

1 SOUTHCENTRAL FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

3
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5
6 VOLUME II

7
8
9 Anchorage, Alaska
10 March 15, 2006
11 9:00 o'clock a.m.

12
13
14 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

15
16 Ralph Lohse, Chairman
17 Doug Blossom
18 Tom Carpenter
19 Gilbert Dementi
20 Richard Greg Encelewski
21 Pete Kompkoff
22 Gloria Stickwan
23 Dean L. Wilson, Jr.
24
25 Regional Council Coordinator, Donald Mike

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42 Recorded and transcribed by:

43
44 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
45 3522 West 27th Avenue
46 Anchorage, AK 99517
47 907-243-0668
48 jpk@gci.net

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Anchorage - 3/15/2006)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We'll start again.

MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, Donald.

MR. MIKE: Just some housekeeping. I wanted to remind the public to please sign in. There's a sign-in sheet on the table. For the public that wishes to testify on individual wildlife proposals, they can fill in the green sheet testimony form.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Donald. Okay. I'd like to call this spring session of the Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council back in session. We are in the process of reviewing proposals. We're actually on Proposal WP06-03. You'll find it on Page 43 in your book. For the Council's information, I've had a request that we've got some folks that would like to come talk to us at 10:00 o'clock about our actions yesterday, so you can give some thought to that.

Bill.

MR. KNAUER: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Council Members. I'm Bill Knauer. Maybe I should do it like some of the other people do. For the record, I'm Ralph Lohse.

(Laughter)

MR. KNAUER: Proposal WP06-03 actually starts on Page 51. It was submitted by Mr. Brian McGuire of Anchorage. It requests that Federally qualified subsistence users forfeit to the State of Alaska for auction all antlers from caribou and moose taken in Unit 13.

Mr. McGuire claims that the Federal subsistence hunts have been abused by some and become a trophy hunt in Unit 13. He states that subsistence

1 users need the meat but not the antlers. He also has
2 stated that Federally qualified subsistence users are
3 using ATVs and accessing non-Federal lands where they
4 are harvesting moose using Federal subsistence
5 regulations.

6
7 In Unit 13, slightly less than 10% of
8 the total area is Federal lands and consists of Bureau
9 of Land Management lands, Denali and Wrangell-St. Elias
10 National Parks and Preserve lands and Chugach National
11 Forest lands.

12
13 For caribou there is a Tier II system
14 for the Nelchina herd and then there are some other
15 caribou harvest regulations for the state. There is a
16 Federal harvest in Unit 13(A) and (B) allowing the
17 harvest of two caribou by registration permit. The
18 Federal moose regulation for Unit 13 is also by permit.

19
20 The biological background, the Nelchina
21 herd is within the management objective range exceeding
22 36,000 animals. The total population for moose is not
23 currently available. Depending upon the area, the
24 trend counts range from a low population in parts of
25 Unit 13(D) to a higher population of 1.7 moose per
26 square mile in Unit 13(C).

27
28 I'm not going to go into great detail
29 on this because the proposal does not seem to respond
30 to any specific biological concerns in either caribou
31 or moose populations. Although there is some
32 likelihood of harvest of moose or caribou under Federal
33 regulations occurring off of Federal lands, law
34 enforcement officers in Unit 13 indicate it is not a
35 significant problem. There is in Unit 13 a very high
36 reporting on the permits.

37
38 Our recommendation is to oppose the
39 proposal because requiring Federally qualified
40 subsistence users to forfeit the antlers places an
41 unnecessary restriction on them. Although many
42 subsistence hunters do leave the antlers in the field,
43 this would be detrimental to those Federally qualified
44 subsistence users who might wish to utilize the antlers
45 as part of their regalia, for arts and crafts purposes,
46 or just as a spiritual reminder of a hunt.

47
48 That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Bill. Any

1 questions for Bill.

2

3

(No comments)

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bill, if I looked at
6 this background that you gave us, if I look at the
7 harvest history, it looks like the average caribou hunt
8 is about 1,450 animals. Am I correct on that?

9

10 MR. KNAUER: That's very close, Mr.
11 Chairman.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And about 350 of those
14 are subsistence. The moose, I think what I got out of
15 that was that it's somewhere between 500 and 550
16 animals are taken a year on the moose and about 50 of
17 those are subsistence moose.

18

19 MR. KNAUER: That's correct, on
20 average.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So about 10 percent of
23 them. Any other questions for Bill.

24

(No comments)

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Bill.
27 ADF&G.

28

29
30 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
31 The Department's comments are on Page 57 of your
32 Council book. While the State would love to have the
33 revenue from the sale of all these antlers, we could
34 use it, it's not a very practical solution to the
35 question. Antler forfeiture might address the trophy
36 hunting issue. It would likely create more problems
37 than it would solve. Antler forfeiture would prevent
38 hunters from using moose and caribou antlers for any
39 purpose, including the production of arts and crafts.
40 If Federally qualified subsistence users hunting under
41 the Federal regulations are harvesting moose on
42 State-managed lands, as alleged by the author of this
43 proposal, these problems should be addressed by Federal
44 enforcement.

45

46 Thank you.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Terry. One
49 other comment on that. If Federally qualified users
50 were really after the trophies, they wouldn't keep

1 putting proposals in to take the spike fork 50 off and
2 they have to have big antlers or want cow hunts like
3 they've wanted. So I don't think it's a real big
4 issue. We've heard that about the hunting on lands
5 that they're not supposed to, other than oversights
6 where it's just pretty hard to tell sometimes exactly
7 where you are. Has enforcement considered it a big
8 problem, subsistence hunters hunting on non-subsistence
9 land?

10

11 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. I've not
12 talked to enforcement personnel about it. It seems
13 unusual at times when you look at the high harvest of
14 moose reported on Federal lands in Unit 13 and the very
15 small amount of Federal land that's present in Unit 13.
16 To a biologist, it would look a little bit unusual to
17 have that level of harvest. At the same time, as Mr.
18 Knauer pointed out, Federal enforcement personnel have
19 not identified big issues with hunting on the wrong
20 lands, but it's something I think -- enforcement is
21 important in cases like this where you have differences
22 in the regulations, you have -- as you point out,
23 Federal lands can be hard to distinguish from other
24 lands. It's something we all have to keep an eye on.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I know that's been
27 brought up before, especially down in the Tecal area
28 and a couple other places that more animals are taken
29 than can actually live there. It just turns out that
30 an awful lot of Federal lands are right on passageways,
31 right down in the Tecal area. You've got an area that
32 you've got a lot of animals pass through that don't
33 live there. I think the same thing is true on the
34 Federal lands up the Denali and Paxson area, so that
35 could account for some of it. I was just wondering if
36 the State enforcement officers had said they were
37 having a problem.

38

39 Bill.

40

41 MR. KNAUER: Mr. Chairman. I've spoken
42 with the Federal enforcement folks out of Glennallen,
43 which is one of the areas the proponent was really
44 concerned about and they work quite closely with the
45 State enforcement personnel in that area. They
46 indicated that neither they nor the State enforcement
47 folks in that area are aware of a significant problem.

48

49 There is, of course, an occasional one.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any other
2 questions. Doug.
3
4 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman. I guess
5 since you raised the issue, do you do aerial surveys of
6 those areas for moose?
7
8 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Blossom.
9 Any of the research that's done is done out of our
10 Glennallen office and I can't tell you exactly how
11 often they're doing -- are you talking about aerial
12 surveys during hunting season or surveys to count
13 moose?
14
15 MR. BLOSSOM: Just to count moose. In
16 the areas that I'm familiar with, moose are in some
17 areas and not others and you could have 1 percent of
18 the land mass have 90 percent of the moose at any given
19 time. If this is happening, we need to know it. I
20 guess you need to do some counts if that's what you
21 think is happening.
22
23 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Blossom.
24 There is some information on Page 55 about moose
25 population estimates for part of Unit 13. I can't tell
26 for sure when the last survey -- surveys for 2004-2005
27 were done, so there is some survey work being done
28 every year out there.
29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug, they do moose
31 surveys out of Glennallen.
32
33 MR. BLOSSOM: Yeah. I just know that
34 moose can be thick in some areas at certain times of
35 the year and maybe that's what's happening. But if you
36 think this other is happening, we should know about it.
37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Terry.
39 Doug, I think what we got from both Terry and Bill is
40 neither the Federal nor the State see it as a big issue
41 at this point in time, but the person who put this
42 proposal in did.
43
44 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman. I had no
45 intention of commenting, except when you start talking
46 about moose populations and you're not able to get that
47 many moose in a given area, well, I disagree and that's
48 why I brought it up.
49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Other Federal,

1 State and Tribal agency comments. Do we have any?
2 Wilson.

3
4 MR. JUSTIN: Thank you. Good morning.
5 Wilson Justin, Cheesh-Na Tribal Council, Mt. Sanford
6 Consortium. I'd just like to comment that we agree
7 with the gentleman at the table. We unilaterally
8 oppose any regulatory effect to put antlers on an
9 auction block for the State. There's no reason other
10 than biasness for that kind of action.

11
12 Thank you.

13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Wilson.
15 Any questions for Wilson.

16
17 (No comments)

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. InterAgency
20 Staff Committee comments.

21
22 (No comments)

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: None. Fish and Game
25 Advisory Committee comments.

26
27 (No comments)

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: None. Summary of
30 written public comments.

31
32 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
33 You'll find your summary of written public comments on
34 Page 57. We have three that all oppose the proposal.

35
36 The Mentasta Traditional Council
37 opposes the proposal. We are opposed
38 to this proposal because a lot of
39 people will sell antlers or use them
40 for art work for income or make tools
41 out of them.

42
43 The AHTNA Subsistence Committee opposed
44 the proposal. We do not support and
45 strongly oppose WP06-03 to forfeit
46 caribou and moose antlers to the State
47 of Alaska auction.

48
49 The Paxson Fish & Game Advisory
50 Committee opposes the proposal. Real

1 subsistence users use antlers for
2 making crafts, jewelry, etc. Antlers,
3 whether trophies or not, hold value for
4 hunters as reminders of their hunts.
5

6 The Denali Subsistence Resource
7 Commission opposes the proposal,
8 stating that requiring Federal
9 subsistence hunters to forfeit the
10 antlers places an unnecessary
11 restriction on them. This proposal
12 does not respond to any specific
13 biological concerns in moose or caribou
14 populations in Unit 13.
15

16 Barbara Cellarius will give the
17 comments for Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource
18 Commission.
19

20 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
21

22 MS. CELLARIUS: Wrangell-St. Elias
23 Subsistence Resource Commission unanimously opposes the
24 proposal as written. The proposed change would
25 unnecessarily limit subsistence users. Subsistence
26 users often make use of the entire animal, and this
27 proposal would deny them the opportunity to use the
28 antlers for handicrafts or other traditional uses.
29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Barbara.
31 Any questions.
32

33 (No comments)
34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Do we have any
36 public testimony.
37

38 (No comments)
39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No requests for public
41 testimony. So a motion is in order to put this on the
42 table for discussion.
43

44 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chair. I move we
45 adopt Proposal 06-03.
46

47 MR. BLOSSOM: Second.
48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
50 seconded that we adopt Proposal 06-03. Discussion.

1 Tom.

2

3 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman. I think
4 there's been substantial public testimony in opposition
5 of this, both State and Federal agencies oppose it,
6 subsistence resource commissions. The total harvest for
7 moose in these areas is about 10 percent for the
8 subsistence hunt and the total harvest for caribou is
9 about 20 percent. That's very insignificant. It is
10 clear that antlers do have some cultural significance,
11 so I would oppose this proposal.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Dean.

14

15 MR. WILSON: Just a point of
16 clarification. Didn't we hear yesterday that Ninilchik
17 and some other areas had proposals that they put in
18 that weren't even making their way to the Council? Is
19 that correct or did I misstate that one? At any rate,
20 I'd heard that some folks had been putting in for
21 proposals that weren't making their way up here, they
22 were being held up.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: There are some
25 deferred proposals on fish on the Kenai.

26

27 MR. WILSON: Okay. Well, I was just
28 commenting on that. It's hard for me to believe that
29 something like this could make it up and some other
30 ones couldn't with this much opposition to it and so
31 on. I plan on opposing it as well.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other discussion.
34 The question is in order.

35

36 MR. CARPENTER: Question.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
39 called. All in favor of Proposal WP06-03 signify by
40 saying aye.

41

42 (No aye votes)

43

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

46

47 IN UNISON: Nay.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion fails
50 unanimously. WP06-04. Bill.

1 MR. KNAUER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
2 This analysis was done by Mr. Dan LaPlant. He's at the
3 Board of Game meeting at Fairbanks this week, so I'll
4 be presenting it for him. This proposal is also
5 submitted by Mr. Brian McGuire of Anchorage. It
6 requests that regulatory language for moose harvests in
7 Units 11, 13, and 15 be changed to require that a legal
8 bull moose under Federal regulations meet the State of
9 Alaska requirement for a legal bull moose in those
10 areas.

11
12 In other words, in the areas of Unit
13 11, 13 and 15 where there is a current difference with
14 the Federal regulation which may be a little more
15 liberal, he is recommending that it be modified to meet
16 the more restrictive State regulation. He indicated
17 that he believes that the more liberal Federal
18 regulation increases the odds of poaching in those
19 areas.

20
21 In Unit 11, Federal lands are comprised
22 of about 78 percent Wrangell-St. Elias National Park
23 and Preserve and 2 percent Chugach National Forest.
24 You heard previously that in Unit 13 there are about 10
25 percent Federal lands and in Unit 15 the bulk of the
26 Federal lands are on the Kenai Refuge 52 percent.

27
28 The regulatory history is relatively
29 long. You'll find it on Page 61. There are both
30 Federal and State hunts in all three of those units.
31 I'm going to skip over to 62 unless there are questions
32 and indicate that within Unit 11, the State antler
33 requirement for moose is spike-fork antlers or 50-inch
34 antlers with 3 or more brow tines. The Federal antler
35 requirement in that unit is one antlered bull.

36
37 So this proposal, if it were enacted
38 would make it definitely more restrictive there.
39 Within Unit 13 the State has two seasons, a Tier II
40 season for one bull and then a general hunt, again
41 spike-fork or 50-inch antlers. The Federal season was
42 again one antlered bull. Within Unit 15, the State has
43 a variety of hunts with either spike-fork antlers or
44 50-inch antlers. The Federal hunts in Unit 15 all
45 require a
46 bull with spike-fork antlers or 50-inch antlers. If
47 adopted, part of the area would eliminate that spike-
48 fork hunt.

49
50 The adoption of this hunt would

1 eliminate the more liberal antler restrictions
2 currently available to Federally qualified subsistence
3 moose hunters. The Federal law enforcement officers
4 with the BLM, Glennallen field office have indicated
5 that they will continue patrols and continue to contact
6 both Federally qualified subsistence users and State
7 hunters in the field, regardless of whether or not the
8 proposed regulation
9 is adopted. Currently, the field office s law
10 enforcement has a relatively high percentage of Federal
11 subsistence hunt reporting for moose. It ranges
12 anywhere from 80 to almost 100 percent reporting, which
13 is excellent. That's exemplary anywhere in the state.
14

15 The permit reports include the specific
16 locations of kill sites. Again, the Federal
17 enforcement personnel work closely with State wildlife
18 enforcement and they have not documented any violations
19 of users taking moose from outside the Federal
20 Subsistence hunting areas.

21
22 Staff recommendation is to oppose this
23 proposal. It's unnecessary for the conservation of
24 healthy moose populations, it adds complexity to the
25 regulations, and it does remove an
26 important element of the rural preference established
27 by the Board in accordance with section .802 of ANILCA.
28

29 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Bill. Tom.

32
33 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah, Bill, just one
34 question. In Unit 13 there's a Tier II hunt, right?
35 The State has a Tier II hunt. August 15th to August
36 30th. Am I not correct that the current State
37 regulation for the Tier II hunt, which is State
38 subsistence, is one bull?

39
40 MR. KNAUER: Yes, that is correct.

41
42 MR. CARPENTER: Thank you.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's interesting,
45 Bill, because I wonder whether he wants the Federal to
46 line up with the strictest State hunt or the most
47 lenient State hunt in a unit. Terry.

48
49 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. The State
50 regulations for Unit 13 moose is either one bull by

1 permit or one bull with spike-fork or 50-inch antlers
2 or antlers with four or more brow tines on at least one
3 side. The one bull season is August 15 to 31. The
4 other season with a spike-fork or other antler
5 requirements is September 1 to September 20. So there
6 are two separate State seasons.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.

9

10 MR. CARPENTER: Right. I was just
11 pointing out the fact that the one bull spike-fork 50,
12 is that a Tier II hunt, too?

13

14 MR. HAYNES: Yes.

15

16 MR. CARPENTER: It is a Tier II hunt.

17

18 MR. HAYNES: I'm sorry.

19

20 MR. CARPENTER: That's a registration
21 hunt. So I guess the point I was making is that the
22 State subsistence season, which is a Tier II season, is
23 one bull.

24

25 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, Tom. All
26 State residents are considered subsistence hunters
27 under the State regulations in this hunt.

28

29 MR. CARPENTER: Well, we can debate
30 that all day long, I guess. I understand why the Tier
31 II process is in place. Anyway, I think my point was
32 made.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think, Tom, the
35 point you were making was that in Unit 13 the State's
36 Tier II or quote/unquote subsistence, hunt if we want
37 to call it that, is just one bull. That's what I was
38 asking. The proponent would like us to align with the
39 State, but in each one of these units other than Unit
40 11 we are aligned with the State on their most lenient
41 hunt, not on their strictest hunt. Terry, I'm sorry to
42 interrupt you. Were you going to give us the State's
43 position?

44

45 MR. HAYNES: I sure will, Mr. Chairman.
46 Our comments are on Page 64 and we're neutral on this
47 proposal. Although having the same antler requirements
48 would simplify the State and Federal regulations, these
49 provisions are not necessary in Units 11, 13 and 15 at
50 this time. If regulatory changes are needed in the

1 future to address moose conservation concerns in any of
2 these units, modifying the antler requirements is one
3 option that should be considered by the Federal
4 Subsistence Board.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Terry. Any
7 questions for Terry.

8 (No comments)

9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Other
11 Federal, State or Tribal agency comments.

12
13 Darrel.

14
15 MR. WILLIAMS: Good morning, Mr.
16 Chairman and Members of the Board. Actually, I'm glad
17 Terry just got something there at the end which
18 satisfied me a lot because one of the things that needs
19 to be considered in this proposal is enforcement and
20 wildlife management are two very different things. In
21 Ninilchik, if we call an enforcement officer, we're
22 lucky to see them in the same day, whether it's
23 domestic violence or whether it's a poached moose. As
24 far as I'm concerned, the enforcement people do not get
25 a pass. They have enormous resources to be able to
26 enforce these areas.

27
28 As far as the conservation, I just want
29 to make sure we note it and everyone understands. That
30 spike-fork 50-inch is a management tool that is being
31 used. Personally, I don't think it's the best
32 management tool, but it's the one that's in place today
33 and that's what it's for. It's for management. It's
34 not determining whether a moose is legal or not legal
35 because I just see a lot of future problems coming up
36 with that and I'm glad it was noted earlier.

37
38 Any questions.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Darrel, I kind of lost
41 you right there on the part where you said it's not for
42 determining whether a moose is legal or illegal. It
43 does determine whether a moose is legal or illegal. I
44 understand why it's used for management because you're
45 taking the young and you're taking the old and you're
46 leaving the breeding stock in the middle. But it does,
47 for the person who takes the moose, determine whether
48 it's legal or illegal.

49
50 MR. WILLIAMS: It does for the person

1 who's taking the moose. As a management tool, it may
2 change and it may need to be changed. The example I
3 like to tell people is, okay, we've talked about this
4 before where the sex trait, is it a genetic expression
5 or is it an environmental expression. If you take a
6 genetic expression and you target it, for instance,
7 let's say we're going to hunt moose with blue eyes.
8 Well, pretty soon you're not going to have any moose
9 with blue eyes. You're going to deplete the gene pool
10 and depress the gene pool. As a management tool, it's
11 real feasible and very likely that it's going to have
12 to change at some point in time when they determine
13 these specific things and that's why I say that, you
14 know, because it may be legal this year and if
15 something happens and they need to make a change in
16 management practices, then it would change and it's
17 going to make it really difficult for a lot of folks.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, it would be
20 horrible if genetics worked out so that we'd never have
21 any spike-forks because they'd all have three tines on
22 the first year because we got rid of all the ones that
23 make little ones. I can see what you're saying.
24 You're saying that we need to understand the antler
25 restriction can change for management purposes, but at
26 this point in time it's a legal definition that
27 determines whether something is legal to take or not
28 legal to take.

29
30 MR. WILLIAMS: That's correct, Mr.
31 Chairman. The other thing I understand is that they're
32 starting to look at doing electrophoreses type work.
33 They're doing some hair trap testing and stuff on the
34 Kenai Peninsula. The guys know me as a professional
35 scientist. I look at that and it's an indicator that
36 when they get these results back and they see what kind
37 of a gene pool they're looking at, they may want to
38 consider some different options and that's probably
39 something that's going to happen in the future.

40
41 Thank you very much.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. InterAgency
44 Staff Committee comments.

45
46 (No comments)

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fish and Game Advisory
49 Committee comments.

50

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Summary of written public comments.

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. You'll find your summary of written public comments on Page 64.

Mentasta Traditional Council opposes the proposal. We are opposed to this proposal. We believe it would increase poaching not decrease. Subsistence users have a difficult time to meet their needs.

The AHTNA Subsistence Committee opposes the proposal. We do not support and strongly oppose WP06-04 to revise harvest limits to reflect State antler restrictions. We take any bull moose, the size of the antlers for trophy, is not considered. We oppose any antler restriction.

Paxson Fish & Game Advisory Committee had no comment on this proposal, stating that the proposal is not specific enough.

Alaska Regional Office, National Parks Conservation Association opposes the proposal. Subsistence regulations should not restrict harvest using trophy measures, such as antler size. Proposal No. 4 would restrict subsistence moose harvest in Units 11, 13, and 15 to only those bulls with an antler size the same as that required for sport hunting. There is currently no statewide antler requirement for moose in Federal Subsistence Regulations.

This proposal seems contrary to the purpose of subsistence, which is to harvest meat to eat regardless of the size and/or age of an adult animal. Should there be a biological reason for restricting harvest to certain age

1 classes and that age restriction is
2 best implemented by antler size, horn
3 curl, or some other measure, then such
4 restrictions could be used.

5
6 We have not seen any biological reason
7 for Proposal No. 4 and implementation
8 of this moose harvest restriction may
9 result in an increased burden on
10 subsistence hunters.

11
12 The Denali SRC unanimously opposed the
13 proposal. The proposed modification to
14 the current Federal subsistence hunting
15 regulations is unnecessary for the
16 conservation of healthy moose
17 populations, it adds complexity to the
18 regulations, and it removes an
19 important element of the rural
20 preference established by the Federal
21 Subsistence Board in accordance with
22 Section .802 of ANILCA.

23
24 The Advisory Committee for the Central
25 Peninsula Fish and Game on Proposal No.
26 4 they voted against the proposal,
27 three yes and four no. The majority
28 did not want to establish the same
29 regulation as the State. They felt
30 each area should have what they feel is
31 necessary for them.

32
33 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Barbara.

36
37 MS. CELLARIUS: Wrangell-St. Elias
38 National Park Subsistence Resource Commission
39 unanimously opposes the proposal as written. The
40 proposed changes would unnecessarily limit subsistence
41 users.

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

45
46 (No comments)

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. A motion to put
49 Proposal WP06-04 on the table.

50

1 MR. CARPENTER: So moved.

2

3 MR. BLOSSOM: Second.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
6 seconded to put WP06-04 on the table. Discussion.
7 Tom.

8

9 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman. I think
10 similar to the last proposal we see there's plenty of
11 public opposition to this from Mentasta, AHTNA,
12 Ninilchik, Paxson, National Parks Conservation
13 Association, both Staff, Department is neutral.
14 There's obviously no biological concern. The harvest
15 is somewhat limited and I don't believe that there's
16 any reason to restrict the subsistence hunt at this
17 time.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tom. Any
20 other comments. Dean.

21

22 MR. WILSON: His main reason for
23 putting this is to stop any poaching. That's under the
24 discussion of the Staff analysis. As outlandish as
25 these proposals are that he's put in, he should at
26 least show up and explain the reasoning why he's even
27 coming up with this. We've got no basis at all for
28 anything behind his idea of putting in these proposals
29 other than poaching and that doesn't even add up.

30

31 Again, I'll oppose it.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Dean.
34 Yeah, we'll have to check into whether or not we could
35 do like the Board and on these proposals where all the
36 written comments and the Staff and the Fish and Game
37 and every line up, we could put them on a consent
38 agenda. But that's basically what Tom is saying. It
39 seems to be unanimous opposition other than the person
40 who put the proposal in. Gloria.

41

42 MS. STICKWAN: Can we put that in a
43 letter to the Board when we do our annual report?

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And ask if we can do
46 that? I think we'll do that. I think we'll put it in
47 our 805 letter and see what we can do. Because
48 something like this, we could apply it to something
49 like this. The nice thing about a consent agenda, if
50 anybody ever wants something taken off a consent

1 agenda, all they have to do is be here and ask to have
2 it taken off.

3

4 MR. CARPENTER: Question.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
7 called. WP06-04. All in favor signify by saying aye.

8

9 (No aye votes)

10

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

13

14 IN UNISON: Nay.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion fails
17 unanimously. We're now on WP06-05. Bill, are you
18 going to do this one?

19

20 MR. KNAUER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. This
21 is also submitted by Mr. Brian McGuire. It would
22 require that subsistence users harvesting a moose in
23 Units 11, 13 or 15 present the skull to an authorized
24 representative for sealing. At the time of sealing he
25 must also identify the specific place and date of the
26 harvest.

27

28 The proponent again claims that the
29 Federal subsistence hunts have been abused. He
30 indicates that Federal subsistence users are using ATVs
31 and accessing non-Federal lands, where they are
32 harvesting moose using Federal subsistence management
33 regulations, which are more liberal than State
34 regulations.

35

36 The State does not require sealing of
37 moose anywhere in the State. The proponent states that
38 the proposed regulatory change would help keep the
39 peace between Federally qualified subsistence users and
40 other hunters.

41

42 You've been already provided the
43 information relative to Federal lands and harvest
44 regulations previously. I'll go directly to the effect
45 of the proposal. This proposal does not respond to any
46 specific biological concerns in moose populations in
47 Units 11, 13, or 15. While there are serious
48 low-density biological issues with moose in both Units
49 11 and 13, this proposal will not solve the proponent's
50 concern that some moose may be taken by Federally

1 qualified subsistence users outside of Federal public
2 lands. Although there is some likelihood of this
3 occurring, law enforcement officers indicate that it is
4 not a significant problem in Unit 13 where the
5 proponent has his main concern.

6
7 All Federal hunts in the subject units
8 are only by Federal registration permit with mandatory
9 harvest reporting. The report rate for these hunts
10 exceeded 89 percent and ranged from a low of almost 83
11 percent to a high of 100 percent reporting. The report
12 does indicate on it the date and place of harvest.
13 Sealing in person would not be cost effective in
14 achieving 100 percent reporting and would impose an
15 unnecessary administrative burden on Federally
16 qualified subsistence users and administrators.

17
18 Additionally, some subsistence hunters
19 may leave the skull in the field rather than bring it
20 in. Others may wish to cook the head in the field or
21 immediately after they return and sealing would be
22 detrimental to that use.

23
24 The Staff recommendation is to oppose
25 the proposal. This places an unnecessary restriction
26 on subsistence hunters who already have very high
27 compliance rate for harvest reporting for moose in
28 these three areas.

29
30 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Bill. Any
33 questions for Bill.

34
35 (No comments)

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Terry, you're up
38 again.

39
40 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. The
41 Department's comments on this proposal on Page 74 are
42 neutral. Although the Department of Fish and Game does
43 not object to the Federal Subsistence Board requiring
44 that the skulls of moose taken in Units 11, 13, and 15
45 be sealed, the proponent's concerns can be addressed in
46 part by active monitoring of hunts in these areas
47 during the hunting season by Federal enforcement
48 officers.

49
50 In Units 11 and 13, Federally qualified

1 subsistence users must contact the Bureau of Land
2 Management if they harvested a moose and must report
3 the harvest location and date of harvest within five
4 days of the harvest. I did make an error here because
5 under the Federal hunt in Unit 13 those moose are
6 reported to BLM in Glennallen. Moose taken in Unit 11
7 in the Federal hunt are reported to the Office of
8 Subsistence Management in Anchorage and that
9 information eventually goes back to Glennallen. So
10 there would be an awkward step there for hunters to
11 have to comply with.

12

13 These provisions, that is active
14 enforcement of the hunts, are positive steps in
15 monitoring. We support efforts by Federal managers to
16 follow up on non-reporters to ensure that monitoring
17 efforts are accurately documenting both harvests and
18 hunter effort.

19

20 Thank you.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for
23 Terry.

24

(No comments)

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Terry.
27 Other Federal, State or Tribal agency comments.
28 Darrel.

29

30 MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, Members of
31 the Board. Thank you. We'd like to oppose this
32 proposal. It's real similar to the proposal 04 because
33 it's under the same premise where enforcement is
34 different than management. When I considered this
35 proposal, I never really thought about it. You know,
36 out of the 2.3 moose that's taken per year out of Unit
37 15, I'm not really sure what the significance of having
38 the head sealed would really provide.

39

40 I think a better approach for an
41 alternative, maybe they should do that with road kills.
42 There's a lot more moose, there would be a lot more
43 information that could be obtained from something like
44 that. Not to mention there's other things that come up
45 and issues that come along with this and you kind of
46 touched on that, in some places not being able to take
47 care of the head and whatnot like they want to. They
48 consider that wanton waste. Some people would be
49 really offended by it.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Darrel.
2 Any questions for Darrel.
3
4 (No comments)
5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. InterAgency
7 Staff Committee comments.
8
9 (No comments)
10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fish and Game Advisory
12 Committee comments.
13
14 (No comments)
15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: None. Summary of
17 written public comments.
18
19 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We
20 have two written public comments. One from Denali SRC
21 and the other from Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence
22 Resource Commission.
23
24 The Denali SRC on Proposal No. 5
25 opposed the proposal because it would
26 unnecessarily restrict subsistence
27 users. Requiring Federal subsistence
28 hunters to seal the skulls places an
29 unnecessary restriction on subsistence
30 hunters who already have very high
31 compliance rates for harvest reporting.
32 This proposal does not respond to any
33 specific biological concerns in moose
34 populations. This requirement for
35 sealing of the skull would be
36 detrimental to Federal subsistence
37 users who may utilize the head for its
38 nutritional value.
39
40 Barbara is going to present the
41 Wrangell-St. Elias SRC.
42
43 MS. CELLARIUS: Mr. Chair.
44 Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission
45 unanimously opposes the proposal as written. The
46 proposed change would place unnecessary requirements on
47 subsistence users.
48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Barbara.
50 Do you have one more, Donald.

1 MR. MIKE: My error, Mr. Chair. On
2 Page 74 there's further public comments on Proposal No.
3 5.

4
5 The AHTNA Subsistence Committee opposes
6 the proposal. We do not support and strongly oppose
7 WP06-05 which would require rural residents to
8 physically go to a Federal or State office to report
9 their harvest and sealing requirement. This proposal
10 would impose additional hardship on rural residents.

11
12 Mentasta Traditional Council opposes
13 the proposal. We do not support this proposal because
14 it is adding more requirements for subsistence users.
15 Most of the users cannot afford to drive too far and
16 this would add more cost to them.

17
18 Paxson Fish & Game Advisory Committee
19 opposes the proposal. This proposal will not address
20 the problem. A hunter could bring in a skull and say
21 they shot it anywhere.

22
23 National Parks Conservation Association
24 opposes the proposal. Subsistence regulations should
25 be culturally sensitive and not include unnecessary
26 administration actions, such as sealing. Proposal No.
27 5 would require the sealing of moose skulls for no
28 apparent biological reason. NPCA recognizes that good
29 harvest data is important to making sound wildlife
30 harvest decisions, but securing that data can be done
31 in a manner far less intrusive and burdensome than
32 sealing moose skulls.

33
34 Defenders of Wildlife supports the
35 proposal. Sealing requirements are limited statewide
36 and usually apply to bears and furbearers. However, if
37 evidence of abuse is substantial in an area, sealing
38 requirements may be necessary to avoid damage to a
39 resource. If moose are being taken outside Federal
40 public lands, a sealing requirement is justified.
41 Federal managers may choose to specify a portion of the
42 animal other than the skull if this is determined to be
43 impractical for field transportation.

44
45 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any public
48 testimony.

49
50 (No comments)

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Regional
2 Council deliberations.
3
4 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman. I move
5 we adopt Proposal 06-05.
6
7 MR. BLOSSOM: Second.
8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
10 seconded that we adopt Proposal 06-05. Tom.
11
12 MR. CARPENTER: I'll speak to that.
13 Once again there's, in my opinion, no public support
14 for this proposal. It doesn't address any biological
15 concern. There's no current State sealing requirements
16 and there are already substantial reporting
17 requirements for moose in these areas, so I'd oppose
18 this.
19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug.
21
22 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman. The one
23 group that did support this talk about poaching and I
24 think the Paxson Fish and Game Advisory answered that
25 best. They said a hunter could bring in a skull and
26 say they shot it anywhere. So I see no justification
27 for supporting this.
28
29 MR. CARPENTER: Question.
30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
32 called. All in favor of WP06-05 signify by saying aye.
33
34 (No aye votes)
35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
37 saying nay.
38
39 IN UNISON: Nay.
40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion fails
42 unanimously. Okay. We are now going on to WP06-13.
43 We were supposed to do something at 10:00 but I don't
44 see anybody here. Oh, they are outside. Okay. Let's
45 take a five-minute break.
46
47 (Off record)
48
49 (On record)
50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We'll call the spring
2 meeting of the Southcentral Alaska Regional Advisory
3 Council back in session. For the information of
4 everybody out there, it's been requested that we have
5 an executive session and we're going to go into
6 executive session at 11:00 o'clock. So everybody will
7 be excused until 1:15 when we start up again this
8 afternoon. We'll see what we can get done between now
9 and 11:00 and go from there. Tom.

10

11 MR. CARPENTER: Does this Council have
12 to go into executive session for specific reasons like
13 a normal board would or can we do it for any reason?

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pete, can you answer
16 that question for me.

17

18 MR. PROBASCO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
19 Pete Probasco. We have Keith Goltz here from the
20 Solicitor's Office and he is going to counsel the
21 Council on legal issues as it relates to action taken
22 yesterday.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Okay.
25 WP06-13.

26

27 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair. Chuck
28 Ardizzone. Proposal 06-13/14 is on Page 76 of your
29 Council book. Proposal WP06-13 was submitted by the
30 Office of Subsistence Management requests that the
31 Federal goat hunting closure in Unit 6(D), sub-area
32 RG245), and the RG stands for registration goat sub-
33 area, be eliminated and that a season be established
34 from August 20 to January 31 allowing one goat total to
35 be harvested by Federal registration
36 permit.

37

38 Proposal WP06-14 was submitted by the
39 ADF&G and requests that the Federal goat hunting
40 closure in Unit 6(D) be eliminated and the harvest of
41 one goat by State registration permit be allowed under
42 State regulations.

43

44 In its Federal wildlife closure review
45 for this hunt area, the Office of Subsistence
46 Management recommended that a proposal should be
47 initiated to modify or eliminate this closure, stating
48 that This Federal closure should receive a more
49 thorough review to examine the potential to provide a
50 harvest opportunity for Federally qualified rural

1 residents and the potential to modify or eliminate the
2 closure to non-Federally qualified hunters, based on
3 the increase in the goat population.

4
5 The goat population within RG245 has
6 increased since the closure of this area in 1993. The
7 Alaska Board of Game has re-established the State hunt
8 on non-Federal lands in 2000. The removal of the
9 closure and the re-establishment of this Federal hunt
10 would provide additional opportunity for Federally
11 qualified
12 subsistence users.

13
14 Based on survey efforts in 2003 the
15 goat population in Sub-area RG245 was estimated to be
16 152 animals. The management objectives for goats in
17 all of Unit 6 are to maintain a minimum population of
18 2,400 goats and to achieve a minimum of 70 percent
19 males in the harvest. There are no specific Sub-area
20 RG245
21 management objectives.

22
23 Subsistence mountain goat harvest in
24 Unit 6(D) is light. Only five mountain goats have been
25 reported harvested between 2001 and 2005. This
26 averages to one mountain goat out of a quota of 17
27 mountain goats per year. The distribution of
28 subsistence mountain goat quotas can be seen on Figure
29 1 and Map 1 and provides subsistence harvest
30 opportunity within close proximity of the populations
31 of Chenega Bay, Cordova, and Tatitlek.

32
33 The goat population within Subarea
34 RG245 has increased from 25 goats when the closure was
35 placed in permanent regulation in 1993 to over 153 in
36 2003. The removal of the closure and the
37 reestablishment of a Federal hunt will provide
38 additional opportunity for Federally qualified
39 subsistence users.

40
41 A small annual harvest from this
42 managed population should have no significant negative
43 impacts on the goat population.

44
45 The preliminary conclusion for WP06-13
46 is to support the proposal. For WP06-14 is to take no
47 action. If there's any questions I'll try and answer
48 them.

49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Chuck, would the fact

1 that you supported Proposal WP06-13 eliminate the need
2 for doing 14? I mean it would take away the Federal
3 closure, so the action wouldn't be needed on WP06-14 as
4 far as the closure is concerned.

5
6 MR. ARDIZZONE: Yes.

7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.

9
10 MR. CARPENTER: Chuck, just one
11 question. I think this is an important question to
12 ask, at least from my own perspective. Did anybody
13 from Cordova, Chenega or Tatitlek ask for there to be
14 an open season?

15
16 MR. ARDIZZONE: No.

17
18 MR. CARPENTER: Then why is the Office
19 of Subsistence Management -- I think this is important.
20 I think this addresses something that Wilson said
21 yesterday, that the people that are the subsistence
22 users in these areas ought to be the ones requesting
23 C&T's and requesting hunts be opened because if that's
24 the case, then there's an obvious demand for it. I
25 think we can address this further once we put this on
26 the table. There's a possible amendment to be in
27 order. I agree that the Office should look at the land
28 closure issues and they should deal with those and
29 bring them before the Council. But actually requesting
30 that a hunt be opened I think ought to be left up to
31 the users.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Pete.

34
35 MR. KOMPKOFF: Mr. Chairman. If
36 there's going to be any closures, we would oppose it
37 even though we take very few goat out of the area.
38 Because of weather conditions, there's times when the
39 goat are down on shore. It's kind of hard to get them
40 off the beach, so you have to pick and choose your days
41 to hunt. If there's any closures, I oppose it.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Chuck, if I understand
44 right, this area has been closed since 1993. What
45 you're requesting is an opener.

46
47 MR. ARDIZZONE: That's correct.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So it has been closed
50 since 1993. What this proposal requests is that that

1 closure be dropped and it become opened.

2

3 MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
4 For the record, my name is Rod Campbell with OSM. One
5 of the things we have been doing, following up on Mr.
6 Carpenter's notion, we have been working with the
7 State. There was a request to review closures in
8 Federal areas and that was one of the things we would
9 review. If there's been long-standing closures, we
10 would look to see if the population still justified
11 having those closed. So this is kind of one of the
12 offshoots of that.

13

14 Thank you, sir.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Rod. Any
17 questions. Tom.

18

19 MR. CARPENTER: When this area was
20 closed, I can't remember what year you said it was now.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: 1993.

23

24 MR. CARPENTER: 1993. Was there a
25 current Federal subsistence season then?

26

27 MR. ARDIZZONE: Yes, there was. I
28 think that's why, when they decided to put the proposal
29 in to open it up, they wanted to open the season back
30 up also.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Alaska Department of
33 Fish and Game.

34

35 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm
36 going to suggest you disregard our written comments on
37 Page 81 of the Council book. There's a little
38 confusion about those comments. The Department is
39 basically neutral on Proposal 13 and we obvious support
40 our own proposal. The main point is that adoption of
41 either of these proposals would reopen goat hunting on
42 Federal lands in Sub-area RG245 of Unit 6(D) either
43 under a Federal permit or a State permit. Under the
44 Federal permit, there would be a harvest quota of one
45 goat. The State currently has a permit hunt on State
46 lands in RG245 and reopening this area would allow
47 hunters using the State permit to access the Federal
48 lands in that area too.

49

50 If Proposal 13 is adopted, Federally

1 qualified hunters would be able to hunt goats only on
2 Federal land in Sub-area RG245, which are more
3 difficult to access than State managed lands in the
4 area. Although Federally qualified hunters would need
5 a Federal permit for this hunt, because the Federal
6 season opens before the State season, it is our
7 understanding the Federally qualified subsistence users
8 usually have hunted and prefer to hunt goats later in
9 the season.

10

11 So adoption of the Department's
12 Proposal WP06-14 would provide hunters more flexibility
13 because under the State registration permit they could
14 hunt on both State and Federal lands in Sub-area RG245.
15 I'll try to answer questions about this. If I can't
16 answer them, Gino may be able to.

17

18 The final point I would make is that
19 under any circumstances we are very concerned that
20 harvest reporting for the Federal hunt has been weak in
21 this area and we are concerned that there be
22 improvements in the harvest reporting in the Federal
23 hunts to ensure that we have a good handle on how many
24 goats are actually being taken and that will facilitate
25 sound management of goats in Unit 6.

26

27 Thank you.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Terry.

30 Pete.

31

32 MR. KOMPKOFF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
33 I know we have been pretty lax in our reporting
34 procedures for goat and deer and stuff like that, but I
35 think if we would get one of the agencies over there
36 during the open hunt to let us know that those permits
37 are available would be really helpful to us over there
38 in Chenega.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Terry, can I ask you a
41 question. This is something I didn't realize when we
42 started this whole thing. RG245 has both State and
43 Federal lands on it.

44

45 MR. HAYNES: That's correct.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And the State lands
48 are down by the beach, aren't they?

49

50 MR. HAYNES: They are closer to the

1 waters.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Federal lands are in
4 back?

5

6 MR. HAYNES: Yes.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So currently the
9 Federal lands, in order to access the Federal lands,
10 they have to cross State lands to get back to the
11 Federal lands. The Federal lands aren't down where the
12 goats come to the beach at all if I understand
13 correctly on that.

14

15 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. On Page 78
16 there's a map showing the various hunt areas. The
17 Federal lands are the shaded lands.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. That's what I
20 needed.

21

22 MR. HAYNES: So the State managed lands
23 are the white lands and you see they include the
24 coastal areas. As I understand it, from talking to the
25 area biologist, Dave Crowley, most of the goat hunters
26 access the hunt areas going from Valdez, from the oil
27 terminal area, and are hunting on State lands. Hunters
28 from Tatitlek would be accessing the hunt areas from
29 Jack Bay, which is.....

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Surrounded by Federal
32 land.

33

34 MR. HAYNES: Correct. But, yes, the
35 State managed lands are the first lands you access in
36 the hunt area. The Federal lands are further inland.

37

38 MR. KOMPKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pete.

41

42 MR. KOMPKOFF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
43 I have another question for you. On RG242 has there
44 been any report of any harvest by Tatitlek in that
45 area?

46

47 MR. HAYNES: I'll defer to the Federal
48 Staff on that. Can we call Milo Burcham up, Mr. Chair?

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, you can.

1 MR. BURCHAM: Mr. Chair and Council.
2 As is already mentioned, the subsistence harvest of the
3 17 permits reserved for subsistence has been pretty
4 light. The harvest that I have had in recent years
5 hasn't come from 242. I'm getting some from 266, which
6 is near Chenega, maybe one harvested there. Some
7 hatchery residents at Cannery Creek are harvesting a
8 goat just about every year. At Tatitlek they're taking
9 one or two goats. A lot of those are coming from
10 Fidalgo area, which would be mostly from 244 and 243.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Milo.
13 Terry, I had a question from what you were saying. If
14 it was under State permit, the hunt would be more
15 available during the time that the goats come down
16 lower and the land that would be open would be the land
17 that they'd have more of a tendency to come down later,
18 which is when the Tatitlek and Chenega prefers to hunt.
19 Am I correct on that?

20
21 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. If the
22 Federal lands are reopened in RG245, then hunters using
23 the State permit will have access to all those lands in
24 245, so it doesn't matter where the goats are as long
25 as the season is open. So I guess our point is that
26 hunters using the State permit have more flexibility in
27 245 than a hunter using a Federal permit.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Question. That's a
30 registration hunt. So it's just open until the quota
31 of goats are taken, right?

32
33 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. That's
34 true. The area biologist has a maximum number of goats
35 he wants to see harvested from the area and when that
36 number is reached he will close the hunt.

37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And he's using the
39 same formula, one nanny is worth two billies. Now my
40 question is, under that registration hunt have they
41 been taking the quota on a yearly basis? I mean do
42 they usually take 100 percent of what they're after?

43
44 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. In 2004-
45 2005 in RG245 in the State hunt there was a quota of
46 seven goats and four were taken that year. The
47 previous year the quota was six and there were three
48 nannies taken, which equaled six goats and the hunt was
49 closed. There's some information on Page 80. The
50 current State harvest quota for 245 has been met by

1 non-Federally qualified hunters in four of the five
2 seasons.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: By what time of the
5 year is the quota usually filled? Do you have any idea
6 on that? If what this would do is open more land and
7 open it for the time they prefer to hunt but the quota
8 is filled already the end of August or September, then
9 its a non-issue because it doesn't do anything.

10

11 MR. HAYNES: If this Proposal 13
12 passes, it would designate one goat for the Federal
13 hunt. Even if under the State quota the quota was
14 reached, the area biologist would not try to take steps
15 to close the Federal hunt because this one additional
16 goat is not likely to have that much impact.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.

19

20 MR. CARPENTER: I think one thing to
21 consider here, this isn't a huge issue, and not to
22 broadcast this very loudly, but we don't really have a
23 real goat problem right now. I mean the goat
24 populations are very healthy. The thing to consider
25 is, the reason that the State permits are utilized
26 instead of the Federal permits in this area is because
27 it's easier to access the State land where the goats
28 are. So basically what you have is you have people in
29 Tatitlek and Chenega and Cordova that are qualified
30 subsistence users using State permits versus actually
31 going to the Forest Service and getting a Federal
32 permit. They have the ability to do that in every area
33 except 245. I believe there's 17 Federal permits
34 available in Prince William Sound and very rarely is
35 more than two of those permits utilized. So, by
36 opening the Federal land in 245, it's going to actually
37 be easier for somebody who lives in one of these rural
38 places to have more access by getting a State permit.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: A question, Terry. If
41 the land was opened but no Federal permit was -- does
42 it consider that there's enough goats right there that
43 you could add one Federal permit to the current State
44 permits? In other words, if you opened the land but
45 you didn't put a Federal permit out, would the State
46 permits increase by one or if we open the land and have
47 a Federal permit will the State permits decrease by
48 one?

49

50 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. I don't

1 think the State would do anything different. It's not
2 a matter of how many permits are issued. It's a matter
3 of how many goats are harvested.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: True. In other words,
6 when the goats are harvested the season is closed.

7

8 MR. HAYNES: Yeah. As I mentioned
9 earlier, if Proposal 13 is adopted and Federal
10 regulations set aside one goat for the Federal hunt in
11 RG245, the State has no plans to reduce its quota by
12 one goat at this time because we don't anticipate a lot
13 of hunting effort on the Federal lands in RG245.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions
16 for Terry. Doug.

17

18 MR. BLOSSOM: So this Federal/State
19 thing, even if we pass 13, there's going to be one goat
20 allowed for the Federal subsistence people.

21

22 MR. ARDIZZONE: If you pass 13, there
23 will be one goat reserved for Federal subsistence
24 users, but you can still harvest under State permit on
25 Federal lands if you remove the closure.

26

27 MR. BLOSSOM: So what we're doing in
28 essence then is opening up more land to everybody to
29 hunt but really not reserving any more for a
30 subsistence person.

31

32 MR. ARDIZZONE: If you pass 13, you're
33 opening the lands to everybody but reserving one goat
34 for subsistence.

35

36 MR. BLOSSOM: Which they have now.

37

38 MR. ARDIZZONE: No, they don't have
39 that.

40

41 MR. BLOSSOM: Okay.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pete.

44

45 MR. KOMPKOFF: I call for the question.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You can't call for the
48 question. We don't even have a motion on the table
49 yet. We've just got Fish and Game up here.

50

1 MR. KOMPKOFF: Oh, okay.

2

3 (Laughter)

4

5 MR. KOMPKOFF: Let's get this thing on
6 the road here.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Other Federal, State
9 and Tribal agency comments. Justin.

10

11 MR. JUSTIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
12 Council Members. Just a brief comment on the principal
13 of subsistence use and hunting. We can appreciate the
14 generosity of OSM and their actions and any agency that
15 works on behalf of subsistence users, but I'd like to
16 reiterate my comments from yesterday, and thank you,
17 Mr. Carpenter, for referring to them. We believe that
18 all subsistence initiatives has to be driven by the
19 subsistence user. I think that the OSM's resources and
20 time would be better served for subsistence users in
21 the long run if they would use their funds and energy
22 to determine why subsistence use is not a priority in
23 that particular area even though past subsistence
24 practices has been extensively utilized in those areas.
25 It would be better in my estimation to find out why
26 they can't get to the game or why is the game not
27 available to the potential user than it is just to go
28 in and say we want a subsistence season.

29

30 I'd like to keep referring to that
31 particular principal throughout the meeting at all
32 times because, in our estimation, subsistence is not
33 only opportunistic but it has to be user friendly,
34 driven by the consumers. That's been a consistent
35 stance by Cheesh-Na and Mt. Sanford. I thank you for
36 allowing me to continue to appear before you. Thank
37 you.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Justin.
40 Dean.

41

42 MR. WILSON: Wilson, for something like
43 this, OSM going after a proposal like this, do you
44 think they should have gotten a tribe involved or an
45 area involved and then they could have gone in and done
46 this. Maybe OSM has an idea for it, but they can get a
47 different group involved other than themselves.

48

49 MR. JUSTIN: I think the way that it
50 should have been done is precisely that. If not a

1 tribe, then at least a potential user group should have
2 been contracted to survey the residents to see what was
3 their use pattern, why don't you go over here instead
4 of over here and why do you use the State system. I
5 mean that's, to me, just preparatory work that should
6 have been done. Once it's done it gives you a very
7 specific idea of how to craft your regulations.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Justin.

10 Any other questions for Justin. Gloria.

11

12 MS. STICKWAN: I have a question for
13 OSM. You said they were requested by the State to open
14 this. Is that something they do every so often or is
15 it requested?

16

17 MR. ARDIZZONE: I have to defer to Rod.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Rod.

20

21 MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah, deferring to me
22 because I had the place in the book. There is a
23 briefing schedule for this meeting that has a draft
24 closure review policy. It's a briefing for all the
25 Councils. It's on Page 172 of this book. It also has
26 some additional information starting on Page 173. I
27 believe that is on your agenda for later in the
28 meeting, which we would get in more detail on that and
29 help you.

30

31 MS. STICKWAN: I asked a question and
32 he didn't answer my question. I was just saying do
33 they review this and open every three years. That's
34 all I wanted to know.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Chuck.

37

38 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair. That
39 briefing document will cover what's been happening.
40 Last year we started reviewing closures statewide and
41 the briefing document will go into more detail, but
42 every three years we're going to start reviewing
43 closures. It was an agreement that was made above my
44 level. So there will be more reviews of closures every
45 three years.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Dean.

48

49 MR. WILSON: So it looks like it's
50 driven by the governor, the letter that did come out,

1 but it doesn't say in here that you can't go to user
2 groups and get some input from them. I think that's
3 kind of where we're coming from with this and get some
4 support or opposition to it before it comes out.

5
6 MR. ARDIZZONE: I agree with you.

7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Chuck, I think that's
9 what Justin was trying to say and I think that's what
10 I've heard from the Council is that the review of the
11 land closure, that's part of policy. The request for
12 the season or the bag limit, that should come from the
13 users and we might want to remember that one in the
14 future.

15
16 MR. ARDIZZONE: I understand that.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The land closure, I
19 don't think there's any choice on that. I think that
20 is something now that's required, is that they review
21 closures to see if they're still necessary and I think
22 it's on a three-year cycle or something like that.
23 That part of it would have been an easy thing to have
24 taken care of.

25
26 With that, any more questions for
27 Chuck.

28
29 (No comments)

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We've had the State,
32 other Federal, State and Tribal agencies. InterAgency
33 Staff Committee comments.

34
35 (No comments)

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fish and Game Advisory
38 Committee comments.

39
40 (No comments)

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Summary of written
43 public comments.

44
45 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. There
46 are no written public comments on this proposal.

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: There are no written
49 public comments on this proposal. Which is also an
50 indication that it's not a user-driven proposal. No

1 requests for public testimony. Okay. At this point in
2 time then a motion to put WP06-13 on the table is in
3 order.

4
5 MR. CARPENTER: Just a question.
6 Donald, wasn't there comments from the Copper
7 River/Prince William Sound Advisory Committee that were
8 sent in.

9
10 MR. MIKE: Yeah, I think we did, but
11 they didn't make the book and I don't have the comments
12 with me. I can do further research and read it into
13 the record if you give me a minute.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom, do you have any
16 idea what they were?

17
18 MR. CARPENTER: I know what the comment
19 is because I wrote them for the AC. I could step down
20 or just give you a brief summary of what they are.
21 Whatever the Chair would like.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Would that be okay
24 with the rest of the Council, just step down and give
25 us the comments and then you can step back.

26
27 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chair. Tom
28 Carpenter from Cordova. Just a brief summary of the
29 comments. The advisory committee was not opposed to a
30 Federal hunt, but as a qualified subsistence community
31 we felt that the proposal should have been driven from
32 Cordova, Tatitlek or Chenega and we're opposed to both
33 the Department of Fish and Game and the Office of
34 Subsistence Management driving proposals. We feel that
35 the user groups ought to be the ones that submit and
36 the debate should start from there.

37
38 Thank you.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Did they make any
41 comment on the closure or opening of land?

42
43 MR. CARPENTER: They were in favor of
44 opening the land. We felt that having all the land
45 open would be a beneficial thing right now. We weren't
46 opposed to actually having a Federal permit, but we
47 think that the request for that permit should be driven
48 from local subsistence users.

49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Dean.

1 MR. WILSON: So you're against the
2 method but you're for the proposal.
3
4 MR. CARPENTER: The advisory committee
5 was for the State proposal to open the Federal land so
6 that State users this next year would be able to use
7 both State and Federal land, but we were opposed to OSM
8 asking for a dedicated subsistence proposal because we
9 feel that should come at the request of the users.
10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pete.
12
13 MR. KOMPKOFF: Tom, can you add that to
14 this proposal as an amendment?
15
16 MR. CARPENTER: I think we could
17 probably come up with something.
18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. WP06-13, a
20 motion to put it on the table is in order.
21
22 MR. CARPENTER: Is this 13 or 13 and
23 14?
24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, if we act on 13,
26 then 14 is not needed to act on it.
27
28 MR. CARPENTER: If 13 is passed.
29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If 13 is passed or
31 modified. Or what we can do is combine the two of them
32 and come up with our own modified proposal.
33
34 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman. I think
35 we could put 13 on the table with an amendment and if
36 the amendment passes and suffices the Council, we could
37 take no action on 14.
38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. WP06-13.
40 Somebody come up with a motion so we can discuss.
41
42 MR. CARPENTER: I move we adopt
43 Proposal 06-13.
44
45 MR. BLOSSOM: Second.
46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
48 seconded that we adopt Proposal WP06-13.
49
50 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman. If I

1 could speak to that.

2

3

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.

4

5

MR. CARPENTER: As stated, my personal
6 position, at least from the Council standpoint and I
7 guess my other seat on the advisory committee, I don't
8 see any objection from Pete, who is one of the users of
9 this area, I would offer an amendment to 06-13 to open
10 the Federal lands that are currently closed but to
11 strike the language that would establish a season from
12 August 20th to January 31st allowing one goat by
13 Federal registration permit.

14

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second for
16 the amendment.

17

18

MR. BLOSSOM: I second it.

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: Any other discussion.

Doug.

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman, Tom. So
45 what you're saying then if we pass this as amended
46 we'll have these registration permits but we won't have
47 a Federal subsistence permit for goat in this area.

MR. CARPENTER: Basically the way I
50 understand the way it would work both State and Federal

1 lands would be open if we pass this permit in this
2 area.

3

4 MR. BLOSSOM: So there will not be a
5 Federal subsistence permit in this area yet.

6

7 MR. CARPENTER: And for the next year
8 that this regulation would take place all hunters in
9 this area would have to use a State permit. The reason
10 I'm not worried about that is currently there's no
11 problem with if you want to get a goat, you can go get
12 one. What it does is it opens the entire area for that
13 State permit to be utilized. I think in the next Board
14 cycle we'll see a proposal that probably requests a
15 Federal permit. My belief is that it ought to come
16 from Tatitlek, Chenega or somebody that lives in one of
17 those communities that asks. I don't think OSM should
18 be asking for it.

19

20 MR. BLOSSOM: So, as I understand it,
21 the subsistence users will have ample opportunity and
22 we're fighting over one goat, so I guess I can agree
23 with the way you're reasoning because it didn't come
24 from the users. Okay.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other discussion.

27

28 MR. WILSON: Question.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has 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: The amendment carries
42 unanimously. Now we have an amended motion in front of
43 us. Any discussion on the motion or, if not, the
44 question is in order.

45

46 MR. CARPENTER: I call the question on
47 the amended motion.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
50 called on the amended motion and that is WP06-13

1 amended so that it reads to open the Federal land
2 closure but not establish a season. All in favor
3 signify by saying aye.

4
5 IN UNISON: Aye.

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

9
10 (No opposing votes)

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The motion carries
13 unanimously.

14
15 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman.

16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.

18
19 MR. CARPENTER: I move that we take no
20 action on WP06-14 in lieu of action taken by the
21 amended language in WP06-13.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second.

24
25 MR. BLOSSOM: Second.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
28 seconded that we take no action on WP06-14 because of
29 our action in WP06-13. Do we need any discussion on
30 that.

31
32 MR. BLOSSOM: Question.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
35 called. 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: We have six minutes
45 until 11:00, which is just about enough time for
46 everybody to have a break. I'd like to excuse
47 everybody in the audience until 1:15. Donald.

48
49 MR. MIKE: Prior to going into
50 executive session we're trying to set up a

1 teleconference for the Chair of the Board to
2 participate. And on the comments from the Copper River
3 Advisory Committee, I did recall we received it and I
4 submitted it to be published in the book, but for some
5 reason it did not make it and I'll go to the office,
6 bring it and read it into the record.

7

8 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Okay. We
11 will see everybody at 1:15. Gilbert, we'll see you
12 next time.

13

14 (Off record)

15

16 (On record)

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We're still missing
19 Pete. He's taking his afternoon nap. And Gloria. I
20 guess we'll have to wait a minute or two then so we
21 have a quorum. Donald.

22

23 MR. MIKE: While we're waiting for the
24 Council Members I can read into the record what the
25 Copper River/Prince William Sound Advisory Committee
26 commented on Proposal 13. They voted 12 to 0 as
27 modified by the committee and the comments are: We
28 agree that Federal lands should be open for hunting in
29 RG245, but we don't agree with establishing a harvest
30 level. There are currently 17 goats available to local
31 residents of which less than three a year are utilized.
32 In our opinion, this is creating a Federal season for
33 local residents which don't utilize existing resources.
34 Allow the State to issue the permit for one goat for
35 all State residents and in the future, if local
36 residents are impacted, our request is to then issue
37 the permit through the appropriate Federal agency.

38

39 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

42

43 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair. We have eight
44 Council Members and have five present, so you have a
45 quorum.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We have a quorum.
48 Then we can go forward with the next proposal. It
49 should be fairly simple to take care of. WP06-15.

50

1 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair. WP06-15 can
2 be found on Page 83. Proposal WP06-15 was submitted by
3 Steven Ray Barnes from Cordova and he requests that
4 same-day airborne hunting be allowed for moose in Unit
5 6(C).

6
7 This proposal would allow Federally
8 qualified subsistence users to hunt moose while
9 same-day airborne. The proponent believes that there
10 are no harvest concerns to the resource and no
11 advantage gained over other hunters if this proposal
12 was adopted. The proponent believes this proposal
13 would help the quality of the meat and quality of the
14 hunt. The proponent also states same-day airborne
15 harvest of moose would broaden the way of harvesting a
16 moose for the better. The proponent believes a hunter
17 who is lucky enough to get drawn for the subsistence
18 hunt should be able to harvest a moose as he or she
19 chooses.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. I think
22 Donald has something he needs to tell us.

23
24 MR. MIKE: I stand corrected on
25 establishing a quorum. We need at least six members to
26 establish a quorum since we have 10 members currently
27 sitting on the Council.

28
29 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So you might as well
32 hold off, Chuck, until we can get one more member. I'm
33 surprised Gloria is not back. Well, I apologize to all
34 of you out there for calling this into session when we
35 don't have a quorum yet. I thought we did.

36
37 MR. MIKE: We can go ahead and hear the
38 agency reports. Oh, here's Gloria. Stay seated,
39 Chuck. Do you want to start from the beginning again,
40 Chuck, just because Gloria wasn't here to hear it.

41
42 MR. ARDIZZONE: Okay. Proposal WP06-15
43 was submitted by Steven Ray Barnes from Cordova and
44 requests that same-day airborne hunting be allowed for
45 moose in Unit 6(C).

46
47 This proposal would allow Federally
48 qualified subsistence users to hunt moose while
49 same-day airborne. The proponent believes that there
50 are no harvest concerns to the resource and no

1 advantage gained over other hunters if this proposal
2 was adopted. The proponent believes this proposal
3 would help the quality of the meat and quality of the
4 hunt. The proponent also states same-day airborne
5 harvest of moose would broaden the way of harvesting a
6 moose for the better. The proponent believes a hunter
7 who is lucky enough to get drawn for the subsistence
8 hunt should be able to harvest a moose as he or she
9 chooses.

10
11 Current cooperative moose management
12 objectives are to maintain a post hunting population of
13 400 moose by the year 2006 with a bull/cow ratio of
14 15:100 for Unit 6(C). In Unit 6(C) the population is
15 currently estimated at 350 moose and is considered
16 stable.

17
18 Hunter success is nearly 100% for the
19 Federal and State hunts in Unit 6(C). Federal
20 subsistence harvest success in Unit 6(C) has been
21 nearly 100% since the hunt started in 1999.

22
23 The effects of this proposal.
24 Currently, same-day airborne harvest of moose is not
25 permitted in the State of Alaska by either State or
26 Federal regulations. If this proposal is adopted it
27 would be the first time that same-day airborne hunting
28 for moose would be allowed on Federal public lands in
29 Alaska.

30
31 The proponent believes since hunter
32 success is nearly 100%, there is no advantage gained by
33 hunting the same day as flying. Biologically, this
34 proposal would have no or little effect on the moose
35 population, since it would not result in additional
36 harvest as hunters must possess a drawing permit to
37 harvest a moose on Federal public lands in Unit 6(C).

38
39 However, specific animals, such as
40 large antlered bulls for instance, could be harvested
41 more efficiently using a same-day airborne advantage.
42 If same-day airborne hunting of moose is allowed in
43 Unit 6(C), local residents of these units who rely on
44 ground access to harvest moose for subsistence could be
45 adversely affected by the competition, disruption, and
46 what some will perceive as an unfair advantage from
47 same-day airborne hunters.

48
49 Since a State hunt, which does not
50 allow same-day airborne hunting, is taking place

1 concurrently with the Federal hunt, enforcement
2 difficulties might arise.

3
4 There is significant public sensitivity
5 and controversy attached to these potential
6 regulations. The extent of aircraft use by Federally
7 qualified subsistence users, and the practical effects
8 of passage or denial of this proposal on those users,
9 are central and yet extremely difficult to assess.
10 Under this proposal it would be legal to hunt moose
11 same-day airborne on USDA Forest Service lands, but not
12 on State lands unless the State modifies its
13 prohibition against same-day airborne hunting.

14
15 The preliminary conclusion for this is
16 to oppose the proposal. If there's any questions, I'll
17 try and answer them.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for
20 Chuck. Terry.

21
22 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. The
23 Department's comments are on Page 88 of the Council
24 book. The Department does not support this proposal.
25 Allowing same-day airborne moose hunting in the Federal
26 subsistence regulations would violate the fair chase
27 principle and establish a dangerous precedent. The
28 proponent indicates that hunters currently have a 100
29 percent success rate in the Unit 6(C) moose hunt and
30 for that reason the Department does not believe that
31 same-day airborne hunting is necessary.

32
33 Furthermore, the proponent incorrectly
34 asserts that same-day airborne moose hunting in the
35 area would provide no advantage over other hunters.
36 The State administers a drawing permit hunt in Unit
37 6(C) that does not allow same-day airborne hunting, so
38 adoption of this proposal would create competition with
39 hunters who access the area by land or water.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Terry. Any
42 questions for Terry. Gloria.

43
44 MS. STICKWAN: Is there any hunt
45 anywhere besides wolves that are same-day air hunting
46 in the state?

47
48 MR. HAYNES: Deer.

49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think there's some

1 caribou hunts out westward that are same-day also. I
2 think out in Unit 9 and Unit 26, but I'm not sure about
3 the other areas.

4
5 MR. HAYNES: There are no same-day
6 airborne moose hunts.

7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No same-day airborne
9 moose hunts anywhere in the state. Any other questions
10 for Terry. Dean.

11
12 MR. WILSON: Other than the principal
13 and starting precedents for this, other than that, is
14 there any good reason to have same-day airborne other
15 than, I guess, the person putting in for it so it's
16 easier to get their animal. Is there any good reason
17 at all for this proposal? For moose I'm talking.

18
19 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. I can think
20 of none, Dean, and our Staff could think of absolutely
21 none. We just saw it as -- first of all, and I didn't
22 mention this in our comments, I think the Federal Board
23 would have to establish that same-day airborne hunting
24 was a customary and traditional practice and I think
25 the Federal Subsistence Board would be hard-pressed to
26 make that determination in this area. So you might be
27 able to make the argument that accessing areas by
28 aircraft may be a customary use or a practice that
29 people use, but since same-day airborne hunting has
30 never been allowed, certainly I would argue that the
31 Federal Board would have a very difficult time
32 justifying adoption of that proposal.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Terry, that's where I
35 would probably disagree with you and I hope we don't go
36 that route. If the opportunity wasn't there, if it
37 wasn't made illegal by law, people would have done it
38 because obviously in Unit 6 they do it for deer. So
39 the same people probably would have done it for moose
40 if they were allowed to do it for moose. But that
41 doesn't really enter in at this point in time because I
42 think if they found to do it, they could do it. The
43 question that Dean asked is there any advantage. The
44 only advantage would be if somebody was seeking the
45 biggest bull they could find. I mean it wouldn't be an
46 advantage for a subsistence hunt, but it would
47 definitely be an advantage if somebody wanted to shoot
48 the biggest bull they could find.

49
50 And as has been pointed out, it's

1 probably unnecessary -- if you've got 100 percent
2 success, you can't get 110 percent success. It doesn't
3 work that way.

4
5 Okay. Other Federal, State or Tribal
6 agency comments.

7
8 (No comments)

9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none.
11 InterAgency Staff Committee comments.

12
13 (No comments)

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: None. Fish and Game
16 Advisory Committee comments. I think we have a letter
17 from the advisory committee, so we can just let it go
18 at that.

19
20 Summary of written public comments.

21
22 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
23 You'll find comments on Page 88.

24
25 Alaska Defenders of Wildlife oppose
26 Proposal 15. Allows same-day airborne
27 moose hunting in Unit 6(C), Cordova
28 area (1) We believe that the use of
29 aircraft does not meet the customary
30 and traditional subsistence use of
31 resources test under Section .803 of
32 Title VIII of ANILCA; (2) Allowing
33 improved access to hunt moose in Unit
34 6(C) is not justified because
35 sufficient access is available by using
36 the Copper River Highway road system.
37 Other subunits in Unit 6 have no roads
38 at all; (3) The language of the
39 proposal requiring a hunter to be
40 clear of the plane is vague and
41 unenforceable; and (4) State
42 regulations have never allowed same-day
43 airborne moose hunting. This exception
44 would be unprecedented statewide. The
45 use of aircraft has never been
46 considered essential to providing for a
47 reasonable subsistence moose hunting
48 opportunity.

49
50 Copper River/Prince William Sound

1 Advisory Committee opposes the
2 proposal. This committee agrees with
3 the author that there is no resource
4 concern as this hunt is fully utilized
5 with harvest success near 100% every
6 year. The concerns we have deal with
7 enforcement with neighboring units with
8 different same-day airborne
9 restrictions by Federal and State law
10 enforcement, fair chase, ability for
11 aircraft to target extremely large
12 breeding bulls in unusually high
13 numbers.

14
15 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. I don't
18 think I have any requests for public testimony. Okay.
19 At this point in time a motion to put WP06-15 on the
20 table is in order.

21
22 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman. I move
23 we adopt Proposal WP06-15.

24
25 MR. BLOSSOM: Second.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
28 seconded that we adopt WP06-15. Discussion,
29 deliberation. Tom.

30
31 MR. CARPENTER: Just a couple comments.
32 Similar to the proposal we received earlier today,
33 there is no public support for this, the Department and
34 Staff are opposed to it. In my opinion, there is an
35 extremely high probability that if you receive one of
36 these permits your success rate will be near
37 100 percent without the use of same-day airborne. One
38 concern in the Cordova area is use of aircraft would
39 set an undue precedent and that some of the extremely
40 large breeding bulls that have allowed our population
41 to remain somewhat stable could be put in jeopardy over
42 a long period of time, so I would oppose this.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other discussion.
45 Dean.

46
47 MR. WILSON: The same thing, for
48 principal and for out of precedent, so I'll oppose it
49 as well.

50

1 MR. CARPENTER: Question.
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
4 called. All in favor of WP06-15 signify by saying aye.
5
6 (No aye votes)
7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
9 saying nay.
10
11 IN UNISON: Nay.
12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion fails
14 unanimously. Okay. We now have WP06-16/17, both of
15 which I know Pete will have an interest in. So I think
16 what we're going to do is take this time period right
17 now to deal with a resolution that Tom would like to
18 bring forward to us and then we'll probably go on to
19 WP06-68 and then we'll come back to 16, 17 and 18, just
20 out of deference to our other Council Member.
21
22 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman. Please
23 bear with me. I have no formal legal training. I'd
24 like to bring forward this resolution. This resolution
25 would be from the Southcentral Regional Advisory
26 Commission that would request the Federal Subsistence
27 Board either extend the current deadline for '07
28 fisheries proposals or call for fisheries proposals
29 with the deadline of October 21st, which is concurrent
30 with the '07 game proposal deadline.
31
32 These proposals would be specific to
33 seasons, methods and means, and harvest limits on
34 Federal public waters of the Kasilof River drainage and
35 for waters north and including the Kenai River drainage
36 within the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge and the
37 Chugach National Forest on the Kenai Peninsula.
38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Is there a second.
40
41 MR. BLOSSOM: I'll second it.
42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
44 seconded. Discussion.
45
46 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman. I think
47 through some debate that the Federal Subsistence Board
48 has requested that some of the issues that are before
49 this Council and the Federal Board be dealt with in a
50 timely manner and I believe the Council feels the same

1 way. The Council also feels that the public process
2 should not be lost while trying to achieve these goals.
3 I think that this proposal addresses the public concern
4 that proposals be dealt with in an expedient manner and
5 I also think that this Council will be able to achieve
6 its goal by allowing the public to continue to have
7 full participation in the process.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tom. Any
10 other comments. Tom, I've got two questions. Do you
11 think it would be necessary in your wording to include
12 within the bounds of the current C&T findings or that
13 would just -- I see Pete shaking his head -- that that
14 would just be expected.

15

16 MR. CARPENTER: The way I understood
17 this, and I just put this together at lunch, but there
18 are currently only a few communities that have a C&T,
19 so I think we're dealing with a pretty small amount of
20 communities and possibly a small amount of proposals,
21 some that might be duplicate proposals. I don't know.
22 If Pete has any comment on how we should change that
23 wording. But I think I'm trying to achieve the goal
24 that we all kind of came to, at least we did, came to a
25 conclusion. This would ultimately have to be decided
26 by the Federal Board if they were to accept this or
27 not.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Any other
30 discussion.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none, the
35 question is in order.

36

37 MR. CARPENTER: Question.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All in favor of the
40 resolution that Tom has just brought forward signify by
41 saying aye.

42

43 IN UNISON: Aye.

44

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

47

48 (No opposing votes)

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. Okay.

1 Now, with that, let's go on to -- I'm asking the rest
2 of the Council's permission to postpone those other
3 ones. Here comes Pete right now, but let's do 68
4 anyhow and then we'll go back to the ones that Pete is
5 involved in.

6
7 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair. Proposal 68
8 can be found on Page 108 of your meeting materials.
9 Proposal WP06-68 was submitted by Southcentral Alaska
10 Subsistence Regional Advisory Council and they request
11 that an additional moose harvest season be added in
12 Units 15(B) and 15(C) between October 20 to November
13 10.

14
15 This is based on lots of discussion
16 with the Council. The Council is very familiar with
17 this. It was originally brought forward by the
18 Ninilchik Traditional Council. I don't know how much
19 detail you want me to go into this, but it would be
20 more in line with your traditional subsistence
21 activities and the spirit and tradition of the hunt.

22
23 Historically, hunts were postponed
24 until later in the year, following the processing of
25 salmon. When harvesting moose later in the year, there
26 is a better opportunity for the meat to be properly
27 cared for and preserved so there will be less wasting
28 of the harvest. Due to changing climatic conditions,
29 the late summer and early fall temperatures on the
30 Kenai Peninsula have been increasingly hot and dry.
31 The proponent believes this makes it difficult to
32 locate an animal and process it efficiently enough to
33 ensure there is no unnecessary waste. Later in the
34 fall, there is reduced recreation from hiking, ATV use,
35 et cetera, which would promote the safety of
36 recreational users and
37 hunters alike.

38
39 We've had a broad history of this
40 proposal. It's been before you numerous times. At
41 your last meeting there was agreement to submit what we
42 currently have in front of us now. This current
43 proposal, the harvest limit would remain one antlered
44 bull with spike-fork/50 or three or more brow tines.
45 The late season addresses the issues of avoiding the
46 moose rut season, and provides for more priority to
47 Federally qualified subsistence users to harvest moose
48 closer to the time period when they customarily and
49 traditionally harvested moose. Excluding Unit 15(A)
50 addresses the moose conservation and road access

1 concerns in the subunit.

2

3 Effects of this proposal. If this
4 proposal were adopted it would help alleviate some of
5 the conservation concerns that arose regarding the
6 previous proposal submitted by Ninilchik Traditional
7 Council, which was WP05-07. The additional hunting
8 season would occur after the rut and avoid first estrus
9 breeding, thus having lesser impacts on the moose
10 population. This proposal provides additional
11 subsistence opportunities when the weather is cooler
12 and meat can be more easily taken care of. This
13 proposal also addresses the concerns of the declining
14 moose population in Unit 15(A) by excluding this area
15 from the additional season.

16

17 The preliminary conclusion is to
18 support this proposal. Any questions.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, Chuck, I have a
21 question. We have up there October 20th to November
22 10th, but in dark writing we have October 20th to
23 November 20th. I see the Fish and Game talks about
24 October 20th to November 10th. I was wondering which
25 of these dates is it. I was under the impression it
26 was October 20th to November 10th.

27

28 MR. ARDIZZONE: I obviously have a typo
29 here somewhere, but I'm not sure which one.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: There's a typo between
32 the two of them and I think it's the typo in the dark
33 one, but I'm not positive. Although if it is, it's
34 repeated on Page 106 too. It's also unrepeated at the
35 top of Page 106 where it says October 20th to November
36 10th.

37

38 MR. ARDIZZONE: In the orange book I
39 have October 20th through November 10th. Is that what
40 you remember as being correct?

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's what I remember
43 and both places where it says Southcentral RAC it says
44 October 20th to November 10th. But in both places
45 where it was typed out as a proposed regulation in dark
46 print it came out October 20th to November 20th. I
47 notice in the Fish and Game's answer to it that they
48 are talking October 20th to November 10th.

49

50 MR. ARDIZZONE: I believe the October

1 20th to November 10th is the correct dates.

2

3

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug.

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

one. I see that you suggested a temporary quota on

1 large moose but not on spike-forks. Was there any talk
2 as to -- you know, this is a Federal registration hunt.
3 Was there any thought as to what should be the total
4 number, at what point would the hunt be closed, is
5 there a maximum number for closing the hunt or would it
6 be see how things go for a while and then go from
7 there.

8

9 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chair. Part of the
10 answer to that question if it would determine what the
11 antler requirements are that would help to determine
12 what we believe would be a safe harvestable surplus,
13 but Gino may be able to add to that.

14

15 MR. DEL FRATE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
16 Gino Del Frate, management coordinator for Fish and
17 Game. The Staff on the Kenai had recommended a quota
18 of five large bulls greater than 50 inches be
19 established in the beginning to try and get a handle on
20 what the interest in this hunt would be. They
21 recommended two bulls for 15(B) and three for 15(C) and
22 that was just to alleviate some of the fears of a lot
23 of hunters going up into the sub-alpine and pursuing
24 these post rut aggregations of bulls.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But as far as taking
27 spike-forks, you don't see any danger in that
28 department at this point in time.

29

30 MR. DEL FRATE: Mr. Chair. I think the
31 idea behind not limiting the number of spike-forks,
32 that time of year there aren't many spike-forks in the
33 sub-alpine area. There are a handful. The spike-fork
34 component of your yearling class of moose is only about
35 50 percent, so there really is no harm in harvesting a
36 few additional spike-forks out of that yearling class
37 of bulls. It gives you the opportunity to take a few
38 moose and you're not hurting that year class because
39 you're protecting approximately 50 percent of the
40 yearlings being that they're three points or greater
41 moose.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, I see what you
44 mean. On the Kenai, 50 percent of your yearling bulls
45 are already bigger than a spike-fork.

46

47 MR. DEL FRATE: That's a general rule
48 of thumb. It can range from 35 percent to 65 percent,
49 but for practical purposes about half the yearling
50 bulls are already greater spikes or forks.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug.

2

3 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman, Gino. How
4 do you propose to pull this off? I refer back to the
5 brown bear hunt where we had a limit on bear and you
6 closed it before it opened. The biologist in charge
7 down there got totally spooked on that brown bear hunt
8 and he's going to get just as spooked on this moose
9 hunt. I thought we had it all worked out with Mr.
10 Selinger last time around on this and now all of a
11 sudden we got it back again. I want to know why.

12

13 MR. DEL FRATE: Mr. Chair, Mr. Blossom.
14 That's a good question. I believe that under a Federal
15 registration permit there would have to be a short
16 reporting period where those moose would have to be
17 reported and then the appropriate action taken once
18 those bulls have been taken. Your comments are noted.

19

20 MR. BLOSSOM: The brown bear hunt was
21 also short notice return right away and it got closed
22 before we hardly got to the field. I don't see this as
23 a workable solution, but I'll listen to other people.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Greg.

26

27 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Mr. Chairman. I just
28 want to note that I also thought we had this all worked
29 out and that we had an agreement if we saw we were
30 taking too many large bulls that we would enact
31 something at that time. As you all know, this went
32 back and forth with the State and Federal managers.

33

34 Also I want to note too, there is no
35 restrictions on the large bulls on the Lake Tustumena
36 drawing hunt that I know of and that's a large number.
37 Just a point.

38

39 One more comment if I may is that we
40 don't have a lot -- well, I'll bring that up later.
41 Thank you.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Greg, one of things is
44 they're not hinging it on that. They just say those
45 concerns will be further reduced if this happened.
46 They're saying they have a concern. One of the things
47 that can happen is if there's a concern, we can see
48 whether that concern actually manifests itself over the
49 course of a year or two and then they put a potential
50 way to handle that concern if it turns out to be a

1 concern.

2

3

Terry.

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

MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm glad you made that point. We are going to be concerned about this hunt if this proposal is adopted as written and I don't believe anything we've ever said suggests that we're perfectly comfortable with this. We appreciate the movement that's been made to address some of our concerns.

I would point out that one reason we have this concern has to do with what we know about participation in the State hunts in this area where there is a potential, based on participation in the State hunts and participation by unsuccessful hunters, that we could see up to 150 hunters potentially applying for this late season Federal hunt if they were unsuccessful in the State hunt. We don't know if that many would apply or not. We don't know how many would -- it would not be an easy hunt. It would take some time to get to the hunt area.

But if we look at the extreme that there was high levels of participation and high success rates based on that potential, there is concern about the effects that could have, so that's why we're really urging caution with administration of this hunt.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug.

MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman, Terry.

That's why when it came up last time around my suggestion was September 26th through October 13th or thereabouts because we had other hunts going on during that time. I felt that was a much safer time to do it. Mr. Selinger, for one, wanted it moved to this later date, which we then agreed to. I agree with you, this later date is more dangerous for that, but I didn't move it to there. Your biologist did that. So you guys have to make up your mind. I'm telling you it's safer to do it earlier, but you folks wanted to do it later. So that's where we're at.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Terry, just a question. This hunt will be handled under Federal managers on Federal land and there will be reporting requirements with this hunt, won't there, and those reporting requirements are, if I understand right, are

1 about five-day reporting requirements there if they're
2 successful.

3

4 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. As I look
5 at the proposal, I don't see a specific number of days
6 that are specified in the proposal.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I wish we had our land
9 manager here from that area.

10

11 MR. HAYNES: He's here.

12

13 MR. WEST: As far as the permits, we
14 don't draft the permits. We issue them.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So the permits are
17 drafted by the Board.

18

19 MR. WEST: By the Office of Subsistence
20 Management.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So you haven't
23 had any hunt that you've been issuing permits there at
24 this point in time.

25

26 MR. WEST: Yes, we have. All of the
27 subsistence hunts now on the Kenai require a permit and
28 we issue them, as do the Alaska Maritime National
29 Wildlife Refuge, but we don't craft the permits, nor do
30 we receive the results back from them. They go to OSM
31 in Anchorage.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's the question I
34 was going to ask you. So you have no in-season manager
35 that's getting back the reports of what's going on.

36

37 MR. WEST: There currently is no
38 mechanism for us to manage in-season. It certainly
39 could be created, but it doesn't exist currently.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug.

42

43 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman, Robin. How
44 many subsistence permits do you now issue a year?

45

46 MR. WEST: Well, again, folks here with
47 the Staff probably have exact numbers, but I'm going to
48 say on average it's between 40 and 100.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.

1 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah, just a couple
2 questions. What's the State reporting requirements for
3 the State hunts in that area?

4
5 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, Tom. There
6 are several different kinds of hunts.

7
8 MR. CARPENTER: Like for a registration
9 hunt. What's the registration hunt reporting
10 requirements? Is it within seven days?

11
12 MR. HAYNES: Gino was telling me he
13 believes it's 10 days.

14
15 MR. CARPENTER: Ten days. Okay. I
16 guess one other question I have then is if you only
17 want to take five large bulls 50-inch or greater, two
18 in 15(B) and three in 15(C), how many bulls would you
19 feel comfortable that you could -- you know, if you had
20 to close a hunt and you still have people in the field,
21 how many bulls over that would you feel comfortable
22 with if you closed the hunt because five bulls were
23 reported as harvested in these areas over 50 inches.
24 If you came in at seven or eight bulls, is that going
25 to be a critical or detrimental effect on the herd?

26
27 MR. DEL FRATE: Mr. Chair, Mr.
28 Carpenter. The actual number of bulls, I think we
29 could say we'd be comfortable with seven or eight, but
30 if you got to nine, would that be too many. I think
31 we're concerned about the amount of participation with
32 the number of hunters going in and disrupting these
33 post rut groups of moose. These moose have been
34 through a period of the rut where they lose up to 25
35 percent of their body weight and if they start getting
36 run around, their chances of surviving a winter become
37 much less.

38
39 So our uneasiness with this hunt has to
40 do with this late season disruption and we're trying to
41 take a cautious approach these first couple years and
42 trying to get a feeling for just how much interest
43 there is in this hunt, how much participation there
44 will be and then what is the effects on these moose.
45 If these moose get run out of the alpine into areas
46 with less quality food, more predators, we could see a
47 slow decline in our moose population or in our bull/cow
48 ratio we could see a much quicker decline and that
49 would be something we would be evaluating over time and
50 then coming back to both this Council, the Federal

1 Board and the State Board of Game if we start running
2 into bull/cow ratio problems.

3

4 MR. CARPENTER: Just to follow up on
5 that, it appears to me at least from what I'm hearing
6 at least from you two, is that you would be more
7 favorable -- you're more worried about the time that
8 this hunt takes place and the amount of people that
9 could participate in it. It seems to me like something
10 like Doug came up with, would you be as concerned if
11 the hunt were to take place earlier as he suggested
12 than you are with the dates that are currently being
13 proposed right here?

14

15 MR. DEL FRATE: My opinion is I think
16 we'd be just as concerned through either one. In one
17 case you're impacting moose that have lost their body
18 weight, that are trying to recover before winter. In
19 the other case, where you're hunting moose that are
20 right in the middle of the rut, we know from our
21 experience at the Moose Research Center that cows are
22 only receptive for 24 hours and if you have hunters in
23 the middle of a rutting group of moose and that bull
24 misses the opportunity to breed that cow, she's going
25 to cycle again, she'll come back into estrus 26 days
26 later and she'll be bred 26 days later, but the chances
27 of her calves surviving are pretty slim. Either
28 surviving or making it through until she becomes a
29 yearling. There's no catching up with small calves
30 when they're born late. So I think there's equal
31 concern for both of those dates but for different
32 reasons.

33

34 MR. CARPENTER: I guess then just one
35 other follow up. To me, biological reasons make sense.
36 Would you be comfortable with an earlier season and a
37 very short reporting time so that you would be able to
38 have a better handle or at least the Federal manager in
39 that area would have a better handle on how many of
40 these big breeding bulls were harvested?

41

42 MR. DEL FRATE: If I were given a
43 choice between an October 20 to November 10 season
44 versus a September 26 to October 13 season, initially
45 thinking this through without looking at additional
46 information, I would say go with the later season and I
47 would like a shorter reporting period, but that's
48 pretty much -- you know, five days is probably adequate
49 to give us some indication of the level of harvest and
50 realizing with such a small quota of moose we would

1 probably end up going over if we had high
2 participation.

3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug.

5
6 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman, Gino. I
7 guess I'll ask this of you. In 15(B) east, how many
8 bulls do you take a year on the average?

9
10 MR. DEL FRATE: Mr. Chair, Mr. Blossom.
11 I don't have that information in front of me, but
12 recalling from my past experience on the Kenai we issue
13 50 permits for the early season hunt and 50 permits for
14 the late season hunt, the late season being September
15 26 to about the 15th of October.

16
17 Terry is showing me. We have about 35
18 of the 50 permittees actually report hunting and take
19 an average of 13 moose per year.

20
21 MR. BLOSSOM: In the late season.

22
23 MR. DEL FRATE: In the September 26 to
24 October 15.

25
26 MR. BLOSSOM: And about the same in the
27 early season then?

28
29 MR. DEL FRATE: I believe it's probably
30 similar. It may be a little bit lower success rate
31 because that late season has a little higher success
32 rate.

33
34 MR. BLOSSOM: But it's safe to take 50
35 bulls a year out of that area?

36
37 MR. DEL FRATE: Probably less.
38 Probably closer to 30 out of 15(B) east.

39
40 MR. BLOSSOM: Okay. I thought I
41 heard.....

42
43 MR. DEL FRATE: About 13/13.

44
45 MR. BLOSSOM: Okay. How about 15(C)
46 and that part that would be open?

47
48 MR. DEL FRATE: Currently there is no
49 season past the 20th of September.

50

1 MR. BLOSSOM: But I mean how many do
2 you take a year now out of the regular season in there?

3
4 MR. DEL FRATE: With regards to the
5 Federal lands portion, typically the Caribou Hills,
6 that area is really tough to break out the harvest
7 statistics specifically for that area because all of
8 our information comes out in drainages and the Caribou
9 Hills, the start of all the major drainages on the low
10 end portion of 15(C). So really hard to say exactly
11 how many. I would suspect there's an additional 30
12 moose that come out of the refuge portion of 15(C) and
13 this is just based on my previous experience on the
14 Kenai just on Federal lands. A lot of the moose are
15 harvested on State lands down in the Cabins area and
16 below where the access is much greater and the moose
17 are fairly spread out at that time of year. The moose
18 then move up into the alpine areas on the refuge and
19 congregate in that area and at times we can have close
20 to 900, 1,000 moose up in that area post rut.

21
22 MR. BLOSSOM: So you're saying you take
23 30 bulls out of that area and how many thousand people
24 have a moose card to hunt that area?

25
26 MR. DEL FRATE: There's about 1,800, if
27 I remember right.

28
29 MR. BLOSSOM: About 2,000 then. Okay.
30 So, I guess my point I'm trying to make is that we have
31 2,000 hunters that are eligible to go in that area now
32 and they take about 30 moose out and in 15(B) east
33 that's an area where you register, you've got to get a
34 permit to hunt, but you're taking 20-some moose out
35 with a limited number of hunters. I just want the
36 Board to understand what the perimeter is.

37
38 MR. DEL FRATE: Mr. Chair, Mr. Blossom.
39 For the late season hunt, we estimate that there's
40 approximately 200 eligible hunters for the Federal
41 hunt. Those are residents of Ninilchik, Port Graham,
42 English Bay and Seldovia and that would be the hunter
43 pool that would be available to go up into that area.
44 Recognizing that it is a late season hunt, it's much
45 more difficult access. We're probably looking at that
46 as the maximum number of people that would participate.

47
48 MR. BLOSSOM: Thank you. Two hundred
49 versus 1,800 for early. Okay.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Doug.
2 Chuck.

3
4 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair. I just
5 wanted to clarify some of the permitting stuff. You
6 can add conditions to permits and we do that like in
7 the Glennallen area. That goes directly to the land
8 manager and then it comes to OSM, so that can always be
9 arranged. So the Kenai Refuge could manage to hunt a
10 lot better and you can add that language if you want
11 to, to add stipulations to the permit to say report in
12 five days to the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge. We'll
13 get the numbers back in our office one way or another,
14 but if it goes directly to the land manager they can
15 manage the harvest much better.

16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Chuck.
18 That would meet a lot of my concerns because you don't
19 expect a problem but you like to put something in place
20 ahead of time so if there's a problem you can address
21 it. Tom.

22
23 MR. CARPENTER: I guess I'd like to ask
24 Doug do you think that a five or seven day reporting
25 requirement to National Wildlife Refuge biologist would
26 be an undue burden?

27
28 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman, Tom. No,
29 it wouldn't be if that's what happens. But I just look
30 back at this bear fiasco we had and because 200-some
31 people registered for this hunt, the second it opened
32 he was closing it. You can cause panic by some of
33 these things happening. We can make this a big chaos
34 thing or we can make it orderly.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I don't think what
37 anybody was looking at, Doug, was putting on a number
38 as much as just have -- I think what Tom was asking was
39 do you think five days would be too short of a time
40 period to require them to be turned in if somebody took
41 a moose.

42
43 MR. BLOSSOM: No, Mr. Chairman, that
44 would be fine.

45
46 MR. CARPENTER: Just to follow up. I
47 wasn't suggesting that I agreed with the amount of
48 moose. I do feel if there is somewhat of a biological
49 concern that either the Department has or the Federal
50 manager that good information, you know, in regards to

1 reporting doesn't seem like that is too big of a deal
2 to me and I think it's maybe something that could be
3 added to this.

4

5 MR. DEL FRATE: Just a couple small
6 points. With regards to the brown bear issue, I think
7 that we would not be as concerned with regards to this
8 moose because we have less of a conservation concern
9 regarding moose. The brown bear season had to be
10 closely monitored. They were getting close to the
11 yearly quota of bears that were being taken, so there
12 was some concern. Granted, the season was closed
13 before the quota was taken and that may have been the
14 wrong management decision on Jeff's part, but he had a
15 conservation concern to be aware of.

16

17 The other part of this is that because
18 this is a Federal season this will be managed by the
19 Federal land manager and our State staff will probably
20 only act as advisors based on what they know of what's
21 going on and the decision will ultimately be made by
22 OSM or the Federal land manager.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Doug.

25

26 MR. BLOSSOM: I hate to keep talking,
27 Mr. Chairman, but he brought up the next subject that's
28 very important. Do you have a conservation concern in
29 either one of these areas? We're talking about moose.

30

31 MR. DEL FRATE: Yes. Mr. Chair, Mr.
32 Blossom. Currently, I would say we don't have a
33 conservation concern for moose in either area. Our
34 bull to cow ratio is at or above our management
35 objectives for both of those areas. Our 15(B) moose
36 population has been stable or stagnant for a number of
37 years and the bull/cow ratio has not changed much. In
38 15(C) the moose population has been healthy, although
39 there has been reported increased predation, and that
40 may not be affecting our bull to cow ratio. So, at the
41 current time, I'd say we have a few extra bulls to be
42 able to harvest.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions,
45 Doug.

46

47 MR. BLOSSOM: No. I thought that was
48 important that we find out if there's a conservation
49 concern and I just heard there wasn't.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Terry.
2
3 MR. HAYNES: And I'm not going to
4 dispute anything Gino said, but that should not be
5 construed as meaning that we may not be close.
6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think what you're
8 saying, Terry, is that's not to be construed as an
9 extreme large surplus. Okay.
10
11 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman. I have to
12 answer that. I have been telling Fish and Game for
13 several years that they have a concern and they don't
14 believe me. Anyway, you're saying one thing and that's
15 what I'm going to hold you to.
16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Dean.
18
19 MR. WILSON: We went over this last
20 year, this late season hunt thing, and some red flags
21 always go up for me any time we're putting hunts out
22 there that are into the rut. Anybody can answer this.
23 The meat that's going to be coming out of this hunt,
24 does it have the potential to be not eaten?
25
26 MR. ARDIZZONE: I'm not touching that
27 one at all.
28
29 (Laughter)
30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Dean, we've gone over
32 that one time and time again and that's personal
33 preference. What's not edible to one person is
34 perfectly acceptable to somebody else. Dean.
35
36 MR. WILSON: I understand that. Well,
37 we've pushed the date off now to a different time, so
38 apparently we're not into the peak. So there's no rut
39 going on between the 20th of October and the 10th of
40 November? My understanding is Interior we have
41 experience with our moose rutting late September and
42 into October and as you start getting more coastal I
43 understand it starts lengthening out longer. Does
44 anybody have any information on that?
45
46 MR. DEL FRATE: Mr. Chair, Mr. Wilson.
47 The rut is not a switch. It's not black and white, on
48 or off. Moose start to go into the rut in early or mid
49 September and I think if a bull found a cow in estrus
50 in mid September he would breed her. Likewise, some of

1 those cows that go into early estrus will cycle early
2 and will come into estrus 26 to 28 days later, so they
3 would be in their second estrus during this period
4 where a hunt would occur. Theoretically, it's not to a
5 moose population's advantage to do that because if
6 they're producing their calves over a broad period of
7 time they're more susceptible to predation and less
8 probable of survival. It wouldn't be advantageous to a
9 moose population to have it spread over a long period
10 of time.

11

12 Typically what we have seen on the
13 Kenai is that the peak of breeding for first estrus
14 happens during the first week of October and bulls are
15 definitely going into the rut in mid to late September,
16 but the peak of the breeding happens during that first
17 week of October.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Dean.

20

21 MR. WILSON: Then just for
22 clarification, 15(A) was relinquished from this
23 compared to the one we had last fall for the purpose of
24 conservation and that is an area I'm not as familiar
25 with as many of you are and that's an area where
26 there's a higher population of big bulls up in that
27 area.

28

29 MR. DEL FRATE: Mr. Chair, Mr. Wilson.
30 In 15(A), a majority of the area where you would expect
31 hunting to occur is right along the road system. It's
32 the Sterling Highway up towards Nikiski. So we have a
33 little more conservation concerns because by the end of
34 the moose season most of the legal bulls are gone.
35 They've been harvested, they've been picked over pretty
36 well. Likewise, our bull to cow ratio in our fall
37 surveys along the road system are very low, so we would
38 have some concerns in 15(A) because our bull/cow ratio
39 in the accessible portions of this unit are extremely
40 low.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions
43 for Fish and Game.

44

45 (No comments)

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Other
48 Federal, State and Tribal agencies.

49

50 MR. WEST: Robin West with Kenai

1 National Wildlife Refuge. As everyone here knows,
2 we've gone through several renditions of this proposal.
3 We've worked, I think, to general satisfaction coming
4 up with what's before you now and the refuge does
5 support it as worded. We recognize concerns that the
6 Department has and we would support Council actions to
7 put reporting periods or quotas on it. Or, in this
8 case, generally we're not kind of wait and see what
9 happened kinds of folks but given the history of it, as
10 long as everyone was aware that this is a real issue
11 and we would look very closely on reporting numbers and
12 so forth we couldn't accept a lot of uncertainty, I
13 think is what I would like to say there. We could look
14 at this hunt for a year or two and kind of gauge and
15 see what quotas or reports might be necessary,
16 recognizing that in the long run we may have some
17 concern on harvest of larger bulls, but I just want to
18 leave you with our support for the proposal as written.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug.

21

22 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman, Robin. Why
23 did this come back to us again? What's different now?

24

25 MR. WEST: I had the same question.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Chuck.

28

29 MR. ARDIZZONE: It's just a process
30 thing, Mr. Blossom. The last meeting it wasn't the
31 wildlife cycle, it was a fishery cycle, so you came to
32 an agreement and it just came back here for approval so
33 the public could see it again before it went back to
34 the Board.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions.

37 Thank you. Darrel.

38

39 MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chair, Members of
40 the Board. Gosh, where should I start. We've spent a
41 lot of time and a lot of effort talking about this one.
42 My understanding was it was passed and it was done.
43 Now I'm seeing a lot of things coming out of the
44 woodwork and questions being raised that's right here
45 in this book. If there's going to be 200 hunters, how
46 come for the last 10 years there's only been 50 and how
47 come it's been 2.3 bulls taken per year and now we have
48 a conservation concern. These are some really profound
49 biased ways of addressing the information. I had to
50 get that out.

1 We discussed this and we really didn't
2 want to take the time to go through and do a couple
3 days testimony on this. What I would like to ask is
4 that all the testimony be noted and I'm not really sure
5 at this point in time, maybe we need time to review
6 that or not. Everyone has already testified to this
7 and I thought for the sake of time we could not go
8 through that process again.

9
10 There's a lot of issues that came up
11 that I did believe was biased. If you read the
12 information that's in this book it should sort a lot of
13 that out. It's a very low number of moose that are
14 harvested in this area, approximately two per year.
15 That should not pose a conservation concern. We spent
16 a lot of time on it before. I believe as far as trying
17 to avoid the estrus cycles, we tried to address that
18 and make it the best we could.

19
20 Without getting into it a whole bunch,
21 I'm going to leave it at that. Does anyone have any
22 questions.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Darrel, what you're
25 saying is that you, as your tribe, support this
26 proposal as it's put before us.

27
28 MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, sir.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Dean.

31
32 MR. WILSON: Darrel, with this proposal
33 that's here, this is going to be -- one of my big
34 concerns is getting an animal with inedible meat.
35 That's going to have to be something that's
36 self-regulated. If we're getting into animals and some
37 of your folks are finding out that this can't be eaten,
38 I'd just ask that you come back and maybe change the
39 dates and work with the Council on something like that.
40 You'll have to work with some of these folks. That's
41 the only thing I have to say as far as that goes. I
42 see where you're coming from on the dates and stuff.

43
44 MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chair, Mr. Wilson.
45 I agree.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Darrel.
48 With that, we'll go on to InterAgency Staff Committee
49 comments.

50

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fish and Game Advisory
4 Committee comments.

5

6 (No comments)

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Summary of written
9 public comments.

10

11 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
12 You'll find your summary of written public comments on
13 Page 116.

14

15 Alaska Defenders of Wildlife oppose the
16 proposal. They urge caution and
17 recommend more conservative action.
18 Late season winter moose hunts
19 advocated by these, WP06-35, 38, and
20 68, proposals invites driving, herding
21 and harassing moose with snow machines,
22 activities currently prohibited under
23 Federal subsistence law. Enforceability
24 is extremely difficult in remote areas
25 at this time of year. Abuses connected
26 with this method of hunting can
27 diminish healthy populations of moose
28 in an area, counter to Section .802 of
29 Title VIII, ANILCA. Unless it is
30 absolutely necessary to provide a
31 subsistence opportunity that is lacking
32 in earlier seasons, we urge the board
33 to take a very conservative approach
34 with late season mechanized winter
35 hunts.

36

37 The Central Peninsula Advisory
38 Committee commented on Proposal No. 68.
39 They opposed the proposal. The
40 majority felt that the late season was
41 not good. Some felt that a late season
42 that corresponds to the State's trophy
43 season was okay, but not one that late.
44 Some felt that there should not be a
45 late season at all.

46

47 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Donald. Do
50 we have any requests for public testimony.

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none. A
4 motion is in order to put it on the table.

5

6 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman. I move
7 that we adopt Proposal WP06-68.

8

9 MR. BLOSSOM: Second.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
12 seconded that we adopt WP06-68. That's recognizing
13 that the dates are October 20th to November 10th.
14 Discussion. Dean.

15

16 MR. WILSON: I'll just reiterate again
17 I'm going to support this proposal. I feel comfortable
18 that the agencies and Ninilchik folks are going to keep
19 track of this hunt enough. I don't think there's any
20 conservation concerns. My main concern is getting
21 moose that's inedible. So I'm going to support this
22 one.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.

25

26 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman. I'm
27 still quite puzzled as to why we're talking about it
28 again. Seeing as we're talking about it again, I'm
29 going to support this proposal. There's a very small
30 amount of harvest that takes place here. I'm not quite
31 satisfied that I agree that 200 people are going to
32 show up for this hunt if historically it's been 40, 50
33 people. Between 40 and 100, I guess.

34

35 The only thing that I would suggest,
36 and I would give deference to the people on the Council
37 that live on the Peninsula, but I don't see any harm in
38 having a reporting requirement to where the Federal and
39 State managers have a reasonable handle on if there is
40 too many big bulls being harvested.

41

42 I don't really have any concern right
43 now that there's a biological concern, so I'll just
44 leave it at that.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug.

47

48 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman. I guess
49 I'll add this comment. I think the first year it will
50 be my guess you'll see 20 bulls in the two areas

1 because of the interest we draw from doing this, but I
2 think after that it will level off to a smaller amount,
3 so be aware of that. That's the reason I ask about
4 conservation concern and there isn't any.

5
6 As far as the edible part, I've taken
7 several moose during the rut on the bench and if you
8 take care of it right, I guarantee you can't tell the
9 difference. I've eaten moose now for 60 years and we
10 take care of it like a beef and if you mess it up,
11 you'll mess it up. But otherwise during the rut it's
12 just as sanitary and good tasting as any other time.
13 Less fat possibly, but taste is fine.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anybody else.

16
17 MR. ENCELEWSKI: I just want to state
18 I'm totally wore out on this proposal. I mean it's
19 been submitted, resubmitted and reworked and I
20 appreciate the State and the Feds both working with us
21 to come to some type of conclusion. I'm totally
22 disappointed in the process that it had to come back
23 here again. I think we're missing something somewhere.

24
25 One other comment I would just make on
26 Doug, I don't think it will be that high to start with.
27 My point is that a lot of people are going to be
28 hunting the regular season prior to this.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Greg.
31 Gloria.

32
33 MS. STICKWAN: I heard Tom Carpenter
34 ask if there would be a reporting. I'd like to hear
35 what those two think about the reporting.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Not unless somebody
38 puts an amendment in there won't be any reporting
39 requirement. I'm going to support this, but I would
40 feel much more comfortable if there was a reporting
41 requirement. As a Council, we've been very supportive
42 of good information in the past. We've done that up in
43 Unit 13 and Unit 11 and that required timely reporting
44 so that a handle can be kept on everything. Again,
45 like Tom, I would leave that up to the people who
46 actually are from the area. I couldn't make the motion
47 to put it on anyhow.

48
49 MS. STICKWAN: That wasn't my question.
50 I wanted to know what they thought about that.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, your question
2 was to the two of them. So, with that, I'll let it go.
3 Doug.
4
5 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman. I make a
6 motion that we have a week's reporting time.
7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Seven day reporting
9 time?
10
11 MR. BLOSSOM: Yeah.
12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I have a second.
14
15 MR. ENCELEWSKI: I'll second it.
16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: This is an amendment
18 to the motion. So we're amending the motion that we
19 have a seven day reporting requirement if successful.
20 Pete.
21
22 MR. KOMPKOFF: Question on the
23 amendment.
24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Question on the
26 amendment. All in favor signify by saying aye.
27
28 IN UNISON: Aye.
29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
31 saying nay.
32
33 (No opposing votes)
34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries
36 unanimously.
37
38 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman. I call
39 the question on the amended motion.
40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. The main motion
42 as amended. October 20th to November 10th, one
43 antlered bull with spike-fork or 50-inch antler with
44 three or more brow tines on either antler with seven
45 day reporting period if successful. All in favor
46 signify by saying aye.
47
48 IN UNISON: Aye.
49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All oppose signify by

1 saying nay.

2

3

(No opposing votes)

4

5

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. Now
6 that one shouldn't come back to us for at least another
7 year. With that, we'll have a very short break and
8 then we'll go to 16, 17 and 18.

9

10

(Off record)

11

12

(On record)

13

14

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We'll go to
15 Proposal WP06-16.

16

17

MR. ARDIZZONE: Proposal 16 and 17 can
18 be found on Page 91. Proposal WP06-16 was submitted by
19 Andrew McLaughlin from Chenega Bay and requests that
20 the antler restriction for Unit 7, that portion
21 draining into Kings Bay, be eliminated and the harvest
22 of either sex moose be allowed. The proposal also
23 requests that the harvest season be changed from August
24 10 to September 20
25 to August 10 to February 28.

26

27

Proposal WP06-17 was submitted by
28 Alaska Department of Fish and Game and requests that
29 the Federal public lands closure for Unit 7, that
30 portion draining into Kings Bay, be eliminated.

31

32

The proponent for WP06-16 believes the
33 regulation should be changed because the customary and
34 traditional use of the moose harvest from the Kings Bay
35 drainages has never been limited by an antler
36 restriction, such as the spike-fork/50 inch or 3 brow
37 tine bulls limitations. The proponent states they have
38 never been confined to harvest dates before September
39 20th, primarily because that time of year in the early
40 season the moose are rarely, if at all, harvestable as
41 the snow has not yet pushed them down from their upper
42 topography habitat that they normally occupy in the
43 early fall at the higher elevations.

44

45

The proponent states the historical
46 moose harvests by Prince William Sound rural residents
47 in the Kings Bay drainages did not take place until
48 later into the winter months, and the limited harvest
49 of any moose, regardless of gender, has always been
50 considered a time honored and customary subsistence

1 practice.

2

3

4 The proponent for WP06-17, Fish and
5 Game, believes the regulation should be changed
6 because, according to information presented in the
7 Office of Subsistence Management Federal Wildlife
8 Closure Review WCR-05-03, few moose have been harvested
9 by Federally-qualified subsistence users in this area
10 since the closure was implemented affecting other
11 users. Removing the closure would provide limited
12 opportunity for other hunters to utilize this area for
13 moose hunting.

14

15

16 The amount of moose habitat in the
17 Kings Bay area is very small, and consists of narrow
18 riparian areas along the Kings River and Nellie Juan
19 River. An aerial survey conducted by ADF&G in 1997
20 revealed 20 moose in the area. The herd at that time
21 consisted of 8 bulls, 10 cows, and 2 calves.

22

23

24 The entire drainages of the Nellie Juan
25 and Kings River were flown in March 2001 by ADF&G, from
26 Nellie Juan Lake downstream to the head of Kings Bay
27 and up the Kings River to the glacier country. Nine
28 moose were counted during the survey in conditions
29 characterized as being excellent for aerial counting.
30 The observers believe that no more than one or two
31 moose could have been missed, if any. There are no
32 more recent surveys at this time.

33

34

35 The small area of moose habitat at
36 Kings Bay is isolated, with only one accessible route
37 for moose to enter the area across the mountains from
38 the Paradise Lakes or Nellie Juan Lake areas, and then
39 down the Nellie Juan River, a distance of 15 to 20
40 miles over difficult terrain. Interchange of moose
41 with other areas is therefore likely minimal. The fact
42 that only nine moose were observed is significant.

43

44

45 Black bear have high densities in
46 western Prince William Sound and brown bears are
47 regularly present in the Kings Bay area. These two
48 predators may elevate the importance of safe calving
49 habitat, which appears to be limited. Productivity and
50 viability of this small group of moose, therefore, is
51 marginal.

52

53

54 Based on harvest records, no moose were
55 harvested from this area since Federal subsistence
56 management regulations established this hunt in 1997.

1 If Proposal WP06-16 were adopted, it
2 would lengthen the harvest season by 161 days and would
3 allow the take of any moose. Extending the season may
4 have detrimental affects on the moose population.
5 Although the harvest limit would not change, the longer
6 season could allow moose to be harvested more easily
7 when they move near the coastline during the winter.
8 Currently, no moose harvests have been reported. If
9 the season is extended and both villages harvest a
10 moose, this could lead to over harvest of this small
11 herd.

12
13 Allowing the possibility of cow harvest
14 in such a small population could also have detrimental
15 effects on the health of the moose population. Cows
16 are important to maintain the herd. If a pregnant cow
17 is taken, it will reduce the recruitment of new moose
18 into the population and thus have a negative impact on
19 the
20 small herd.

21
22 If Proposal WP06-17 were adopted it
23 would not change the harvest season or limits for
24 Chenega Bay and Tatitlek, but it would remove the
25 closure to non-Federally qualified subsistence users,
26 which may lead to competition from non-Federally
27 qualified hunters. However, few moose have been
28 harvested in this area
29 since the closure was implemented. Removing the
30 closure would provide the possibility of additional
31 harvest, which could jeopardize the conservation of
32 this small herd.

33
34 The preliminary conclusions for these
35 proposals are for WP06-16 is to oppose the proposal.
36 However, it is recommended that Federal registration
37 permit language be added to the regulation, allowing
38 managers to closely track harvest of this small herd.

39
40 For WP06-17, the recommendation is to
41 oppose the proposal. If there's any questions I'll try
42 to answer them.

43
44 MR. CARPENTER: I've got a question.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Questions for Chuck.
47 Tom.

48
49 MR. CARPENTER: Thank you, Mr.
50 Chairman. I was reading the comments on Page 95 that

1 the Federal Subsistence Board approved a special action
2 request to close this hunt in 2001. Has this been
3 continually closed since then or was it only for that
4 year?

5
6 MR. ARDIZZONE: My understanding is
7 there was a special action request submitted by the
8 Chugach National Forest, which was rejected by the
9 Board, so it was never closed. And a special action is
10 only good for 60 days, so it wouldn't be continual.

11
12 MR. CARPENTER: Okay. I see. Thank
13 you.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions.

16
17 (No comments)

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Department of Fish and
20 Game.

21
22 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
23 The Department's comments that Tom was referencing have
24 been modified slightly because the Federal Staff have
25 offered an alternative to the Proposal 16. We continue
26 to not support the original Proposal WP06-16 for
27 reasons that are in our written comments on Page 95.
28 There are low moose numbers in the Kings Bay area and
29 there's simply no conservation biological basis to
30 allow the harvest of cow moose in that kind of
31 situation.

32
33 We support the proposal as modified in
34 the Preliminary Conclusion in the staff analysis to
35 require a Federal registration permit for these hunts
36 because then there would be some documentation of
37 whether there is actual participation in the hunt.
38 Based on our current information, we're not aware of
39 any hunting activity taking place in the area.

40
41 We continue to support Proposal
42 WP06-17, the Department proposal, simply because if the
43 opportunity that's being provided under Federal
44 regulations is not being used, then that opportunity
45 should be available to other hunters. It's obviously,
46 under any circumstances, a very limited harvest is all
47 that's sustainable in this area, but we do have
48 concerns about opportunity by other hunters being
49 prohibited if the opportunity is not being utilized by
50 Federally qualified subsistence users.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Terry, if we ended up
2 supporting a registration permit and it turns out that
3 that registration permit is being used on a regular
4 basis but no take is being taken, would you still feel
5 the same way about WP06-17? I was looking here and it
6 said 2001 was nine animals, 2002 was 12 animals and it
7 turns out that the time period that we're talking,
8 which is August 10th through September 20th, that no
9 party has a chance to -- for one thing, all those
10 animals are too high to be taken at that time anyhow.
11 Would there be any need to drop that Federal closure if
12 Federal permits were being used and actual hunting was
13 taking place but there's just no success?
14

15 MR. HAYNES: Gino may want to comment
16 on this. But I would say, again, if there's no Federal
17 harvest occurring, even if there is effort being made,
18 then I would conclude that there is a very small number
19 of moose available for harvest, so that opportunity
20 should not be prohibited. I'm not sure how much
21 interest other hunters would have in this area given
22 the low likelihood of finding moose.
23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.
25

26 MR. CARPENTER: I have two questions.
27 I agree, at least in my opinion, August 10th to
28 February 28th is too long. Maybe even August 10th to
29 October 20th would be more reasonable. But I have a
30 question for you, Terry, and that is this. We
31 basically have a population of moose between 10 and 20
32 on a typical year and I'm not sure if this survey is
33 done every year. I guess what I'm curious about is why
34 is there an antler restriction, spike-fork/50 on Kings
35 Bay on somewhat of a non-viable herd. I guess the
36 reason I ask that is the entire unit 60, which is
37 Prince William Sound, there's a State harvest of one
38 bull for registration permit and I'm pretty sure, not
39 100 percent but 98 percent sure, they don't even fly
40 surveys because it's a non-viable moose population.
41

42 So I guess I'm curious why we need to
43 restrict Chenega and Tatitlek with a spike-fork/50.
44 Just a question.
45

46 MR. HAYNES: You're referencing the
47 Federal hunt?
48

49 MR. CARPENTER: I'm asking you do you
50 think -- you know, basically this proposal,

1 notwithstanding the dates, but they're asking for the
2 antler restriction that the Federal Subsistence Board
3 has imposed right now on a non-viable population, why
4 do we need to have an antler restriction. The State
5 currently has a hunt that has no antler restriction and
6 it's the same type registration permit. Isn't the
7 Federal Board being more restrictive in basically the
8 same area than the State is?
9

10 MR. DEL FRATE: Mr. Chair. Gino Del
11 Frate. Mr. Carpenter. The short answer is manager
12 discretion. The longer answer is without as much
13 knowledge of Unit 6 moose population, I would suspect
14 that the participation in that hunt is very low that
15 the occasional harvest of a bull moose would still
16 allow for the breeding of the remaining cows when it
17 did take place. Within the Kenai, the rest of the
18 Kenai is managed under spike-fork/50 and we have
19 maintained that the subsistence hunt also be maintained
20 at spike-fork/50 and that is to allow a more hands-off
21 approach where you can take theoretically all of the
22 spike-forks and all of the greater than 50-inch moose
23 and still have a breeding population of bulls.
24

25 I would argue that we have a viable
26 population, not a non-viable population because we have
27 been sustaining this very small population for a very
28 long time. Should we go in this area and significantly
29 harvest all the timber and create better habitat, we
30 may be able to produce more moose, we may be able to
31 produce less moose if we make it more vulnerable to
32 predation.
33

34 I think this very small population is
35 just surviving barely and an occasional harvest of a
36 bull here and there is not going to make a difference.
37 If we start taking cows, it would make a difference
38 really fast.
39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.

41
42 MR. CARPENTER: So I guess what you're
43 suggesting is -- I mean I agree with you taking cows
44 out of a population can be detrimental to a small
45 population, but if you have a small population of
46 moose, taking one bull, regardless of the antler size
47 each year, is going to have a very minimal impact on
48 that population. Would you agree with that?
49

50 MR. DEL FRATE: Yes, as long as that

1 wasn't the last bull.

2

3 MR. CARPENTER: Right. And I guess
4 what I'm getting at is, we have a small population with
5 an extremely low participation level. I mean the State
6 is obviously quite aware of that because of the
7 proposal in number 17. I guess what I'm trying to get
8 at is we have Chenega and Tatitlek that might be able
9 to establish some kind of a harvest pattern for their
10 communities if the antler restriction the Federal Board
11 has put in place wasn't so extreme. And I agree with
12 you, I don't think by allowing them to harvest one bull
13 versus a spike-fork/50 it's not going to do anything to
14 that population. I'm not a biologist, but I wanted to
15 ask you because I know that you are. Thanks.

16

17 MR. DEL FRATE: One of the other
18 important parts about spike-fork/50 is the medium-aged
19 bulls, the allegedly two through five year olds that
20 would be medium size, have a higher probability of
21 survival during a significant winter event and in
22 Prince William Sound where you are subjected to deep
23 snow winters we would want to afford the best
24 opportunity to maintain that breeding population and
25 that is another real important part about spike-
26 fork/50.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pete.

29

30 MR. KOMPKOFF: I have a question. Has
31 there ever been any studies about the migration pattern
32 of the moose that are in Kings Bay along the Nellie
33 Juan River over to that bay right next to Seward?

34

35 MR. DEL FRATE: Mr. Chairman. No.

36

37 MR. KOMPKOFF: Just to follow up, Mr.
38 Chairman. I believe those moose travel up in that
39 area. There has to be more than 20 because there's
40 been recorded 12 bulls seen in one summer. So they
41 must be chasing somebody around to get over there.
42 Then they move out of there before dead of winter. I
43 believe there's very few because I haven't seen any
44 around during the winter months on the beach or
45 anything. Lately I haven't been able to get over
46 there. When I was younger I did.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So, if I understand
49 right, there probably is no biological problem with
50 removing the antler restriction because it just ends up

1 being one bull. The cow part of it, there seems to be
2 universal objection to that. Lengthening the season
3 for that many days all through the winter would be
4 pretty extreme, but possibly lengthening it a little
5 longer in the fall would be an alternative. I too like
6 Staff's recommendation that there be a registration and
7 a return permit. I just don't know how easy that would
8 be able to be accomplished if the people are hunting
9 out of the villages and don't go to town first. It
10 would have to be made readily accessible in the
11 villages for the permit.

12

13 MR. DEL FRATE: Mr. Chair. I guess I
14 could offer up what we currently do under the State
15 Tier II system for the communities of Nanwalek and Port
16 Graham. We have a similar situation where we have a
17 very small moose population. We have set a harvest
18 quota of two bulls and we allow the hunters in this
19 case, four permittees allowed, when they harvest a
20 moose they call in to the Homer Fish and Game office
21 within two days of taking the animal and after two
22 bulls have been taken that season is closed. The
23 theory is to allow one moose for each community to be
24 harvested. In reality, usually one community gets both
25 moose. Actually, I take that back. The reality is,
26 usually only one moose at most gets taken in any one
27 year. I think this year we had two moose with an
28 extended season.

29

30 I could offer that as an option that
31 you can consider. My preference is to keep the spike-
32 fork/50 regulation in place. It's worked very well on
33 the Kenai for both subsistence and non-subsistence
34 users and it does ensure some protection for breeding
35 bulls and I think that would still be my preference and
36 the Department's preference.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.

39

40 MR. CARPENTER: Gino, those two
41 communities you just mentioned, the hunt they have,
42 they have to report within two days, is there any
43 antler restrictions in their hunt.

44

45 MR. DEL FRATE: I knew you were going
46 to ask that.

47

48 MR. CARPENTER: I mean is the entire
49 Kenai Peninsula spike-fork/50?

50

1 MR. DEL FRATE: It's one bull.
2
3 MR. CARPENTER: Just to make a point.
4 It's pretty reasonable to be able to have a similar
5 type relationship with Chenega and Tatitlek with a
6 Federal manager that each community knows -- and I'll
7 offer up some amended language when we get to that
8 time.
9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Out of curiosity,
11 would this be classed as Prince William Sound or as the
12 Kenai?
13
14 MR. DEL FRATE: As far as the State is
15 concerned, it's within Unit 7, which is part of the
16 Kenai Peninsula.
17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But you have the
19 precedent in Unit 7 already at Nanwalek and Port Graham
20 that you have a subsistence hunt with no antler
21 restrictions on the Kenai.
22
23 MR. DEL FRATE: Right. The important
24 distinction there is there is a limit of only four
25 permits, it's not an unlimited hunt.
26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Any more
28 questions for Fish and Game.
29
30 (No comments)
31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Other Federal, State
33 and Tribal agencies.
34
35 MR. KOMPKOFF: Mr. Chairman. Do I have
36 to leave my seat if I want to speak.....
37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do you want to speak
39 on behalf of the tribe?
40
41 MR. KOMPKOFF: Yes.
42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Please.
44
45 MR. KOMPKOFF: Mr. Chairman, fellow
46 Council Members. Pete Kompkoff from Chenega Bay. I'd
47 like to give you a little history for the rest of the
48 audience about Chenega Bay. Chenega Bay is located on
49 Evans Island, Prince William Sound. It's between
50 Seward and Whittier if you go by boat. It's in western

1 Prince William Sound. We have no stores. The only
2 thing you can buy there is gas, diesel and candles at
3 the church. So all of our food has to be shipped in or
4 what we get is through subsistence. Being able to
5 allow the village of Chenega a potlatch ceremonial hunt
6 in Kings Bay would be very good for the village and I
7 support this proposal on behalf of that and so does the
8 village. That's what I have to say. Any questions.

9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pete, by potlatch
11 you're saying that if a moose is taken out of Kings
12 Bay, that's probably what it will be used for.

13
14 MR. KOMPKOFF: That's what it will be
15 used for. We have a regular ceremonial ceremony for
16 the 1964 earthquake that destroyed the village of
17 Chenega and the 26 villagers.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So this is pretty much
20 the only access to moose that you have in western
21 Prince William Sound.

22
23 MR. KOMPKOFF: That is the only access.
24 The last time I was able to get a moose I had to go to
25 Koyukuk River to get one.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.

28
29 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah, Pete. Thanks. I
30 think it's important, in my opinion, that we try to
31 satisfy the needs of the people in Chenega and
32 Tatitlek. You heard what Gino said. Currently right
33 now there's a season from August 10th to September 20th
34 and I'm curious. If we were to lift the antler
35 restriction to allow Chenega Bay to harvest one bull
36 instead, would you be receptive to that if the season
37 was August 10th to October 20th? So you'd stay away
38 from the pregnant cow issue, which is important,
39 especially in a low population, but would that satisfy
40 Chenega Bay's needs?

41
42 MR. KOMPKOFF: Mr. Chairman, Tom. Yes,
43 it would. Thank you very much.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Dean.

46
47 MR. WILSON: By approving that proposal
48 that we're talking about, lifting the restrictions,
49 this kind of goes into a couple proposals up ahead
50 where you guys have actually put in for a potlatch bull

1 in much regulated Cordova area. Would this take the
2 place of that? Would we be striking 18 at that point
3 if we could get you guys a moose yearly out of Kings
4 Bay or are we still looking at both of them? That's my
5 first part.

6

7

The second part question is.....

8

9

MR. KOMPKOFF: Can I answer the first
10 one because I'll forget about the second one. Mr.
11 Chairman, Dean. The question was would it satisfy our
12 needs for one moose for a traditional harvest. Not
13 necessarily, you know. I don't think there's been a
14 moose taken out of Kings Bay since 1967 by either
15 community. That's quite a few years back. Because of
16 the restrictions and the accessibility of Kings Bay, it
17 makes it hard for us to even make an attempt to go over
18 there, so that's why we've been avoiding it. But if
19 these restrictions were removed, I think we'd make a
20 good attempt to harvest one over there.

21

22

MR. WILSON: Just a follow up on that.
23 I kind of see where you're going. Looking at the
24 history of the hunt, it's really not even classified as
25 a hunt. It would be more classified as a lottery. But
26 if anybody does get anything out of that area, Chenega
27 Bay should have first right to it. How about if all
28 the restrictions were pulled all together and you guys
29 were allowed one moose out of there?

30

31

MR. KOMPKOFF: I would like that
32 better. By the way, I oppose WP06-17. I don't want
33 any openers. Any other questions.

34

35

(No comments)

36

37

MR. KOMPKOFF: If not, that's all I
38 have, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

39

40

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With that,
41 InterAgency Staff Committee comments.

42

43

(No comments)

44

45

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fish and Game Advisory
46 Committee comments.

47

48

(No comments)

49

50

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Summary of written

1 public comments. Do we have any, Donald.

2

3 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair, we don't have any
4 written public comments.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We don't have
7 any call for public testimony. Darrel, I have you down
8 for just general at the end of the day.

9

10 MR. WILLIAMS: Yes.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We are open to
13 putting a motion on the table for WP06-16.

14

15 MR. CARPENTER: Are we doing these
16 separate?

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think we should.
19 Whoever makes the motion can do what they want to do.

20

21 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman. I move
22 that we adopt 06-16.

23

24 MR. BLOSSOM: Second.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
27 seconded to adopt WP06-16. Discussion, amendments.

28

29 MR. CARPENTER: I'll start off the
30 conversation here. I think it's pretty evident, at
31 least in my opinion, that we need to figure out a way
32 to satisfy Chenega Bay. Although I don't agree with
33 the original proposal, the August 10th to February
34 28th, I think that is too long. I don't have any real
35 objections to lengthening it to October 20th. I know
36 the hunts in Unit 6 run until October 31st, so that is
37 pretty consistent for similar geography and coastal
38 type communities.

39

40 I have some concern with allowing any
41 moose, but I think the probability is quite low of
42 harvest in this area. I think we should make it as
43 receptive to Chenega Bay as we can. My idea was to
44 make it any bull, but I guess before I offer up an
45 amendment I'll see what some of the other Council
46 members have to say in regards to that.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom, I have a couple
49 questions I'd like to ask Fish and Game before we go
50 any farther. Terry, you're the manager on the Kenai.

1 The Port Graham and Nanwalek hunts, what's their time
2 frame?

3

4 MR. DEL FRATE: Mr. Chair. That season
5 was recently changed from August 30 to September 30, to
6 August 20 to September 20. It's a 30-day hunt.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's a 30-day hunt and
9 it's a registration hunt.

10

11 MR. DEL FRATE: It's a Tier II permit
12 hunt.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's a Tier II permit
15 hunt. Are only residents of Nanwalek and Port Graham
16 qualified for that hunt?

17

18 MR. DEL FRATE: Technically, under
19 State regulations, all Alaska residents are qualified
20 to apply. I can tell you that all permittees since
21 inception of that hunt have been either residents of
22 Port Graham or Nanwalek.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Then the next question
25 I had, the drawing hunt at Cordova. What's the current
26 season on that, Tom?

27

28 MR. CARPENTER: Currently the State
29 season, it's going to be a little different this year,
30 but the Federal season, and Milo can correct me if I'm
31 wrong, I believe is September 1st, which I believe all
32 the moose hunts in Unit 6 start September 1st, and the
33 Federal hunt you have until December 31st for bulls.
34 Cows is October 31st. There's a five cow drawing. It
35 varies year to year, but anywhere from 15 to 30 bulls,
36 depending on aerial surveys and such. The State season
37 ends for the bull drawing hunt on October 31st. So
38 that's why I was saying that a season from August 20th
39 to October 20th is pretty similar to what the dates are
40 in State and Federal regulation for bulls in 6.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And the hunt down on
43 Bering River.

44

45 MR. CARPENTER: The Bering River hunt
46 is a State hunt and that's September 1st to October
47 30th and that's five cow. It's a drawing hunt for cows
48 and it's any bull.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that ends October

1 30th? It goes to December something.

2

3 MR. CARPENTER: Actually, the hunt does
4 go until November 30th, I believe. That was changed a
5 couple years ago at the Board of Game. You're right.
6 But I will say this, all of Unit 6 is any bull.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Well, I was
9 just thinking of what you were talking about, Tom. If
10 this turns out to be a registration hunt with two
11 permits and the land stays closed to anybody except
12 Chenega, just to see how this would work and we went to
13 any sex, myself, I would prefer to give them at least
14 as long as we give the drawing hunts in Cordova, which
15 is September 1st till December 31st and see what
16 happens. That would give them an opportunity to see if
17 any bull and a winter hunt would satisfy their need for
18 a local potlatch moose. Tom.

19

20 MR. CARPENTER: Just another question
21 to Gino. Is there any reason why -- I mean I
22 understand that we try and keep regulations consistent
23 at least within the unit if you can, but is there any
24 reason why a moose hunt can't start earlier than August
25 20th?

26

27 MR. DEL FRATE: Mr. Chair, Mr.
28 Carpenter. The short answer is no. Typically, when
29 moose hunts start getting proposed earlier and earlier,
30 we get more and more complaints by hunters that the
31 warm temperatures reduce meat quality. However, I
32 think on the Kenai the archery season starts August
33 10th for most of the area that's open to archery as
34 well as other parts of the state. If you're going to
35 be hunting cows, you have a calf care issue.

36

37 MR. CARPENTER: I guess I would agree
38 with you, Mr. Chairman. I don't see that it would be a
39 problem. August 20th to October 31st or October 30th,
40 which is a week longer than you have in the rest of
41 Unit 6, it's pretty consistent but it does give them a
42 little more opportunity to fulfill their needs.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What I was thinking is
45 the people in Chenega live more of a lifestyle like the
46 people in Cordova and they're active in commercial
47 fishing and things like that. That's one of the
48 reasons our moose hunt there doesn't start until the
49 first of September and then goes later into the fall.
50 I was thinking that could possibly apply in Kings Bay.

1 We could give them a later opener, which would be like
2 the 1st of September and then extend it as long as
3 Cordova, go December 31st, but I'll leave that up to
4 whoever makes the amendment. But if we're going to
5 have a registration hunt and basically try to take one
6 bull out of there, we're going to be watching that herd
7 pretty closely.

8

9 Are you sure '67 was the last time a
10 moose was taken out of there? I thought we had a
11 couple moose taken out of there in the '80s.

12

13 MR. KOMPKOFF: There was an attempt in
14 the '80s. Maybe Tatitlek did.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tatitlek took one?
17 Yeah, I thought there was. But the harvest has been
18 extremely low. If we feel like there's enough of a
19 surplus that we could take one bull and it would
20 probably average out to about one every other year at
21 the most, then I think we ought to give them a
22 subsistence opportunity that's long enough that it's
23 valid to give them that opportunity. And knowing the
24 people there, I know that they do a lot more running
25 around in boats come wintertime than they do during a
26 commercial fishing season and everything.

27

28 Pete, if you were going to pick a date
29 and knew you couldn't go to February 28th, what kind of
30 dates would you pick?

31

32 MR. KOMPKOFF: Mr. Chairman. I think
33 the dates September 1st to December 31st would be
34 sufficient.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Dean.

37

38 MR. WILSON: When is that potlatch you
39 guys have annually?

40

41 MR. KOMPKOFF: It's March 24th, next
42 week. We have a gathering every year in Anchorage and
43 we bring our subsistence food and serve all Native
44 food, everything. Sometimes we throw in a turkey.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pete, are you still
47 under current law? You're still allowed to take a sea
48 lion if you want to, aren't you?

49

50 MR. KOMPKOFF: Yes, we are. We got one

1 last week. So one more will do.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.

4

5 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman. I'd like
6 to offer an amendment to Proposal 06-16. The amendment
7 would read as follows that Unit 7 moose, that portion
8 draining into Kings Bay, residents of Chenega Bay and
9 Tatitlek, between the dates of September 1st and
10 December 31st, each village may take one bull by
11 registration permit.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You're not going to
14 put a reporting time period on it?

15

16 MR. CARPENTER: I think to be
17 consistent I don't see any reason not to. And that a
18 seven-day reporting requirement to the Federal manager
19 be required.

20

21 MR. ENCELEWSKI: I second that motion.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Moved and seconded the
24 amendment.

25

26 MR. CARPENTER: I'll speak to the
27 amendment. I think that it's been established, and I'm
28 not a biologist, but taking one bull out of a small
29 population is not going to be detrimental. By changing
30 the dates we're giving Chenega Bay and Tatitlek more
31 opportunity for subsistence to hopefully meet the
32 demands of supplying their communities with a moose for
33 their potlatch and establishing a seven day reporting
34 requirement will hopefully give the Federal managers
35 data and maybe some information just by talking to the
36 person within the community that harvested that moose
37 to just get a general idea of what's going on in the
38 Kings Bay drainage.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pete.

41

42 MR. KOMPKOFF: I have a question for
43 Tom. Is that any bull?

44

45 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah, Pete, my
46 amendment is to lift the restriction of spike-fork/50
47 and make that any bull.

48

49 MR. KOMPKOFF: Thank you.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Dean.
2
3 MR. WILSON: I wanted to get some
4 clarification on this. Is this going to eliminate the
5 need for another potlatch bull over in Cordova with
6 WP06-18 or is this going to be in addition?
7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That proposal is still
9 in front of us.
10
11 MR. WILSON: I understand that. I'm
12 just looking ahead here because it does affect this one
13 here. What I'm wondering, is this going to be
14 sufficient for Chenega. As we're talking, we want to
15 get a potlatch moose to you guys annually if we can.
16
17 MR. KOMPKOFF: Mr. Chairman, Dean. We
18 have a motion in front of us and I'm straying off the
19 motion. I apologize for that. But if there's a way
20 that we could work it if we're not successful in one
21 area, I'd like to go to another area and have that
22 option.
23
24 MS. STICKWAN: That's a different unit.
25
26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.
27
28 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman. I'm
29 trying to address some of those concerns that Dean has.
30 I think one of the reasons I'm making this amendment --
31 not trying to get off the subject, but trying to think
32 ahead like you are, I'm trying to make the proposal, at
33 least my opinion, and give them as much opportunity to
34 satisfy their need because some documentation possibly
35 will not allow them to have as much of an opportunity
36 in maybe a further proposal that we're going to deal
37 with. So I'm hoping that this will give them more time
38 and make their chance of harvesting an animal in this
39 area go way up by taking the antler restriction off.
40 At least that's my idea.
41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other discussion
43 on the amendment. Dean.
44
45 MR. WILSON: I guess what I'm wondering
46 is if it's been so long since anything has even been
47 taken in that area, would it be too much of a stretch
48 to allow any moose to be taken in that area. If
49 there's a limit of two, is it too much of a stretch to
50 pull the bull restriction out completely and then, on

1 the second part to that, if that was done, could we
2 eliminate 18?

3

4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pete.

5

6 MR. KOMPKOFF: That's a hard question
7 to answer, but I believe so. I would think it would
8 eliminate 18 because we have no C&T established in Unit
9 6(C), even though the community residents have lived in
10 Cordova before and my wife had her name drawn one year
11 for a permit over in Unit 6(C). I'll just leave it at
12 that.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I see what you
15 meaning, Dean. Tom.

16

17 MR. CARPENTER: Dean, theoretically, I
18 don't have any problem with that. The problem that I
19 foresee is that I'm not sure the Federal Board would go
20 with that. I mean we can send our recommendation to
21 them, but I'd hate to see this proposal fail and have
22 Chenega and Tatitlek have to live with the regulations
23 that are in place now because maybe we pushed this
24 proposal too far.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Chuck.

27

28 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair. We don't
29 really have good data on this small herd. The last
30 count was nine animals. I don't know how many cows
31 were present, how many bulls were present. If we're
32 going to get into that reproductive capacity and start
33 harvesting cows, we may end up with no herd in that
34 area. I'd be much more comfortable with any bull
35 harvest than I would cows. I would say that would
36 cause a conservation concern and that's one of the
37 reasons the Board can vote against the proposal.

38

39 MR. ZEMKE: Steve Zemke, Chugach
40 National Forest. A couple things. One is we were
41 planning to try to do a moose survey in the area last
42 fall and that was weathered out, but we have plans to
43 do another one this fall and hopefully get cow/calf,
44 bull/cow and calf survival information as well as
45 overall population.

46

47 The other one is that when there's only
48 eight or 10 potential cows within the herd, then there
49 would be reproductive concerns, at least in my view.
50 As you were mentioning Tom, it may be pushing the

1 envelope too far with the limited data that we have.
2 I'd be more comfortable with that approach after next
3 winter when we do have better information.

4
5 Thank you.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pete.

8
9 MR. KOMPKOFF: To avoid any more
10 discussion on the issue, I would be satisfied with
11 removal of the restriction size of the antlers and go
12 with the one bull.

13
14 MR. CARPENTER: Question.

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

19
20 IN UNISON: Aye.

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

24
25 (No opposing votes)

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The amendment carries.
28 We now have an amended motion before us. Do we have
29 any more discussion on the amended motion.

30
31 MR. KOMPKOFF: Question on the motion.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
34 called. All in favor of the amended motion signify by
35 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: The amended motion
45 carries. With that, we go on to WP06-17. A motion to
46 put WP06-17 on the table is in order. Chuck has
47 already given us the background on that.

48
49 MR. CARPENTER: So moved.

50

1 MR. BLOSSOM: Second.
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
4 seconded to put WP06-17 on the table. Discussion.
5 Tom.
6
7 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman. I think
8 in lieu of action taken in 16, trying to give Chenega
9 and Tatitlek more opportunity, I think it would be
10 premature to allow this Proposal 17 to go forward at
11 this time. I think we need to give the action that
12 we've taken a chance to work and I think if the State
13 feels in the future that they're concerned by non-
14 participation, I think they should readdress it at that
15 time.
16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tom. Any
18 other comments.
19
20 (No comments)
21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We also heard that
23 there was going to be some surveys done, so we'll have
24 better information as to the amount of moose that are
25 available in the future. I would probably support what
26 you just said, Tom. Any other discussion.
27
28 MR. CARPENTER: Question.
29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
31 called. All in favor of WP06-17 signify by saying aye.
32
33 (No aye votes)
34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
36 saying nay.
37
38 IN UNISON: Nay.
39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion fails
41 unanimously. WP06-18.
42
43 MS. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
44 Maybe this will be quick. My name is Helen Armstrong.
45 I'm the anthropologist at the Office of Subsistence
46 Management. Proposal 18 is on Page 98 of your book.
47 The analysis starts there. It was submitted by the
48 Native Village of Chenega and requests that residents
49 of Unit 6(D) be added to those with a positive
50 customary and traditional use determination for moose

1 in Unit 6(C).

2

3

4 Currently the C&T for moose in Unit
5 6(C) is for residents of 6(A), (B) and (C). The Native
6 Village of Chenega also requested a permit to take one
7 bull moose annually for a ceremonial potlatch. Those
8 proposed regulations you'll find on Pages 98 and 99.

8

9

10 I do just want to make a note that in
11 the Federal regulation proposal book there was an error
12 and this proposal included all residents of Unit 6(D),
13 but the original proposal as written only requested a
14 positive C&T determination for Chenega Bay in Unit
15 6(C).

15

16

17 We had a lot of discussion about this
18 proposal and the analysis and the Staff decided it
19 should be a two-step process because there was a
20 request to take one bull for the potlatch that first we
21 needed to do C&T and then we needed to address that if
22 the C&T went through. Because it's a very limited
23 population in 6(C) and there are conservation concerns,
24 the Staff felt if it goes forward and the Board
25 approved the request, that Chenega Bay residents would
26 be added to the list of rural residents eligible to
27 harvest moose within Unit 6(C). Because there was
28 limited participation in this hunt and there were
29 conservation concerns, Section .804 of ANILCA could be
30 applied and you could have an analysis to determine if
31 Chenega Bay residents could participate in the drawing
32 hunt. That would go through a public review process.
33 It would be a proposal just like any proposal and would
34 be in the next round of proposals next year if the
35 Board does give them C&T.

35

36

37 I don't need to go into anything about
38 Chenega Bay since Pete very eloquently gave some
39 background and some history. The problem, as he was
40 mentioning earlier, is the hunting that they've done in
41 Unit 6(C) has been when they lived in the Cordova area
42 after the earthquake. The way C&T is done is not based
43 on the users but on the uses of the community. So just
44 because somebody moves from one community to another
45 anywhere in the state, not just here, you don't take
46 that C&T with you. The C&T is based on the community
47 uses.

47

48

49 The Council has already heard a similar
50 proposal quite a bit in the past. The regulatory
51 history is on Page 99 and I'll just briefly summarize.

1 This first came to the Board in 1997 when there was a
2 request for a Unit 6(C) ceremonial moose harvest.
3 There was no C&T for the moose in the unit, so they
4 followed through with a C&T Proposal 98-019 and that
5 requested the traditional use determination for Chenega
6 Bay and Tatitlek residents in Unit 6. That proposal
7 was deferred. There was a need for collecting more
8 information.

9
10 The Southcentral Regional Council
11 discussed the issue in the fall of 1998. From my
12 reading of all of the background of this, I think the
13 Council did a very good job and deferring the proposals
14 to try to gather as much information as possible.
15 After considerable public testimony and discussion, the
16 Council then voted to oppose the proposal.

17
18 The proposal was reconsidered and then
19 the Council deferred it until another meeting and was
20 then taken up in October of 1999. There wasn't any
21 additional testimony, then it was taken up again in the
22 winter of 2000. What ultimately came out of it was
23 what I had referred to earlier, that there are some
24 uses of Chenega Bay residents in Unit 6(C) for taking
25 moose, but that hadn't happened from when they lived in
26 Chenega Bay.

27
28 So the conclusion of that series of
29 proposals was that the Council didn't support the
30 proposal to provide Chenega Bay and Tatitlek with a
31 positive C&T use determination for moose in Unit 6 and
32 then the Board rejected the proposal based on the
33 recommendations from the Council, the InterAgency Staff
34 Committee and ADF&G.

35
36 In looking at the eight factors for
37 determining customary and traditional uses, there isn't
38 much evidence of Chenega Bay taking moose much at all.
39 There have been eight household harvest studies
40 conducted by ADF&G from '84 to '97, which is quite a
41 few, and that was because of the oil spill. There was
42 one moose taken in '84, one in '85 and three in '97.
43 The harvest ticket database indicates that Chenega Bay
44 residents have taken nine moose since 1985, five were
45 taken on the Kenai Peninsula, one in Unit 16(A), but
46 none in Unit 6. No moose have been reported harvested
47 since 1985 in Unit 6(C) by Chenega Bay residents.
48 Thus, there's not any information that would indicate
49 people from Chenega Bay have taken moose in Unit 6(C).
50

1 The effect of the proposal are on Page
2 104 in your analysis. If this were adopted, the
3 residents of Chenega Bay would be added to the list of
4 rural residents eligible to harvest moose in Unit 6(C).
5 Because of the limited number of moose, estimated at
6 350 animals, there are 26 Federal permits, that most
7 likely you would have to do a Section .804 analysis.
8 If it was determined Chenega Bay should be given the
9 right to take one of those moose, the effect would be
10 that they would then compete with the residents of Unit
11 6(A), 6(B), and 6(C).

12
13 What that means in reality is that it
14 adds about approximately 21 eligible house to the pool
15 of eligible
16 users and it would then could create fewer permits for
17 the residents of Units 6(A), 6(B), and 6(C).

18
19 My recommendation is to oppose the
20 proposal and this is based on that there's no new
21 information that we have from the last time the Board
22 and the Council reviewed this and at that time the
23 Council didn't find any evidence of a consistent
24 pattern of use by people living in Chenega Bay and
25 since 2002 there's not been any record of Chenega Bay
26 residents taking moose in Unit 6(C).

27
28 I would like to add though that I think
29 just because there wasn't any evidence that I was able
30 to find, I think it's important that the Council and
31 Pete provide some information and if he has something
32 new to add that the Council can then reconsider that
33 new information.

34
35 If the Council recommends supporting it
36 and the Board adopts it, then it would be with the
37 understanding that there probably should be an 804
38 analysis done next year to determine if the Chenega Bay
39 people should have the ability to get a permit and then
40 get their potlatch moose.

41
42 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Pete.

45
46 MR. KOMPKOFF: Mr. Chairman, Helen. Do
47 you suppose if my brother Donald was able to give his
48 testimony on behalf of his proposal it would have maybe
49 made a difference in the determination that was made?
50

1 MR. ARMSTRONG: I think you'd have to
2 ask the Council that question. The original
3 recommendation from the Staff in the earlier analysis
4 was to support it and then the Council ended up not
5 supporting it. But I think you'd have to ask the
6 Council that question.

7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pete, Don wasn't there
9 in '98 but he was there in March of '99 and he did a
10 lot of testifying in March of '99, so he was there when
11 we considered it. In fact, we see the discussion that
12 we had right here in '99. Gloria.

13
14 MS. STICKWAN: They said it was because
15 of the earthquake that they moved to a different area.
16 So that would have been an interruption that they had
17 no control over and that's probably why they didn't
18 hunt over there. Is that true?

19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. The current
21 village is how far from the old village?

22
23 MR. KOMPKOFF: It's 25 miles.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: After the earthquake,
26 quite a few of them moved to Cordova for a while until
27 they got the new village started and then they moved
28 back. I think that's what she was pointing out. They
29 never did any of their hunting from when they lived in
30 either one of the villages. They did it during that
31 time period that they lived in Cordova.

32
33 MR. KOMPKOFF: Yeah. That was 1964 to
34 1984.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: About 20 years. Pete,
37 did you have something more you wanted to say.

38
39 MR. KOMPKOFF: I was going to make
40 another comment. Do you suppose after taking more
41 testimony and come up with a different analysis that
42 C&T could be established for Chenega and Tatitlek?

43
44 MS. ARMSTRONG: It's, of course, up to
45 the Council how they want to recommend and what the
46 Board decides, but I have seen that happen where the
47 Board has heard public testimony and has changed from
48 what the analysis had been. It's hard for me to guess.

49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Helen, I think that's

1 kind of what we told him in '99 and 2001 when we
2 handled it. As we said, come up with some testimony,
3 come up with new information so we can consider it and
4 that's what really has to happen, we have to have
5 something more to base it on than we had then, Pete.

6
7 MR. KOMPKOFF: Mr. Chairman. When we
8 come to the final decision on this when a motion is
9 made, can an amendment be added to that motion to
10 specify these things that you mentioned. More
11 testimony before you can make a determination.

12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, that's just
14 understood. I'm not saying what we're going to do on
15 this, Pete, but if it would get turned down, you can
16 always resubmit it and bring new information. I think
17 what Helen was saying, if I understood correct, was
18 that currently we have no new information since the
19 last time that we, as a Council, and the Board voted
20 not to. Pete.

21
22 MR. KOMPKOFF: If there's some way that
23 an analogy can be done based on the interruption of the
24 natural disaster of '64 and then the Exxon Valdez oil
25 spill, some kind of determination can be made by the
26 Department of Fish and Game and the other departments
27 that are involved in making these decisions about
28 residents of Chenega Bay having gone through those
29 hardships.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Pete. Tom.

32
33 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah, I just had a
34 couple comments. I'll save most of it. This is an
35 unusual situation. Me from Cordova and Pete from
36 Chenega Bay. I mean I understand the people of Chenega
37 Bay's concerns, but I've been involved representing the
38 advisory committee the last few times.

39
40 I think there's a few things that are
41 important to consider here when you're dealing with
42 C&T. First of all, when Cordova was given a C&T when
43 the Federal government took over subsistence, they
44 already had a C&T. This has come before this Council
45 at least two times. In my estimation, there's no new
46 information. Personally, I like to base C&T -- there
47 has to be some kind of documented evidence to be able
48 to give a community C&T because it is kind of the make-
49 up of that community.

50

1 I have some information here. Just to
2 maybe expound a little bit, these are introduced moose.
3 This is a non-indigenous species to Unit 6. As a
4 viable population, there was no moose there. They were
5 transported in the '50s from the Matanuska Valley. The
6 earthquake happened in Cordova in 1964 and at that
7 time, as Pete said, people were relocated from Chenega
8 to Cordova and Valdez and different places until their
9 village could be moved.

10
11 This moose hunt didn't even start in
12 Cordova until the late '50s or early '60s. By the time
13 the people of Chenega Bay moved there, they had never
14 previously hunted this population because there was no
15 hunt. So I think that's one important thing to
16 consider when we're talking about this. The only other
17 information I could use is that this has been a Federal
18 hunt now for maybe five years, six years. Before that
19 it was a State drawing hunt. Basically from 1990 to
20 2005 there were zero applications from the Village of
21 Chenega that were submitted in regards to trying to get
22 one of these State permits. So that means obviously
23 there was none issued.

24
25 The other thing is the rest of Unit 6
26 is a registration hunt in which any of these people
27 anywhere in the state can get a permit from Fish and
28 Game and there's never been a recorded harvest by
29 anybody from Chenega Bay. So I think the opportunity,
30 notwithstanding this drawing hunt, they did have
31 opportunity to participate in Unit 6 hunts, but there's
32 no record of that.

33
34 The thing I thought was interesting was
35 under the general harvest within different places
36 around the state or different registrations there's
37 harvest every year. It doesn't tell me which unit that
38 was in, but that is the kind of information you have to
39 base the C&T on. I think testimony is good, but -- you
40 know, I'm not trying to prolong this, but that's kind
41 of hard to get around, I think.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pete.

44
45 MR. KOMPKOFF: Mr. Chairman, Tom. I
46 have to disagree with you on that, that nobody has put
47 in for a drawing hunt. My wife was drawn in Cordova
48 one year. Every year I put my name in when I come to
49 Cordova for that drawing, but my name has never been
50 drawn.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pete, can I ask you a
2 question.

3
4 MR. KOMPKOFF: Sure.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: When you've put your
7 name in for the drawing, have you put it in with a
8 Cordova address, Valdez address or Chenega address?

9
10 MR. KOMPKOFF: Chenega address. And
11 lately I haven't been able to get over to Cordova
12 because I don't trust the boat I have. I got a new
13 boat now, so different story.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Gloria.

16
17 MS. STICKWAN: I've been attending
18 these meetings for over 10 years. I've seen C&T was
19 done just by oral history, someone coming here and
20 talking about it, and C&T was given to that community.
21 It's been done in the past. So I think Chenega Bay
22 could come up with even oral history showing that they
23 use this area, we should take that into consideration.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think what you're
26 saying, Gloria, is we have based it on oral testimony
27 and that's one of the things we requested even from
28 Don, bring some people. That's what it's going to take
29 so that we have a record to build on.

30
31 Okay. Fish and Game.

32
33 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, thank you.
34 The Department's comments are on Page 106. The
35 Department does not support this proposal essentially
36 for reasons that Helen has stated. I also really
37 appreciated Mr. Carpenter's comments because I think he
38 helps to lay out the history of how long moose have
39 been available in the area and it brings into question
40 the issue of how long does use have to occur to
41 constitute a C&T use and that's always difficult to
42 address. But, clearly, there's not enough information
43 presented at this meeting in our judgment for the
44 Council to support making a change to the current C&T
45 finding for Chenega Bay.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for
48 Terry. Pete.

49
50 MR. KOMPKOFF: Mr. Chairman, Terry. I

1 think C&T can be determined -- if we had a potlatch and
2 had a moose at that potlatch and we could determine
3 that's C&T. It doesn't have to go back 20 years to
4 develop customary and traditional use.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions
7 for Terry.

8
9 (No comments)

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Other Federal, State
12 or Tribal comments.

13
14 (No comments)

15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: InterAgency Staff
17 Committee comments.

18
19 (No comments)

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fish and Game Advisory
22 Committee comments.

23
24 (No comments)

25
26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Public testimony.

27
28 (No comments)

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Written public
31 comments.

32
33 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
34 You'll find your written public comments on Page 106.

35
36 One written comments received from the
37 Copper River/Prince William Sound
38 Advisory Committee to oppose the
39 proposal. This is a proposal this
40 committee has seen twice the last ten
41 years. Both instances proved
42 unsubstantial evidence to allow for a
43 Customary and Traditional use
44 determination for Residents of Prince
45 William Sound, and the Federal
46 Subsistence Board agreed both times by
47 voting against the proposal. The lack
48 of harvest in Unit 6(C) being the
49 greatest determining factor.
50

1 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Regional
4 Council deliberation, justification, recommendation. A
5 motion to put WP06-18 on the table is in order.

6

7 MR. CARPENTER: So moved.

8

9 MR. BLOSSOM: Second.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We have it on the
12 table. Discussion. Tom.

13

14 MR. CARPENTER: I'd just like to
15 comment. Being consistent with what we've done in the
16 other proposals, written public comments do not support
17 this, neither do the Department and the OSM Staff.
18 Unfortunately, this is somewhat of a situation that is
19 kind of uncomfortable at least for me. Everybody in
20 Prince William Sound is kind of a small, close-knit
21 family to a certain degree. But these moose in Unit
22 6(C) are highly utilized by residents of Cordova. You
23 can rarely find a population of animals that a
24 community of 2,500 only harvest 25 every year and we're
25 talking about 100 percent every year. I think changing
26 that routine or trying to incorporate more residents
27 into that is a difficult problem.

28

29 I hope that at least from some of the
30 actions that this Board has taken in the last couple
31 hours relieves some of the pressure and hopefully
32 enables people of Chenega Bay and Tatitlek to have more
33 opportunity to harvest moose and I think the Council's
34 actions have proven that we're trying to strive to meet
35 some of those demands.

36

37 I just think in my own opinion the
38 harvest record shows and I can only go by what the
39 Department of Fish and Game's statistics are over the
40 last 25 years. There's general moose harvest around
41 the state, but there's little or no harvest recorded in
42 Unit 6, especially Unit 6(C). So I would have to
43 oppose this proposal at this time.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other discussion.
46 Dean.

47

48 MR. WILSON: Would this proposal of the
49 potlatch or the C&T status dive into the existing Eyak
50 20? It wouldn't be an addition, correct? It would be

1 19 and 1.

2

3

4 MR. CARPENTER: Typically the Native
5 Village of Eyak has a potlatch moose that they're
6 allowed to take. When they were originally given the
7 potlatch moose, they had to renew through the Federal
8 Board, through the Council, every year. They have been
9 given permanent status to go out and take that for
10 their Sobriety Day celebration. But that moose was
11 taken out of the overall harvestable surplus. So if
12 the Department of Fish and Game that year decided that
13 there was a harvestable surplus of 27 bulls, then there
14 would actually only be 26 because the Native Village of
15 Eyak would be harvesting one of them. If we were to
16 give Chenega Bay that, then it would be reduced by one
17 again. We're talking about 2. some percent chance of
18 harvesting one of these moose. I think it would be
19 difficult.

19

20

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pete.

21

22

23 MR. KOMPKOFF: Mr. Chairman, Tom. The
24 residents of Cordova have vast areas. They have Units
25 6(C), 6(B) and 6(A) to get their moose and a lot of
26 them do. A lot of other residents go down the Bering
27 River and they take six or eight moose out of there, I
28 know that. Some go to 6(B) across the river and get
29 some from there. So it's not like we want to deprive
30 the residents of Cordova for one more moose and the
31 population has survived over the years. Beings how I
32 put the proposal in, I have to support it.

32

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Pete. Can
35 I ask you a question?

35

36

MR. KOMPKOFF: Certainly.

37

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do the residents of
40 Chenega have access to 6(A) and 6(B)? They're legally
41 allowed to hunt moose there, aren't they?

41

42

MR. KOMPKOFF: I believe so.

43

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. I was just
46 wondering. Doug.

46

47

48 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman. Tom, did
49 the Village of Eyak have a C&T finding? Did they hunt
50 moose in this area and all, so that's how they got
51 their C&T or were they similar to Chenega until they

1 got the potlatch?

2

3 MR. CARPENTER: No, the Native Village
4 of Eyak is located in Cordova. Eighty percent of the
5 people that are shareholders in either Eyak Corporation
6 or in the Native village, they live in Cordova, so they
7 automatically have a C&T. So basically the village
8 didn't really have a problem documenting the fact that
9 village people had harvested moose.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pete.

12

13 MR. KOMPKOFF: Mr. Chairman, Tom. Let
14 me ask you a question then. I'm a member of the Eyak
15 Corporation as well as Chenega Corporation. Does that
16 qualify me for C&T?

17

18 MR. CARPENTER: I'm not a technical
19 person. Maybe Helen can explain it better, but the way
20 I understand it is you have to reside -- your permanent
21 residence has to be in Unit 6(C), which is Cordova.
22 Cordova is the only townsite.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Good try, Pete. Pete,
25 I'll say the same thing I said to your brother, Don.
26 If you want to bring this forward, what you really need
27 to do is bring some written and public testimony. The
28 records don't show it. I have to go along with Tom on
29 that and we've gone through it twice and the Board's
30 gone through it. The records don't show it, so in
31 order to change things the only thing that would change
32 things would be written and public testimony. Both of
33 those were lacking in both of the tries we had.

34

35 MR. KOMPKOFF: Okay. I will do that.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Dean.

38

39 MR. WILSON: I think regardless of what
40 we decide here it's going to get shut down by the Board
41 anyhow because of the C&T aspect of things. I'll count
42 on a future survey of the Kings Bay area and hopefully
43 we can up their portion down the road so we can get
44 them an annual one, but for right now I'd oppose this
45 one.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.

48

49 MR. CARPENTER: Just one more
50 conversation adding to what Dean says. I'm actually

1 kind of hopeful in the future that -- if there was a
2 decent survey done every year, I'm actually hopeful
3 that the Kings Bay permit, when Chenega and Tatitlek
4 are issued this permit, I would hope that maybe we'll
5 find a viable population to where whoever the Federal
6 manager is, if there is a surplus of cows in the area
7 or if the bull/cow ratio is not what they want, they
8 could potentially issue different permits in the future
9 depending on the surveys.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any more discussion.
12 Greg.

13

14 MR. ENCELEWSKI: I just want to
15 mention, Pete, I sure understand your dilemma. The C&T
16 determination and the eight criteria are tough to meet
17 at times, although I think spiritually you have it, no
18 question. That said, I do know that whatever you can
19 document and the more people you bring to testify the
20 better off you'll be.

21

22 MR. CARPENTER: Question.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If there's no further
25 discussion, the question has been called on WP06-18.
26 All in favor signify by saying aye.

27

28 (One aye vote)

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
31 saying nay.

32

33 IN UNISON: Nay.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion fails.

36

37 MR. KOMPKOFF: Let the record show that
38 I voted yea.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With that, I
41 promised one person that he would be able to quickly
42 speak before we quit for the day. It's 25 after 5:00.
43 We're going to allow Darrel to speak to us and then
44 we're going to recess until 9:00 o'clock tomorrow
45 morning.

46

47 MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, Members of
48 the Board. Thank you for letting me have this time.
49 First of all, to get started, I'd like to thank
50 everybody for your time, your dedication that you guys

1 have put into this. I know it's been kind of a
2 frustrating process. Essentially what I have to do is
3 I would like to be able to put some things on record
4 that I've been directed to put on record and I'd like
5 just a few minutes to do that.

6
7 After talking with Ninilchik
8 Traditional Council about some of the events here,
9 trying to take care of this convoluted string of events
10 that we're dealing with, I was asked to comment on the
11 Administrative Procedure Act and the direction of
12 imposing actions at the RAC. What I've been informed
13 of and what I'm going to ask for the record is that
14 they probably shouldn't have had an executive session
15 today for whatever it was that needed to be addressed.
16 Part of that is that we sure would have liked to have
17 been privy to some of the information from that. I was
18 asked to address that.

19
20 I understand that part of the process
21 in addressing that kind of action may be that we should
22 be allowed to be able to supplement the record in this
23 kind of event. I was asked to put that on the record.

24
25 I have also a very interesting thing
26 that might kind of give you guys a little bit of hope
27 and I thought I'd read this to you, too. As far as
28 when Congress was putting the RAC's together, there's
29 some really interesting information that's coming out
30 of some litigation with the Sierra Club and when
31 Congress did this the purpose of the legislative action
32 was, and I can read it, the continuation of subsistence
33 uses of rural Alaska is threatened by rapid population
34 growth of Anchorage, Fairbanks and other urban centers
35 to result in pressure which urban residents engage in
36 subsistence and sport uses have placed on important
37 fish and wildlife populations.

38
39 That kind of wraps up a lot of problems
40 that you guys have been having to deal with and I
41 thought I might give this to Donald and maybe he can
42 distribute it to different folks.

43
44 In closing, I would just like to go
45 ahead and kind of reiterate that NTC is still working
46 on the 60-day motion for reconsideration on some of our
47 stuff and we appreciate all the work and time that
48 everybody has put into this.

49
50 Thank you very much.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Dean.

2

3 MR. WILSON: I didn't catch that. Who
4 was the author of that and the date?

5

6 MR. WILLIAMS: You know, I don't have
7 the date on this, but I made a copy and the reference
8 is at the bottom. It's the Safari Club International
9 versus Demientieff and it has a case number and whatnot
10 where they had some litigation on this. I'll leave you
11 a copy. It's an interesting article because it seems
12 like I've heard quite a few times where people are
13 trying to take care of C&T and rural determination
14 comes into it and it's getting hard for a lot of folks
15 because there's different pressures from different user
16 groups and things like that. I thought it might be
17 something good for everyone.

18

19 MR. WILSON: The only other thing I was
20 going to mention just kind of to Ralph is can you
21 direct a summary of executive session so there isn't
22 any conflict there? There's apparently some concern as
23 to why we went in. Or is that completely not going to
24 happen?

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Can I what now? Can I
27 summarize why we went into executive session?

28

29 MR. WILSON: Yes.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I was informed that we
32 were going to get legal counsel and it was for legal
33 counsel.

34

35 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you very much for
36 giving me the time, Mr. Chairman.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With that, this
39 meeting is recessed until 9:00 o'clock tomorrow
40 morning.

41

42 (Off record)

43

44 (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
)ss.
STATE OF ALASKA)

I, Joseph P. Kolasinski, Notary Public in and for the state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 125 through 227 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the SOUTHCENTRAL FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME II, taken electronically by Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC on the 15th day of March 2006, beginning at the hour of 9:00 o'clock a.m. in Anchorage, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by under my direction and reduced to print to the best of our knowledge and ability;

THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 30th day of March 2006.

Joseph P. Kolasinski
Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 03/12/08