest beaver or other
15 furbearers with a firearm on Park Service lands asked
16 to change the original proposal that would expand the
17 trapping season to a proposal that would expand the
18 hunting season for beaver.

19
20 If the proponent's change were adopted,
21 Federally-qualified subsistence users would be able to
22 harvest beaver year round with a firearms. During
23 approximately eight months of the years, specifically
24 from September 25th through May 31st, there would be no
25 harvest limit for beavers with a firearm. From June
26 1st through September 24th, the harvest limit would
27 continue to be one beaver per day with a one beaver
28 possession limit.

29
30 Because of easy access to beaver
31 streams and ponds along the road system, a year round
32 hunting season with no harvest limit for eight months
33 of the year could potentially jeopardize the beaver
34 populations in easy to access roaded areas throughout
35 Unit 11 as a result of increased harvest and wounding
36 loss. It could also potentially impact trappers who
37 trap under State regulations for beaver in this area.

38
39 Adopting an expanded Federal
40 subsistence trapping season as originally proposed,
41 however, with no harvest limit for beaver, would
42 provide an additional 77 days of opportunity to take
43 beaver. Adopting the original proposal would also
44 align Federal and State trapping regulations for beaver
45 in Unit 11, simplify regulations overall, therefore
46 reduce confusion and not create potential conservation
47 concerns for beaver populations in easy to access
48 areas.

49
50 Therefore, the OSM preliminary

1 conclusion is to support Wildlife Proposal WP08-15 as
2 it originally proposed. In other words, to expand the
3 beaver trapping season.

4
5 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members of
6 the Council.

7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions. Ricky.

9
10 MR. GEASE: Yeah. If you extended year
11 round hunting with one beaver per day, one in
12 possession, would that alleviate conservation concerns?

13
14 MR. RISDAHL: Mr. Gease through the
15 Chair. Would you repeat that?

16
17 MR. GEASE: Currently right now for the
18 hunting season, it's one beaver per day, one in
19 possession from June 1 through October 10th. If it was
20 a year-round hunting season with the same possessions
21 of one beaver per day, one in possession, would that
22 alleviate the conservation concerns, because that then
23 would put harvest limits on beaver per day in
24 possession. Thank you.

25
26 MR. RISDAHL: That's a good question,
27 Mr. Gease. That would definitely possibly
28 substantially reduce the harvest. And the only thing
29 that I can say to that is that's not what the proponent
30 asked for and therefore we did not evaluate that.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I have a question.
33 How would expanding the current proposed Federal
34 regulations, September 25th through May 31st, and
35 allowing -- changing it to a hunting one, and so
36 allowing them to shoot them, how would that affect the
37 State regulation, which is already September 25th
38 through May 31st, unless the State regulation does not
39 allow them to shoot one, which is what I believe it
40 does, but I'm not positive on that.

41
42 MR. RISDAHL: Mr. Chairman. Let me
43 defer to the State to answer question about hunting
44 beaver. I don't have that information with me right
45 now.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

48
49 MS. CELLARIUS: Mr. Chair.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, Barbara.
2
3 MS. CELLARIUS: Can I answer that?
4
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, you may.
6
7 MS. CELLARIUS: For the record, Barbara
8 Cellarius with Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and
9 Preserve.
10
11 On national park and preserve lands
12 there is a prohibition on using a firearm to take a
13 beaver under a trapping license whether it's a State
14 season or a Federal season.
15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right. And this would
17 open it up for hunting under a hunting license.
18
19 MS. CELLARIUS: (Nods affirmatively)
20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Okay.
22
23 MR. GEASE: Question.
24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Ricky.
26
27 MR. GEASE: Just to clarify then, but
28 there is a hunting season June 1 through October 10th,
29 1 beaver per day, 1 in possession. Okay.
30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. This would
32 basically change it to a hunting season all year round,
33 but from September 25th through May 31st, there would
34 be no bag limit.
35
36 Okay. Bill.
37
38 MR. STOCKWELL: Yeah. I'm a little
39 confused. The proposal is for changing the trapping
40 season, then Mr. Wilson called up and he wanted to
41 change that to a hunting season? All right. But --
42 and the hunting season would be open year around, but
43 only during that summer part there would be a
44 possession and bag limit, right?
45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right.
47
48 MR. STOCKWELL: Okay. So why when you
49 go to the hunting season wouldn't you have the bag
50 limit the year around? Well, anyhow.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think the idea in
2 the summertime was that they were strictly being taken
3 for food. That one a day was more than sufficient.

4
5 MR. STOCKWELL: I understand that, but
6 what I'm saying is, why would we then have no limit
7 during the winter of a hunting season, which we're
8 changing from a trapping season?

9
10 MR. RISDAHL: Mr. Chairman. Mr.
11 Stockwell. I actually wasn't the individual that spoke
12 with the proponent, but I definitely see what you're
13 saying. The original hunting season was put in place
14 obviously to allow subsistence users to take beaver for
15 food. That was the hunting season. But once he
16 discovered that he could not hunt on Park Service
17 lands, he thought, oh, we need to expand the hunting
18 season. But OSM, after evaluating this, we decided
19 that, you know, if you could -- if you were able to
20 hunt year around and with no harvest limit, that might
21 be a conservation concern on these roaded areas.
22 Therefore we said, you know, we'll support this for the
23 expanded trapping season, because the harvest would not
24 likely be as great, there wouldn't be nearly as many
25 people out there doing it, and therefore not nearly the
26 conservation concern, and yet people could continue to
27 harvest meat during the summer for food with a firearm,
28 because there already is a hunting season for them.

29
30 Does that help at all?

31
32 MR. STOCKWELL: Sort of. But you did
33 not analyze making a hunting season with a bag limit
34 and possession limit year around?

35
36 MR. RISDAHL: We did not. We did not.

37
38 MR. STOCKWELL: Thank you. I think
39 that you already answered that once, but it's still
40 confusing.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Gloria,
43 did you have a comment.

44
45 MS. STICKWAN: I thought I understood
46 this, but now I'm confused.

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do you want to take a
49 minute?

50

1 MS. STICKWAN: No. You're saying that
2 you're -- this proposal is no limit for trapping or
3 hunting? The OSM.

4
5 MR. RISDAHL: Ms. Stickwan. The way we
6 -- our conclusion, OSM's conclusion is to support the
7 proponent's proposal as it was originally brought to
8 us. and that would be to expand the trapping season to
9 firearm hunting for this longer season, instead of
10 going to what he suggested later was to make a longer
11 hunting season with a no limit. So what we've done is
12 actually a little more conservative than what the
13 proponent asked after he discovered that he could not
14 hunt beaver on Park Service lands.

15
16 MS. STICKWAN: And you'd say there's no
17 limit, or keep the 30 beaver?

18
19 MR. RISDAHL: Well, as far as the
20 trapping season goes, there would be no limit during
21 this expanded season. However, there would still be a
22 hunting season as there has been in the past that ran
23 from -- let's see, what was it -- June 1 through
24 September 24th, and that harvest limit is 1 beaver per
25 day with one in possession. And that is essentially --
26 that was created to provide that as an opportunity for
27 food.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.

30
31 MR. CARPENTER: I was just going to
32 make a comment. And maybe it's just a suggestion, but
33 when an individual puts a proposal in, and it's
34 submitted and the Staff analysis is done, I think
35 that's the way it should be submitted to the Council.
36 Because I think it just causes confusion when -- I
37 mean, I think there's people that are -- you know, it
38 causes confusion after the fact when we're looking at
39 one thing, but he really wanted another. I think, you
40 know -- and I understand it's Dean and I want to make
41 every allowance for him, but you do have the next Board
42 cycle to go through, but.....

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Larry.

45
46 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman. If I could
47 say it this way, on Page 82 we're showing the proposal
48 as officially submitted, and we've characterized what's
49 being asked for in the general description and then we
50 show the effect in regulation if it was passed. That

1 is the official submission. That's what was let out
2 for comment this summer. That's the proposal of
3 record.

4
5 What Greg is reporting is that in the
6 course of analyzing it, we had contact with Mr. Wilson,
7 the proponent, and as he understood Park Service
8 regulations, trapping versus hunting, firearm use, when
9 he took a look at all of that, he started to think that
10 perhaps working with the hunting regulations would be
11 better capturing what he was after. But we were -- we
12 had already received the proposal, it was out for
13 comment, it was under analysis. So the analysis notes
14 that contact that that thinking by him and talks about
15 consequences of going in that direction. But in the
16 end, our conclusion is simply is to simply support the
17 proposal, the official proposal, the one on Page 82,
18 not the concept that emerged in dialogue with him.

19
20 So the record is clean, we've got a
21 proposal, it was out for comment in a proposal booklet,
22 which several of you have, and the analysis concludes,
23 support the proposal. All this discussion about
24 hunting and contacts with the proponent are kind of an
25 aside, giving you context on his thinking. But we are
26 working with the proposal of record.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Larry.
29 Gloria.

30
31 MS. STICKWAN: I was wondering if we
32 can hear from NPS about hunting along the road system
33 for beaver.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

36
37 MS. CELLARIUS: For the record, Barbara
38 Cellarius. Gloria, could you repeat your question,
39 please?

40
41 MS. STICKWAN: I just wanted to hear
42 what you had to say about hunting for beaver along the
43 road system in Unit 11.

44
45 MS. CELLARIUS: My understanding
46 actually comes from some comments that we got from the
47 State area biologist, and I think that Mason would
48 concur with those comments. Mason is the wildlife
49 biologist for the park. And that is if there was a no
50 limit hunting season, that it's possible that you could

1 have the beaver populations in the road-accessible
2 ponds pretty much -- you could do some significant
3 damage to those populations if there was a no limit
4 season. And that's what was being discussed. I mean,
5 that was sort of the issue that was circulated for
6 comment.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Barbara.
9 As a long-time resident of Unit 11 and trapper from
10 that area and a few things, I'll make a couple comments
11 on this. Currently the only open hunting season that
12 we have on beavers on the road system, because they are
13 not in Federal land, almost all of them, is the State
14 Highway Department, which has a tendency to kill
15 beavers that plug up culverts, and they kill all
16 beavers and they use dynamite and shotguns. And that's
17 the decimation of the beavers along the road system,
18 not other hunters.

19

20 The hunting season that we put in place
21 in the past was to allow, and we talked about that with
22 Batzulnetas and a few places like that, was to allow
23 the taking of beavers for meat in the summertime
24 especially like at the cultural camps and at
25 Batzulnetas and other people that were camping out.
26 And they would be scattered all over.

27

28 This proposal does not hardly affect --
29 at least it doesn't affect the road system between
30 Chitina and McCarthy, because all of the ponds that are
31 alongside the road that have beavers in that area are
32 on State or private land, and so Federal law does not
33 apply to them. It would only apply to off road ponds.

34

35

36 I still -- there's a reason that the
37 State, and it's reason historically we have not had
38 hunting for beavers. They're very susceptible, they're
39 very accessible that way, and the loss is pretty great.
40 And so in the past, if you look at State regulations,
41 we do not have hunting for beavers. We have hunting
42 for muskrats, we've always had that, but not for
43 beavers. And I think it -- personally, I think it's a
44 wise choice, and I would be very willing to go along
45 with an extension of the trapping season, but
46 personally I would not extend the hunting season. I
47 would let it go at that.

48

49 Any other questions for the State -- I
50 mean, for the OSM. State of Alaska.

1 MR. RISDAHL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
2 for your clarification. And I apologize for confusing
3 you with bringing in that extra stuff, but I felt, you
4 know, given Mr. Wilson's.....

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, i think it was
7 good that you brought in, because I think we put some
8 things on the table.

9
10 MR. RISDAHL: Thank you.

11
12 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. Adoption of
13 this proposal would align the State and Federal beaver
14 trapping regulations in Unit 11, but the effect would
15 be not to provide any additional opportunity outside of
16 -- or on Federal lands outside of the park, because
17 that opportunity is already available in State
18 regulations.

19
20 We don't -- we haven't given a lot of
21 thought to ideas about a hunting season extension or a
22 hunting season with a particular bag limit and daily
23 possession limit and so forth. I believe we share your
24 concerns about potential for wounding loss, and
25 particularly during the summer months, I know that our
26 Staff in Glennallen have in years -- there was a
27 proposal a number of years ago that they commented on,
28 and that was the perception that summer visitor can
29 have if they would see people plunking beavers from the
30 roadside, and so there could be some public perceptions
31 concerns in addition to wounding loss and those kinds
32 of things.

33
34 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
35 Preliminary Comments to the Regional Advisory Council.

36
37 Wildlife Proposal WP08-15:

38
39 Liberalize the beaver trapping
40 regulations in Unit 11.

41
42 Introduction:

43
44 This proposal would align the Federal
45 beaver trapping season and harvest limit in Unit 11
46 with current State regulations.

47
48 Impact on Subsistence Users:

49
50 The proponent says the longer season

1 and unlimited harvest limit would provide more
2 opportunity before and after freeze up for trappers and
3 consumers of beaver meat. If the intent is to promote
4 more harvest of beaver with firearms under the trapping
5 regulations, however, this proposal would apply only to
6 Federal public lands in Unit 11 outside of Wrangell-St.
7 Elias National Park and Preserve. National Park
8 Service regulations do not allow the harvest of
9 furbearers with firearms under trapping license on NPS
10 lands.

11

12 Opportunity Provided by State:

13

14 State regulations authorize beaver
15 trapping in Unit 11 from September 25 to May 21, with
16 no limit on the number of beavers that can be taken.

17

18 Other Comments:

19

20 Adoption of this proposal would align
21 the State and Federal beaver trapping regulations in
22 Unit 11 but would not provide additional opportunity on
23 Federal lands outside of Wrangell-St. Elias National
24 Park because that opportunity is already available in
25 State regulations.

26

27 Recommendations:

28

29 As discussed above, this proposal would
30 not provide additional opportunity on limited Federal
31 public lands outside of Wrangell-St. Elias National
32 Park and Preserve (already provided by State
33 regulations) and is not necessary to provide continued
34 customary and traditional subsistence use.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Terry. Any
37 questions for Terry. Fish and Game.

38

39 (No comments)

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none, thank
42 you, Terry.

43

44 MR. HAYNES: Thank you.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have any other
47 Federal, State and tribal agency comments on this
48 proposal.

49

50 (No comments)

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: InterAgency Staff
2 Committee comments.
3
4 (No comments)
5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fish and Game Advisory
7 Committee comments.
8
9 (No comments)
10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Summary of written
12 public comments. Do we have any, Donald.
13
14 MR. MIKE: Yes. Yes, Mr. Chair.
15 You'll find your summary of written public comments on
16 Page 88. We received two written public comments from
17 the Copper River Native Association, and AHTNA, Inc.,
18 and they both support Proposal 15 to allow a Unit 11
19 beaver season with no limit of taking beavers as there
20 is no conservation concern.
21
22 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have any public
25 testimony.
26
27 MR. MIKE: We have no public testimony.
28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Then a motion to
30 accept Proposal WP08-15 as written is in order.
31
32 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman. I move
33 proposal 08-15 as submitted.
34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I have a second.
36
37 MR. HENRICHS: I'll second.
38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
40 seconded. Discussion.
41
42 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman. I'll
43 speak to it. I see no biological concern, it aligns
44 seasons, reduces confusion and I'd call the question.
45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Did you have a
47 question, Bill.
48
49 MR. STOCKWELL: I do. My question is
50 what we're voting on. We're voting on the proposal as

1 is written on Page 82, correct?

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right.

4

5 MR. STOCKWELL: Thank you.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The proposal as
8 written on Page 82. Okay. Any other discussion. I
9 think the question has been called. All in favor
10 signify by saying aye.

11

12 IN UNISON: Aye

13

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

16

17 (No opposing votes)

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. Okay.

20 At this point in time, do we want to go on to 16, or
21 shall we put 16 off to tomorrow, since these are the
22 short easy ones, you know.

23

24 (Laughter)

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And the Fish and Game
27 has requested that we would start tomorrow, because of
28 somebody's having to go some place with Proposal --
29 that WP08-17 and 18, right? So we can either complete
30 16 today or we can -- when we need a break, we can go
31 back to 16 tomorrow. Finish it? Okay. We will finish
32 WP08-16 today if we have to stay here until 9:00
33 o'clock tonight.

34

35 MR. CARPENTER: No way, man. We're
36 going to be done by 5:00 o'clock. 5:00 o'clock.

37

38 MR. RISDAHL: Mr. Chairman. Members of
39 the Council. For the record my name is Greg Risdahl,
40 OSM biologist.

41

42 Wildlife Proposal WP08-16 begins on
43 Page 90 of your book. This proposal was submitted by
44 Mr. Dean Wilson, Jr. It requests changing the Unit 11
45 Federal subsistence mountain goat season dates from
46 August 25th through December 31st to August 10th
47 through December 31st.

48

49 The proponent states that beginning the
50 mountain goat hunting season at the same time as the

1 Dall sheep season would provide more opportunity for
2 Federal subsistence hunters. In fact, many subsistence
3 hunters are in the field before August 25th to make
4 sure they do not get caught out in snow storms.
5 Currently there is very little hunting pressure on
6 mountain goats in Unit 11 specifically by subsistence
7 users, and that if there is an increase in hunting
8 pressure, then the established quota would still limit
9 the total take.

10

11 Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and
12 Preserve manages 79 percent of the land in Unit 11.
13 The Forest Service manages approximately two percent of
14 the lands.

15

16 Residents of Unit 11 and a number of
17 other communities in Unit 13 have a positive C&T use
18 determination for mountain goat hunting in Unit 11.

19

20 The Alaska Department of Fish and Game
21 began collecting mountain goat harvest information back
22 in 1972 in this area. Since 1980, the State has
23 administered this hunt by registration permits. The
24 Federal subsistence registration permit system began in
25 1998 when the Federal Subsistence Board determined that
26 there was a subsistence use of mountain goats by local
27 rural residents in the national park itself. At that
28 time, an August 25th to December 31st season was
29 established.

30

31 The use of aircraft is prohibited by
32 Federally-qualified subsistence users hunting under
33 Federal regulations within the park proper, although it
34 is allowed in the preserve.

35

36 As far as biology goes, there are
37 approximately 700 mountain goats inhabiting the
38 southern Wrangell and Chugach Mountains in Unit 11.
39 Population information is collected from one aerial
40 trend survey located at MacColl Ridge north of the
41 Chitina River. The average mountain goat population on
42 MacColl Ridge has been around 65 goats per year. Most
43 goats are believed to be counted on the exposed cliffs
44 when this trend area is flown. The long-term average
45 kid/adult ratio is about 23 kids per 100 adults. And
46 occasionally additional population information is
47 collected during aerial surveys for Dall sheep
48 incidently.

49

50 The Alaska Department of Fish and Game

1 management objective is to maintain a harvest of less
2 than 10 percent of the estimated mountain goat
3 population in Unit 11. Since 1998, an average of 9.4
4 mountain goats have been taken by an average of 51
5 hunters each year during the State registration hunt.
6 During the same time period, an average of 2 mountain
7 goats has been taken by an average of 29 Federally-
8 qualified subsistence users hunting under Federal
9 subsistence regulations. Thus the total State and
10 Federal combined average take is just over 11 mountain
11 goats per year. State and Federal hunters together are
12 harvesting less than two percent of the total mountain
13 goat population on a yearly basis, well below the
14 Alaska Department of Fish and Game's harvest objective
15 of 10 percent.

16
17 By the way, the quota for Unit 11, the
18 total quota is set at 45 mountain goats, so we're
19 taking 11 mountain goats per year out of a total quota
20 of 45, and subsistence users are taking two of those.

21
22 In terms of the proposal, changing the
23 Unit 11 Federal subsistence mountain goat season dates
24 would lengthen the Federal subsistence by 16 days at
25 the beginning of the season, and would align the goat
26 season with the start of both the State and Federal
27 sheep hunting seasons. This would allow Federally-
28 qualified subsistence users an opportunity to hunt
29 mountain goats and Dall sheep at the same time and
30 during the most accessible part of the season, likely
31 increasing the harvest a small amount. However,
32 because Unit 11 is remote, mountain goat habitat is
33 typically difficult to access, few individuals are
34 eligible, and fewer still choose to hunt under Federal
35 subsistence regulations, it is expected that the number
36 of additional goats to be taken would be small.

37
38 Therefore, the OSM preliminary
39 conclusion is to support Wildlife Proposal WP08-16.

40
41 Thank you.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any
44 questions.

45
46 (No comments)

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you for a very
49 nice synopsis on that.

50

1 Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

2

3 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. The
4 Department does not support this proposal. Unit 11
5 goat population is the northernmost goat population in
6 Alaska, and conservative management is required. Most
7 of the accessible goat hunting areas are marginal goat
8 habitat and goat numbers are low in these areas. Only
9 about half the goats in Unit 11 are found in areas
10 accessible to hunters.

11

12 Implementing an earlier Federal season
13 would subject goat populations in some of these
14 accessible areas where local residents also hunt Dall
15 sheep to potential over-harvest. An earlier season
16 opening would encourage the incidental harvest of goats
17 by Federally-qualified subsistence users who fail to
18 harvest a Dall sheep and who are not specifically
19 targeting goats.

20

21 One area in particular where goat
22 numbers are low, but very accessible is the
23 Kotsina/Kuskulana area, and we believe goats there
24 would be vulnerable to overharvest.

25

26 We believe the existing Federal season
27 provides ample goat hunting opportunity for Federally-
28 qualified subsistence users.

29

30 Neither the proposal nor the
31 preliminary conclusion provide for close in-season
32 monitoring if this proposal was to be adopted. Such
33 monitoring would be critical in order to assess the
34 potential effects of increased goat harvest in specific
35 goat hunting areas, and to facilitate in-season
36 closures if necessary for conservation purposes.

37

38 Thank you.

39

40 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
41 Preliminary Comments to the Regional Advisory Council.

42

43 Wildlife Proposal WP08-16:

44

45 Lengthen the hunting season for
46 mountain goat in a portion of Unit 11 by opening the
47 Federal season to coincide with the Federal sheep
48 season on August 10 which is 15 days earlier than the
49 current Federal goat season opening on August 25. The
50 Federal goat season currently opens a week earlier than

1 the State season, which opens on September 1.

2

3 Introduction:

4

5 This proposal request that the mountain
6 goat season in Unit 11 be opened on August 10 instead
7 of August 25 in order to align it with the season
8 opening date of the State's general sheep hunt in Unit
9 11 and provide more hunting opportunity for Federally-
10 qualified subsistence users.

11

12 Impact on Subsistence Users:

13

14 Adoption of this proposal would provide
15 additional goat hunting opportunity on the short-term
16 for subsistence users in Unit 11, that portion within
17 the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve, by
18 opening the season on August 10 instead of August 25.
19 However, if harvests substantially increase,
20 restrictions on goat hunting may necessary in the long-
21 term.

22

23 Opportunity Provided by State:

24

25 State regulations authorize the harvest
26 of one goat by registration permit in Unit 11 during a
27 September 1 through November 30 season.

28

29 Conservation Issues:

30

31 The Unit 11 goat population is
32 northernmost goat population in Alaska and conservative
33 management is necessary. Most of the accessible goat
34 hunting areas are marginal goat habitat, and goat
35 numbers are low in these areas. Only about half the
36 goats in Unit 11 are found in areas accessible to
37 hunters. Implementing an earlier Federal season would
38 subject goat populations in some of these accessible
39 areas where local residents also hunt dall sheep to
40 overharvest. An earlier season opening would encourage
41 the incidental harvest of goats by Federally-qualified
42 subsistence users who fail to harvest dall sheep and
43 are not specifically targeting goats. For example,
44 goat numbers are low but very accessible in the
45 Kotsina-Kuskulana area and would be vulnerable to
46 overharvest.

47

48 Enforcement Issues:

49

50 Differences in State and Federal

1 regulations create enforcement issues in areas of mixed
2 land ownership.

3

4 Recommendation:

5

6 Oppose. The existing Federal season
7 provides ample goat hunting opportunity for Federally-
8 qualified subsistence users. Neither the proposal nor
9 the Preliminary Conclusion in the Federal Staff
10 analysis provide for close in-season monitoring if this
11 proposal is adopted. Such monitoring is critical in
12 order to assess the potential effects of increased goat
13 harvest in specific goat hunting areas and to
14 facilitate in-season closures if necessary for
15 conservation purposes.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Terry.

18

19 Any questions for Terry. Bill.

20

21 MR. STOCKWELL: Yeah. I'm not just
22 sure how you can answer this, but the conclusions of
23 OSM is that there's no conservation concern for goats
24 under this proposal, and you have very strong
25 conservation concerns of this proposal. My question
26 is, who am I supposed to listen to?

27

28 MR. HAYNES: The State, of course. Mr.
29 Chairman.

30

31 (Laughter)

32

33 MR. STOCKWELL: Yeah. Okay.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And then
36 justification, please. Thank you.

37

38 (Laughter)

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Terry, for what I see
41 is the State is looking at it on a microscopic basis
42 where the OSM is looking at it as an over-all unit, and
43 I can recognize that. I know that you can take all the
44 goats off of any one hill by hunting the best spot on
45 that hill, and sooner or later you get rid of them all.
46 But your concern is not the over-all population. Your
47 concern is that that early sheep hunt may concentrate
48 effort on certain small areas where you have a small
49 population isolated to a certain ridge or a certain
50 bowl.

1 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. Yes.
2 Because based on what our Staff in Glennallen have told
3 me, with only about half the goats in Unit 11 being
4 easily accessible.....

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: There aren't any
7 easily accessible.

8
9 (Laughter)

10
11 MR. HAYNES: I mean, well, relatively
12 speaking. About half the population really isn't going
13 to be subject to hunting, and in their judgment the
14 other half could be. And if there is earlier
15 opportunity and opportunistic hunting by Dall sheep
16 hunters, then you do subject some of these localized
17 populations to the potential for over-harvest. We
18 don't know what actual behavior might occur, but that
19 is a concern.

20
21 MR. STOCKWELL: So you're worried about
22 ridge-by-ridge rather than the overall goat population
23 within Unit 11, correct?

24
25 MR. HAYNES: That's correct.

26
27 MR. STOCKWELL: Thank you.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Ricky.

30
31 MR. GEASE: Yeah, a couple of things.
32 One is you have on the State side is a harvest cap of
33 45 and pretty far below that. And the other thing is
34 the majority of people hunting mountain goats now are
35 accessing it by plane where you can kind of identify
36 where goats are. I just have a hard time reconciling
37 it if there's a conservation cap of 45 and we're way
38 below that consistently, where is the conservation
39 concern? And if there is a conservation concern, is
40 the State considering adjusting the harvest cap of 45?

41
42 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. I think
43 what we're looking at is we don't know what hunter
44 behavior is going to be. And until -- you know, given
45 that, again, only a portion of the goat population is
46 readily accessible to hunters, we can't -- based on
47 current goat hunting patterns in Unit 11, the
48 Department's comfortable with that quota. But if you
49 change the hunting effort, and some of it's
50 concentrated on particular subpopulations, then I'm not

1 sure how we would respond to that. But it's hard to
2 sort out the potential effects of this proposal.
3 You're correct. The current harvest is well below
4 what's available for harvest, and we're just concerned
5 about kind of these unknown changes in hunter use of
6 particular areas.

7
8 MR. GEASE: Are there specific
9 identified areas where there's an overlap between --
10 I'm not familiar with hunting in that area. Is there
11 specific areas where there's a -- are there large areas
12 of overlap between mountain goats and sheep, or are
13 there small isolated areas where there is an overlap
14 between mountain goats and sheep?

15
16 MR. HAYNES: Through the Chair. I
17 didn't talk to our Staff about specifics like that. I
18 did mention -- I did reference one area where -- the
19 Kotsina/Kuskulana area were that is an accessible goat
20 hunting area, and as I recall, it is on route to sheep
21 hunting country. So that is one particular area that
22 sheep hunters would pass through. And whether or not
23 they were successful in getting a sheep on their way
24 back, they might -- if they spotted a goat, they might
25 take it. And so that's one specific area that Staff
26 did mention to me.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Terry on
29 that. And that would bring out one question I'd like
30 to ask you. Do you know the current closure of the
31 sheep season? This aligns the goat season with the
32 opening of the sheep season, and if I remember right,
33 the current closure of the sheep season is either
34 September 1st or September 10th up there.

35
36 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. The State
37 Unit 11 sheep season closes on September 20th.

38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: September 20th. So
40 this basically would give us an additional 15 days of
41 goat hunting during sheep season. And having lived out
42 in Unit 11, most of the hunters that are in Unit 11
43 come out to go sheep hunting. I mean, Unit 11 is a
44 sheep hunting area, not a goat hunting area. So the
45 goats are probably taken opportunistically. And what
46 he was talking about, the Kuskulana/Nugget Creek area
47 also applies to MacColl Ridge, also applies to Donovan,
48 also applies to Hidden Creek. Those are major sheep
49 areas, but they also have a goat population. The head
50 of the Lakanah. And in general most of the people that

1 are there are hunting sheep. And what this would do is
2 extend the season 15 days during the sheep season when
3 hunters are in the field.

4
5 Now, whether that's a problem -- the
6 problem that I don't see is if it's a problem about
7 having reporting fast enough so that you can react,
8 that reporting isn't in place right now under current
9 State law. You have a 45-goat cap, and they could all
10 come off of MacColl Ridge and the State wouldn't know
11 until the end of the season. And so the same -- it's a
12 conservation concern, but the State doesn't address
13 that conservation concern any more than this
14 subsistence proposal would address that conservation
15 concern.

16
17 So I can't see -- that's where I would
18 have to go along with the OSM, that this proposal
19 doesn't cause any greater conservation concern with a
20 45 cap than the current State season does with a 45
21 cap.

22
23 Do you have any comment on that, Terry?

24
25 MR. HAYNES: No, sir.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Any other
28 questions for Terry, for State.

29
30 (No comments)

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Terry.

33
34 MR. HAYNES: Thank you.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The only part that I
37 would disagree with Terry on is that half the goats are
38 inaccessible. In Unit 11 I would put it at about 80
39 percent of the goats are inaccessible and 90 percent
40 are inaccessible for most of the year, you know. And
41 it's -- by regular standards, especially since in the
42 hard park proper you can't use an airplane, you know.
43 But I'm not disagreeing with him. Just that would be
44 an additional comment.

45
46 Anybody from Federal, State or tribal
47 agency that has comments on this. Park Service.

48
49 MS. CELLARIUS: Mr. Chair. Barbara
50 Cellarius from Wrangell-St. Elias. I don't have a

1 comment as much as I just want to say that the Federal
2 goat hunt in Unit 11 is a registration hunt and so the
3 hunters have I think its 15 days or is it -- is it 15?

4

5 MR. BUKLIS: It doesn't say in these
6 regulations. It would be a permit condition.

7

8 MS. CELLARIUS: But what's the standard
9 permit stipulation for returns? It's 5 or 15 days.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's either 5 or 15.

12

13 MS. CELLARIUS: I don't have a permit
14 with me to look at it, but it's either 5 or 15 days.
15 And it comes back to us slightly circuitously, but we
16 get them pretty quick. For administrative reasons they
17 get mailed to Glennallen, and then we get them from
18 Glennallen. But we do take a look at them as they come
19 in, and if there was -- if it looked like there was
20 getting, you know, to be large numbers, we would
21 certainly get in touch with the State and talk to them
22 about the quota.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Barbara. I
25 think with the fact that over the years the average is
26 two goats per year for subsistence hunters and 11 goats
27 per year total in Unit 11 kind of gives you an idea of
28 what goat hunting is like in Unit 11.

29

30 Any other questions for Barbara.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No. Hearing none,
35 let's go to InterAgency Staff Committee.

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fish and Game Advisory
40 Committees.

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Written public
45 comments.

46

47 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair. You'll find your
48 written public comments starting on Page 94. We
49 received two written public comments from AHTNA, Inc
50 and Copper River Native Association, and they are both

1 in support of Proposal 08-16 to increase the Unit 11
2 goat season by 15 days. This will allow Federally-
3 qualified subsistence users greater opportunity to hunt
4 goat and sheep in Unit 11 at the same time.

5

6 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Speaking to that, I
9 would like to mention that when I first came to the
10 valley, I used to visit with one of the older Native
11 ladies in Chitina, and she talked about in fall. In
12 fall they headed up to the mountains to hunt sheep and
13 goats simultaneously together. And they lived on sheep
14 and goats up in the mountain until the snow drove them
15 back down. And so I think it would be shall we say
16 customary and traditional to have sheep and goat
17 hunting combined at the same time, at least from an
18 AHTNA standpoint.

19

20 Okay. At this point in time we have no
21 public comments. Donald, nobody's for public
22 testimony?

23

24 MR. MIKE: We didn't get any public
25 testimony requests, Mr. Chair.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So a motion is
28 in order to accept WP08-16.

29

30 MR. HENRICHS: I'll make the motion.

31

32 MR. CARPENTER: Second.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
35 seconded. Would you like to speak to your motion.

36

37 MR. HENRICHS: No.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Would the second like
40 to speak to the motion?

41

42 MR. CARPENTER: I would just say that
43 there's no biological concerns. This will allow
44 greater subsistence opportunity. The subsistence
45 harvest levels are very low. And both Copper River
46 Native Association and AHTNA supports it. Call the
47 question.

48

49 MS. STICKWAN: I'm sorry, what?

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria would like to
2 speak first.
3
4 MS. STICKWAN: And so I'd like to state
5 what Barbara said that they check on the quota, so they
6 make sure there isn't a conservation concern as well.
7 And thank you for saying that AHTNA use sheep and goat
8 traditionally. I think they should be combined.
9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Okay.
11 Question's been called. All in favor signify by saying
12 aye.
13
14 IN UNISON: Aye.
15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
17 saying nay.
18
19 (No opposing votes)
20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. We
22 will recess this meeting until 8:30 tomorrow morning.
23 We will be starting with WP08-17 and 18.
24
25 (Off record)
26
27 (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

