



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

SOUTHCENTRAL ALASKA  
FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL  
ADVISORY COUNCIL

October 15, 1999

9:00 a.m.

Taken at:  
Hawthorne Suites  
1110 West 8th Avenue  
Anchorage, Alaska

Reported by:  
Sandra M. Mierop, CSR, RPR, CRR



1 REGION 2  
2 SOUTHCENTRAL ALASKA SUBSISTENCE  
3 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

4 SEAT 1:  
5 GILBERT DEMENTI, SR.  
6 P.O. Box 14  
7 Cantwell, Alaska 99729

8 SEAT 2:  
9 KENNETH VLASOFF  
10 Box 161  
11 Tatitlek, Alaska 99677

12 SEAT 3:  
13 FRED H. ELVSAAS  
14 P.O. Box 133  
15 Seldovia, Alaska 99663

16 SEAT 4:  
17 ROY S. EWAN  
18 213 East 5th Avenue  
19 Anchorage, Alaska 99501

20 SEAT 5:  
21 CLARE SWAN  
22 P.O. Box 2332  
23 Kenai, Alaska 99611

24 SEAT 6:  
25 FRED JOHN, JR.  
P.O. Box 6024  
Mentasta Lake, Alaska 99780

SEAT 7:  
RALPH LOHSE, CHAIRMAN  
P.O. Box 14  
Cordova, Alaska 99574

COORDINATOR:  
HELGA EAKON  
Office of Subsistence Management  
1011 East Tudor Road  
Anchorage, Alaska 99503



1                   OCTOBER 15, 1999.

2                   MR. LOHSE: I'd like to call this  
3 meeting of the Southcentral Alaska Subsistence  
4 Regional Advisory Council back to order. It's  
5 October 15th, about a quarter to 9:00 in the  
6 morning.

7                   We had a roll call, and a quorum was  
8 established. Right now, Roy Ewan is not here.

9                   We were in the middle of discussing  
10 some Federal Subsistence Fisheries Management  
11 issues, but we were going to put off the last one  
12 on the November training session until we went over  
13 the annual report.

14                   So, I'm going to turn to Helga for  
15 the annual report.

16                   MS. EAKON: Thank you, Mr. Chair,  
17 for the benefit of our two new members, each year  
18 this Regional Council does what is called and  
19 annual report. It is addressed to the Chair of the  
20 Federal Subsistence Board, and it focuses on issues  
21 that fall outside the scope of the regulatory  
22 framework.

23                   If you will, look under Tab I in  
24 your book. For the benefit of those in the  
25 audience, there are copies on the information table  
by the coat rack. You will find a letter dated  
August 13, 1999 addressed to Mr. Lohse as Chair and  
signed by Mitch Demientieff of the Federal  
Subsistence Board; and this is the formal response  
from the Board to the Regional Council's report of  
1998. Briefly, it addresses the decreasing use of  
all-terrain vehicles for these purposes; and this  
Regional Council put this issue on the back  
burner. They're going to take a wait-and-see  
attitude.

                  The second major issue for the '98  
annual report is the "Kenai Peninsula  
Rural/Nonrural Determinations." That is still on  
the table.

                  The third issue was "Customary and  
Traditional Use Determinations." That is not such  
a burning issue anymore because we can have Rachel  
Mason, the staff anthropologist. The backlog of  
the customary and traditional use proposals is no  
longer there.

                  The fourth issue is the Regional  
Council's request that there be adequate staff to  
handle the Federal Management of Subsistence  
Fisheries; and, of course, that will be on the  
table again.



1 Unless there are questions, this  
will handle the topic, Mr. Chair.

2 MR. LOHSE: Thank you, Helga. I  
3 think one of the things we can bring out is: Mitch  
4 Demientieff's response to concerns that we had, and  
5 that is that we had identified his concerns, the  
6 ATVs, the Kenai Peninsula rural/nonrural  
7 determinations, customary and traditional use, and  
8 the use of staff.

9 After we go over this next section  
10 on the agenda, we need to come up with an annual  
11 report for '99. We need to identify some concerns,  
12 find out if we have any concerns that we need to  
13 identify to send in our annual report for this  
14 year.

15 Okay. With that, thank you, Helga,  
16 again. If there are no questions or discussions,  
17 we'll go on.

18 What we were on was Issue 8,  
19 "November Training Session and Agenda Development"  
20 for the -- is the presenter here?

21 MS. EAKON: Sanford Rabinowitch, who  
22 is a staff committee member, will do the  
23 presentation here.

24 MR. LOHSE: Thank you, Sandy.

25 MR. RABINOWITCH: My name is Sandy  
Rabinowitch. I'm with the Park Services. I'm with  
the staff committee with the Federal Subsistence  
Board. I've also been a member with Ida  
Hildebrand, with the subcommittee that has worked  
on development and training.

In the information you had -- I  
handed out to you, there's a pink handout, looks  
like this. I'll hold it out so people can see it  
in the back. There's extra copies in the back of  
the room, and what this does -- I'll give you a  
moment -- I'll give you a moment to find it there.

What this handout does is something  
fairly simple; that's just to let you look at a  
draft agenda for a three-day training session. Let  
me stress -- excuse me -- let me stress that it's  
in draft form. It was put together by talking with  
all the Council chairs. Ida Hildebrand talked to  
ten Council chairs and gathered items for the  
agenda, and the four of us in the committees polled  
all of our agencies through various means and  
gathered additional ideas. I'd say about two  
thirds of them on the paper come from Council  
chairs and the others come from the agency people.  
We tried to meld them together.



1                   We've -- where you see the large  
2 blocks going across the whole pages, what that's  
3 telling you is that everybody who attends this,  
4 which we anticipate to be about 200 people, 100  
5 council people, all Council members from all ten  
6 councils, roughly 100; we anticipate about another  
7 100 agency people from all the Board agencies. So,  
8 the large blocks tell you that we envision  
9 everybody being together in the same room, general  
10 sessions. And where you see the smaller blocks on  
11 Day 1 and Day 3, those are breakout sessions where  
12 people go to sessions, basically, that they're  
13 interested in, topics of your choice.

14                   So, I won't take a lot of time. I  
15 know you have a lot of business to do; and you  
16 can -- you know, you can look through the structure  
17 of it and -- nor will I read to you all the agenda  
18 topics; but our interest is to see if these seem  
19 like the right topics to you. That would be the  
20 first item.

21                   The second item would be if you have  
22 any recommendations about presenters, Federal  
23 people, State people, Native organizations, or any  
24 other organizations, people who would be good  
25 presenters for these topics; and I would add that  
these aren't all intended to be just a single  
speaker. We envision some panel sessions, three --  
where there are three, four, five people leading  
the discussions, particularly the smaller ones. If  
you have any recommendations about the smaller  
ones, we'd be happy to get them. We'd like to  
involve as many prospectuses as we can. Lord  
knows, there are plenty of issues to look at and  
discuss.

18                   That's kind of really it in a  
19 nutshell. I'll strive for simplicity and briefness  
20 this morning.

21                   We're going to try to finalize the  
22 agenda in about two more weeks, and then we'll be  
23 trying to get that out in writing to all of you in  
24 the mail so you'll know what the agenda will be. I  
25 think we'll probably mail that out just after the  
Christmas holidays. We'll get it in after the mail  
rush in December; but we'll be trying to finalize  
everything in just a couple of weeks, get the  
presenters all lined up in the month of November.  
That's it in a nutshell. I can answer questions if  
you have any; and we're happy to take any  
suggestions you have, either here right now or  
anybody with any of the agencies. You can pass



1 them along and get them to us.

2 MR. LOHSE: Sandy, we can pass them  
3 to Helga, can't we?

4 MR. RABINOWITCH: You bet.

5 MR. LOHSE: Do any members of the  
6 Council -- you have a chance to look at this, see  
7 if you see anything missing on it or see anything  
8 you'd like included on it.

9 MR. VLASOFF: Is there any date on  
10 it?

11 MR. RABINOWITCH: Excellent  
12 question. I went past that a little too fast  
13 because I didn't mention it. We are getting very  
14 close to having the 25th, 26th, and 27th of January  
15 as the dates. It's not quite set, but it's getting  
16 close. We're still working on a meeting space and  
17 locking the location down with a contract is the  
18 key. And just last Friday, sort have taken a step  
19 closer but not knowing the dates yet. Thank you  
20 for asking that. I should have said that.

21 MR. LOHSE: If you don't have  
22 anything right now and if you see something that  
23 you feel needs included, I know they called all the  
24 Council chairs and had a couple of things; and I  
25 see one of them that's on there. If you see  
something that you feel needs to be included on  
there, we can call Helga; and she can relay that  
kind of information to Sandy. It probably would --  
more than likely it would be included or covered  
under one of the other topics, but it's possible  
that if there's some area that's been missed that  
one of you will recognize it; and that will get  
passed on to you. We also have Jerry Bird's phone  
number on the bottom of the third page here. I --  
the 800 number is the same as if you want to get  
Helga. Any way it works, just get them on in.

19 MR. LOHSE: This will be the  
20 complete Councils from all ten regions.

21 MR. RABINOWITCH: I believe it's the  
22 first time, Helga.

23 MS. EAKON: Yes, this will be the  
24 very first time that all ten meeting advisory  
25 Councils have convened.

26 MR. RABINOWITCH: So, we're looking  
27 forward to that. There's a big task ahead,  
28 obviously. It's our sense that trying to get  
29 everybody together is the best way to sort of  
30 start.

31 MR. LOHSE: No questions or  
32 discussions or comments?



1 MS. SWAN: Do you want to make a  
comment about your -- oh, that's the end -- the end  
2 of January is fine.

3 MR. LOHSE: The end of January is  
fine.

4 MS. SWAN: Not a problem.

5 MR. LOHSE: Thank you, Sandy.

6 MR. RABINOWITCH: Thank you.

7 MR. LOHSE: At this point in time,  
I'd like to reiterate if there's anybody in the  
8 audience that wants to comment, make testimony on  
anything, or just say something, fill the blue  
9 slips out in the back, fill one out; and if there's  
a certain place in the agenda that you feel that  
10 you'd rather speak, we're more than happy to let  
you speak then. Otherwise, we'll just open it to  
you, you know, at any time; because we like to have  
everybody feel that at least they can participate  
or at least give their viewpoints, whether it's  
agreed with or not.

11 At this point in time, we're going  
to go on to new business.

12 And the first thing we have is our  
annual report for 1999. And we need a preliminary  
13 identification of regional issues; in other words,  
what are some of the things that the Council sees  
14 as problems or issues that we would like the  
Federal Board to address?

15 I'll make the first comment on  
that. I would like to thank the Federal Board for  
16 moving ahead with the issue that sat on our table  
so often, which was the Kenai rural/nonrural, and  
17 just tell them that we will be keeping an eye on  
it.

18 Are there any other issues that you  
can think of?

19 We haven't heard much about the ATV  
problem. Have there been any more meetings? Have  
20 they done anything on it?

21 MR. DEMENTI: That's the only thing  
I know of, the last one they had.

22 MR. LOHSE: I don't know if it's  
that much of an issue this year; with the caribou  
being down, the seasons got shortened; and it  
23 didn't last very long.

24 MR. DEMENTI: There is still big  
outfits going in there.

25 MR. LOHSE: There is still big  
outfits going in there?

I haven't heard anything -- I didn't



1 hear -- didn't hear the complaints that I heard  
last year. That's a better way of putting it.

2 Anybody else think of any issues  
that we would like the Board to address or that we  
3 see as issues to be put on the table at this time?

4 MS. EAKON: We can keep this open,  
because after wint- -- at the winter 2000 meeting  
is when you formally approve it.

5 MR. LOHSE: So, if we come up with  
any issues between now and then or at that meeting,  
6 we can add them to it?

MS. EAKON: Yes.

7 MR. LOHSE: So, then, basically, one  
of the things we can do is, everybody -- well, you  
8 go back to your area, see what some of the concerns  
of the people in your area are. If there's any  
9 issues that we feel that they need to address or at  
least recognize.

10 With that, if there is no further  
discussion or comment, we will finish with Item A,  
11 which was the annual report; and we'll go on to the  
review of the Regional Council charter.

12 Helga?

13 MS. EAKON: Okay. If you will look  
under Tab J in your meeting notebook, you will find  
that the Federal Advisory Committee Act requires  
14 that chairman advisory committees is limited to two  
years; so, therefore, your Regional Council charter  
15 has to be renewed by December of even-numbered  
years; so, therefore, it is going to be reviewed in  
16 December of 2000.

Your Regional Council can recommend  
17 to the Board these items, a name change, a boundary  
change, the size of the Regional Council  
18 membership, specific subsistence resource  
commission appointments, and criteria for removing  
19 a member; and you do have a copy of the current  
charter in your book; and, I guess, if you have any  
20 changes that are within your authority, now is the  
time to suggest those.

21 MR. LOHSE: Do we need to renew or  
appoint any regional subsistence resource SRC?

22 MS. EAKON: Yes. However, we can do  
that under agency reports when the Park Service  
23 does their report, Mr. Chair.

MR. LOHSE: Thank you.

24 Does anybody see the need to change  
the name, the boundary, or the size of the Regional  
25 Council membership?

The only other thing we'll deal with



1 then, is the subsistence regional committee  
2 memberships. Like Helga said, we can deal with  
3 that when we get to the Park Service agency  
4 report. And the other thing that we have that we  
5 can change is the criteria for removing the  
6 members. And those are the only areas that we can  
7 change; otherwise, a motion to approve the charter  
8 as it stands is in order.

9 MS. SWAN: So move.

10 MR. LOHSE: It's been moved that we  
11 continue with the charter as it stands.

12 MR. DEMENTI: Second.

13 MR. LOHSE: Been seconded.

14 Is there any discussion?

15 MR. VLASOFF: On Item 7, the  
16 estimated costs, is that going to change now with  
17 the fisheries activity?

18 MR. LOHSE: It doesn't -- is that  
19 part of the charter, or is that -- that's an  
20 estimate?

21 MS. EAKON: That is just put in  
22 there because the Federal Advisory Committee Act  
23 requires cost figures.

24 MR. LOHSE: A number.

25 MS. EAKON: They require a number,  
so we always just estimate the sum of \$100,000 per  
year.

MR. LOHSE: But in view of the -- of  
the potential for increased activity, I was just  
wondering, is that based on prior years? I've  
never seen a prior year charter.

MS. EAKON: Yes. That is a correct  
estimate, thus far.

MR. LOHSE: The next question, then,  
is there -- if there's shortfalls, is there ways to  
amend the estimate?

MS. EAKON: No. It is not our  
concern. That's handled by our administrative  
officer who does the budgeting. So, it's not a  
worry of ours.

MR. VLASOFF: Okay.

MR. LOHSE: We can't change it. We  
can't double our output.

MR. JOHN: I've got a question. On  
a meeting -- when the fisheries take off, will the  
meetings be increased?

MS. EAKON: No, as Tom said  
yesterday, we will meet every fall and every winter  
as we always do. It's just that a year from now is  
when you will make recommendations on fish



1 proposals.

2 MR. LOHSE: It's possible our  
meetings will last longer.

3 MS. EAKON: It is possible --  
normally, your meetings are like two days; it's  
4 possible that we'll have to go even -- maybe four  
days, depending on how many proposals.

5 MR. JOHN: Okay.

6 MR. LOHSE: We went three days a  
number of times when we had a lot of C&Ts on the  
table.

7 MS. EAKON: It is possible that we  
might have to work a fourth day.

8 MR. LOHSE: Okay. We have the  
motion on the table. Do we have any other  
discussion on the motion?

9 If not, the question is in order.

10 MR. VLASOFF: Question?

11 MR. LOHSE: The question has been  
called. All in favor, signify by saying "aye."

12 SPEAKERS: Aye.

13 MR. LOHSE: All opposed signify by  
saying "nay."

14 Motion carries.

15 MR. LOHSE: We've approved our  
charter for two years.

16 Okay. At this point we go on to --  
I've -- National Parks Service and one of the items  
17 under it is "Subsistence Resource Commission  
Appointments."

18 MR. LOHSE: Morris?

19 MR. EWAN: MR. MORRIS: I'm having a  
hard time hearing you back there. Could you move  
the mikes closer to you so we can hear?

20 MR. LOHSE: We'll do that. Thank  
you.

21 Okay. National Parks Service  
Subsistence Resource Commission appointments.

22 At this point, I think we go to  
Denali National Park. This is Hollis Twitchell.

23 MR. TWITCHELL: Good morning, Chair,  
Council members. My name is Hollis Twitchell. I'm  
with Denali National Park. Last name is Twitchell,  
T-w-i-t-c-h-e-l-l.

24 Denali Subsistence Resource  
Commission has two Council members appointed by the  
Southcentral Regional Council. One of them is  
Vernon Karlson, which is -- his term of appointment  
25 continues through November of 2001; so he continues  
to serve. Vern Karlson is also a member of the



1 Denali Fish & Game Advisory Committee in the  
Cantwell area. Lifelong resident of the area.

2 The second appointee is Gilbert  
3 Dementi. Gilbert, of course, is on the Council  
4 here and has been serving on the Denali Subsistence  
5 Resource Commission since 1996. His term of  
6 appointment continues through November 4th of this  
7 fall, 1999. So, we would request some action in  
8 terms of that appointment.

9 In your book, under Tab L --  
10 MS. EAKON: Excuse me, Hollis.  
11 Actually, I put it under tab -- yeah, you're right,  
12 Tab L. I had intended to put Mrs. Collins' letter  
13 under Tab K, but I didn't; so you're right, sorry.

14 MR. TWITCHELL: I just wanted to  
15 refer you to a letter from the Denali Subsistence  
16 Resource Commission regarding Gilbert's willingness  
17 to -- his willingness again to serve on this  
18 Council, the Southcentral Regional Advisory  
19 Council.

20 In the letter, the Commission  
21 mentions that they appreciated Gilbert's role both  
22 on the Subsistence Resource Commission as well as  
23 on this Southcentral Regional Advisory Council,  
24 and, in particular, the coordination that occurs  
25 between the two by having a member serving on both  
the Council and on the Commission and the increased  
communication that that provides back and forth  
between the two advisory bodies.

Although this letter is speaking  
particularly towards Gilbert's willingness to serve  
again on the Council, it also reflects their  
appreciation for the service on the Denali  
Subsistence Resource Advisory Commission. I just  
wanted to bring that to your attention.

I did contact the Chair of the  
Denali Fish & Game Advisory Committee out of  
Cantwell and asked him if there were any other  
candidates that he thought we could think to name  
as an alternative person to consider; and at that  
time, he expressed the willingness on his behalf to  
serve if he was selected. That individual's name  
is Monty Carez. Monty Carez has -- grew up, spent  
his life in the Cantwell area as well. He  
currently is the Chair of the Denali Fish & Game  
Advisory Committee, and he explains that he's been  
serving on that committee on and off for 19 years.  
So he's been an active -- active in wildlife issues  
in that area for many years. So, if you are  
looking for another name of an individual who could



1 also serve, he was willing to put his name  
forward.

2 There wasn't anyone else that he  
3 could think of that I could bring forward to you as  
an alternative, another alternative name; so at  
4 that point, that's all I have in order to -- to  
offer.

5 I think there's one -- two issues  
6 that are important here; one of having the  
connection between Fish & Game Advisory Committee  
7 and the Subsistence Resource Commission. With them  
serving in that role on our Commission and also on  
8 the Fish & Game Advisory Committee, we have a good  
connection with those two. With Gilbert serving on  
9 the Council as well as the Commission, that  
provides good linkage between these two  
10 committees. From Kenai Park's perspective, there  
is good lines of communication between the three  
different advisory groups; so we feel very  
comfortable with that arrangement.

11 That's all I had to offer. If  
there's any questions, I'll answer those.

12 MR. LOHSE: I guess the only  
13 question that I have is: Gilbert, have you  
expressed a willingness to serve on this  
committee?

14 MR. DEMENTI: Yes.

15 MR. LOHSE: At this point in time,  
then, a motion is in order to either reaffirm  
16 Gilbert as our representative on the Denali  
Resource Commission, or to take the other name  
that's in --

17 MR. JOHN: I make a motion for  
Gilbert.

18 MR. LOHSE: Do I hear a second?

19 MS. SWAN: Second.

20 MR. LOHSE: We move the motion to  
reaffirm Gilbert. Any discussion?

21 Do you have anything you'd like to  
say?

22 MR. DEMENTI: Not right now.

23 MR. LOHSE: Hearing no discussion,  
the question's in order.

24 MR. JOHN: Question.

25 MR. LOHSE: Question's been called.  
All in favor of reappointing Gilbert to the Denali  
Park SRC, signify by saying "aye."

SPEAKERS: Aye.

MR. LOHSE: Opposed signify by  
saying "nay."



1 Carries unanimously.  
2 Okay. Hollis, is that all that we  
3 have from you at this point in time?  
4 MR. TWITCHELL: That's correct.  
5 MR. DEMENTI: Hollis, I'd like to  
6 thank the Commission for re-electing me. I'll try  
7 to do a good job for you.  
8 MR. TWITCHELL: Thank you. We  
9 appreciate your contributions very much.  
10 MR. LOHSE: At this point in time,  
11 then, we go to Item 2, which is the Wrangell-St.  
12 Elias SRC. Heather is going to be doing the  
13 presentation.  
14 MS. YATES: My name is Heather  
15 Yates, Y-a-t-e-s, Wrangell-St. Elias.. Our  
16 commission isn't as formal as Hollis's. I've  
17 spoken to Fred John, Jr. as our candidate. He  
18 currently -- at the last meeting we voted him to  
19 serve for the second term, I believe; and we would  
20 like to reappoint him to the Commission. I have no  
21 other names in the hat.  
22 MR. LOHSE: Are you willing to serve  
23 on it?  
24 MR. JOHN: Yeah.  
25 MR. LOHSE: Okay.  
26 Then a motion is in order to --  
27 hearing no other names, to reappoint Fred John, Jr.  
28 to Wrangell-St. Elias.  
29 MS. SWAN: So move --  
30 MR. VLASOFF: Move.  
31 MR. LOHSE: So moved by Ken. He  
32 beat you to it. Do you want to second?  
33 MS. SWAN: Second it.  
34 MR. LOHSE: Motion on the table to  
35 reappoint Fred John, Jr., to the St. Elias National  
36 Park SRC. Any discussion? If none, the question  
37 is in order.  
38 MR. DEMENTI: Question.  
39 MR. LOHSE: Question has been  
40 called.  
41 All in favor, signify by saying  
42 "aye."  
43 SPEAKERS: Aye.  
44 MR. LOHSE: All opposed signify by  
45 saying "nay."  
46 Motion carries unanimous. As  
47 somebody who deals with Wrangell-St. Elias National  
48 Park, I'd like to thank you for your service on the  
49 SRC.  
50 MR. JOHN: Thank you, Heather.



1 MR. LOHSE: Do you have any other  
information for us?

2 MS. YATES: I think we're on later.

3 MR. LOHSE: Okay. Thank you very  
much.

4 Okay. Now we go on to agency  
reports. I see that Helga has slipped a little  
stinger in here. It says, "Please, limit reports  
5 to resource information helpful to Regional Council  
and those who wish to submit proposals to change  
6 Federal subsistence regulations. Please, allow  
time for questions from the Regional Council and  
7 from the public."

8 Now, Helga, you know none of the  
agencies make long-winded reports.

9 MS. EAKON: No comment, Mr. Chair.

10 We'll start with the Bureau of Land  
Management, Brenda.

11 A SPEAKER: Can you ask them to  
speak into the microphone?

12 MR. LOHSE: The people up here?  
You'll have to -- you'll have to pretend you're a  
singer or something.

13 MS. BECKER: Good point. As y'all  
know, this is my last one. I get to step down. We  
have a biologist at Glennallen, Elijah Waters.  
14 He'll be taking over after this meeting, and at  
your next meeting he'll be giving the report. I'll  
15 be helping him out as much as I can. But he'll  
handle it from now on.

16 I think you guys have the handout of  
the report I submitted. This was written at the  
17 end of September. At that point, we had issued  
1306 caribou permits to residents of Unit 13 and  
18 the surrounding communities. We had done 948  
caribou permits to residents of 20(D). We had  
19 issued total 462 moose permits to residents of Unit  
13 and 297 moose permits to the residents of  
20 20(D).

21 The caribou numbers will keep  
changing because we issue caribou permits until the  
end of the season, which is March 31st.

22 We went to Delta for three days.  
Cindy Thompson was up there for two days by herself  
23 and was totally overwhelmed. We had 694 caribou  
permits and 294 moose permits in the three days  
24 that we were there, which is a lot. They're all  
handwritten, every one of them.

25 The moose permits for the residents  
of 20(D) had been -- this was the first year that



1 we had issued the moose permits to them. The  
2 caribou permits, this was the second year; and it's  
3 definitely more than what we had issued last year  
4 to the residents of 20(D), which is in the Delta  
5 area.

6 The season stayed the same. Moose  
7 was August 1st to September 20th. Caribou was  
8 August 10th to September 30th, and it will reopen  
9 the 21st of October and run through the end of  
10 March at this point unless something changes  
11 between now and then.

12 The only change that we had that  
13 affected any of the caribou hunting in that area  
14 was on September 8th. The State had closed Tier 2  
15 to the taking of cows. They had kept it open  
16 strictly for the taking of bull caribou.

17 That's pretty much all I've got.

18 MR. LOHSE: Brenda, a little  
19 clarification here on the caribou permits that were  
20 issued to Unit 20(D) residents, that was for  
21 hunting caribou in Unit 13, wasn't it?

22 MS. BECKER: 13(B). And the moose  
23 for the 20(D) residents was also in 13(B).

24 MR. LOHSE: Okay. I was just trying  
25 to see the change.

MS. BECKER: Not a whole lot at this  
14 point. But the success rates were -- it's  
15 dependent on how fast Fish & Wildlife Service gets  
16 the hunt reports, so it changes all the time. I  
17 usually can't give you an accurate hunt report  
18 until after the season is closed. Even then,  
19 whatever we start -- whenever we start issuing  
20 permits for the next season, we're still getting  
21 hunt reports for the last season.

22 MR. LOHSE: Right.

23 MS. BECKER: They send us a list of  
24 the ones that had mailed in their cards, and we  
25 check their list whenever they get their permits;  
and we make sure they fill out the hunt report for  
the previous season. We don't tell them that they  
can't have the permits. It's just kind of a  
standing rule. If you're on my list, you fill out  
the hunt report before you get the permits.

26 MR. LOHSE: You get the information,  
27 but you don't penalize the hunter?

28 MS. BECKER: Right, right.

29 MR. LOHSE: It would be pretty hard  
30 to tell what the success for this year is at this  
31 point in time.

32 MS. BECKER: The last time I talked



1 to Chuck Miller at Fish & Wildlife Service, he had  
2 made the statement that Unit 20(D) residents had  
3 taken 20 -- 20 moose, I think, out of the 13(B);  
4 but that was like off the top of his head. I was  
5 getting some other information from him.

6 MR. LOHSE: That's that area out by  
7 the Tatitlek River that they got C&T for, right?

8 MS. BECKER: It includes the Delta  
9 and the Spokana wildlife and Scenic River. There  
10 was more accessible, in the sourdough area, there's  
11 about 20 miles that's all road accessible starting  
12 at 151 on the Richardson Highway, and then at the  
13 upper end of Unit 13, approximately 206 miles to  
14 the end of Unit 13.

15 MR. LOHSE: It's just interesting to  
16 see how much of a change that would make in the  
17 total hunt, but we'll find that out next year.

18 MS. BECKER: Right.

19 I should have better information at  
20 least by your next meeting. I can have some better  
21 information as far as the success and stuff. It  
22 will be a little bit more accurate, at least as far  
23 as the permits that had been turned in to that  
24 point.

25 MR. LOHSE: Okay. Any other  
questions for Brenda?

MR. JOHN: Opening up the Delta,  
people can hunt in 13(D), double the hunting in our  
area?

MS. BECKER: Yes, sir, it has.  
Total last year, as far as the Unit 20(D)  
residents, we had only issued like 748 permits for  
the caribou in Unit 13(B) to the Delta residents.  
This year it's already over 950, and the numbers  
are still climbing.

MR. JOHN: Okay. I see you went to  
Delta and issued a permit. Did you go to other  
people in the Unit 13 area to issue permits --

MS. BECKER: We haven't for the last  
two years, but we haven't had the staff to do it.  
We did go to Delta last year for two days. This  
year we went for three. Last year there was only  
one person that went. This year whenever we went  
to Delta, there was one person that went for two  
days; and I went up for the third day because it's  
just -- I mean, you'll have 30 people sitting there  
waiting for permits at one point; and it's that way  
all day long.

MR. JOHN: My question is: Why does  
Delta have the special permit -- of people coming



1 in to get the permit in other areas and not the --  
2 like the northern area or other areas in our  
3 region?

4 MS. BECKER: I'm not real sure.  
5 That was our direction. We had at one point gone  
6 to Myers Lake, and we had gone to Paxon; and we had  
7 advertised that we would be in those areas. Like I  
8 say, for the last two years, we haven't had staff  
9 to be able to do that. There was one year that we  
10 worked with Gloria Stickwan for the Elders and had  
11 gone to the Elders' houses and issued permits.  
12 Staffing has been very short; but as far as going  
13 to Delta, we were told to go to Delta to issue the  
14 permits; and then we were there for just a certain  
15 length of time; and if residents up there don't get  
16 their permits, then they have to come to the  
17 office; but that was our direction through BLM.

18 MR. LOHSE: Brenda, I'm sitting here  
19 looking at the numbers; and basically last year you  
20 had a total of 2,220, counting Delta, in Unit 13;  
21 and this year up to this point in time you've got  
22 2,254.

23 MS. BECKER: Yes, sir.

24 MR. LOHSE: That's really only a 34  
25 increase, but you say you still have more people --  
there's still more people signing up today?

26 MS. BECKER: Yes, sir. We issue  
27 permits until the -- until March 31st, which is the  
28 last day of the season; and we actually do have  
29 people that come in on the last day to get their  
30 permits.

31 MR. LOHSE: Okay. So, this  
32 preliminary number at this point in time is already  
33 34 permits higher than last year?

34 MS. BECKER: Yes, yes. And I think  
35 since I did the report up, we've already issued  
36 more than that. So the number right now is even  
37 higher.

38 MR. LOHSE: Okay.

39 Any other questions for Brenda?  
40 Brenda, thank you for your work,  
41 your reports, and everything that we've had in the  
42 past.

43 MR. JOHN: It's her last time here.

44 MR. LOHSE: It's her last time  
45 here. Of course, unless somebody is sick and can't  
46 get here, you have to take their place.

47 MS. BECKER: Yeah, it's been a lot  
48 of fun. I've really enjoyed it. If I can help in  
49 any way, just let me know.



1 MR. LOHSE: Thank you.  
MS. BECKER: Thank you.  
2 MR. LOHSE: At this point in time we  
go to the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Services, Kenai  
3 Fish & Wildlife Refuge. Who is the presenter for  
that?  
4 MS. EAKON: Mr. Chair, Mark Chase,  
who normally does that, says there is nothing going  
5 on down there with the exception of the Kenai rural  
issue, therefore, had no report.  
6 MR. LOHSE: Had no report. So,  
there are no burning issues on the refuge itself?  
7 MS. EAKON: On the refuge itself  
according to Mark Chase.  
8 MR. LOHSE: Okay. At this point in  
time we'll go to the migratory bird update. We've  
9 got an extra supplement in your supplemental  
package on that. The presenter for that will be --  
10 MR. STEVENS: I'm Bob Stevens, and  
it looks like you have room for more papers.  
11 My name is Bob Stevens. That's  
S-t-e-v-e-n-s.  
12 I'm with the Migratory Bird  
Management Office. I was in the Western Interior  
13 office, and they asked me why I would be there when  
migratory birds does not come under Title VIII as a  
14 resource; but we have something to talk about. I  
think it's very important for your consideration,  
15 and -- excuse me. What I want to do is just talk  
very briefly about the upcoming establishment of  
16 management bodies or managing spring and summer  
subsistence harvest of migratory birds.  
17 Last -- last fall and through the  
winter, we were doing a few spot meetings around  
18 the state trying to get some idea of what kinds of  
issues were of concern to the subsistence hunters  
19 regarding regulating spring and summer hunting. At  
that time, we said that we would put together a  
20 draft document and then go out to the Regional  
Advisory Councils for some input, and that is what  
21 we're in the process of doing right now. Our time  
frame is this: The document that you have in front  
22 of you is the draft. It contains four possible  
models for establishing management bodies. One of  
23 those models involves you, and that's why we would  
like very much to have your input.  
24 If you could comment either as a  
group or if you would prefer to do so as  
25 individuals, that would be fine; but we would like  
to know how you feel at least about the model that



1 pertains to the Regional Advisory Council.

2 The comments are due to us by the  
3 end of October. The regional director, Steve  
4 Allen, will make a decision in November as to what  
5 model he will use in the management bodies. We  
6 hope to have management bodies in place early in  
7 the year 2000, and we hope to have the first set of  
8 regulations in place by the spring of 2001. That's  
9 the time frame that we're working under right now.

10 Just a very brief background, and in  
11 Tab L of your book, it does give a very brief  
12 background and also gives a very brief synopsis of  
13 the four models that we'll be looking at. And what  
14 I will do is very briefly go through the four  
15 models to compare them so you have some idea of  
16 where Model 2 stands in relation to the other  
17 three, since Model 2 is the one that affects you.  
18 You may have some questions regarding the treaty  
19 itself. The migratory treaty with Canada does  
20 provide for hunting in the spring and summer. If  
21 you have any questions on that, I will answer those  
22 or attempt to answer those for you.

23 What I will do is start with Model  
24 1, either in Tab L or if you'd like to go along  
25 with me in the red book, page 11 is the beginning  
of the description of the models.

1 The treaty -- before I get into  
2 Model 1, the treaty mandates that we establish  
3 management bodies for management; and it also  
4 mandates that those management bodies consist of  
5 three equal partners, being one-third Native,  
6 one-third Federal, one-third State. So, when you  
7 see how these management bodies are broken out as  
8 far as the makeup, that's the reason they're broken  
9 out the way they are.

10 Model 1 has one statewide management  
11 body. We are proposing, based on what we had heard  
12 last year, that we establish management agreements  
13 with regional partners to help establish that  
14 management body; and the regional partners are  
15 proposed to be the regional nonprofit  
16 associations. The one exception to that would be  
17 the North Slope Borough, which would be the  
18 Government entity up there. Again, these are  
19 proposals and would be subject to change as well.  
20 The Cook Inlet Tribal Council would be one of the  
21 partners involved. You can see Bristol Bay Native  
22 Association, Kodiak Area Native Association. We  
23 would enter into funding agreements with those  
24 partners under this model to help offset their cost



1 in managing this program. And what they would do  
2 is, probably, based on what we've heard from them,  
3 is set up Regional Migratory Bird Committees to  
4 address those issues. One member from each of  
5 those regional committees would then be appointed  
6 to the statewide management body. Recommendations  
7 made by the management bodies will go directly to  
8 the four flyway Councils in the Lower 48 states and  
9 to the Fish & Wildlife Regulations Committee in  
10 Washington, D.C.

11 The management body would send a  
12 representative as a regular representative to the  
13 Pacific Flyway Council since that is where the  
14 nesting birds primarily in Alaska, is the Pacific  
15 Flyway.

16 A couple of considerations for this  
17 model, one is that with the state body  
18 recommendations go with the Lower 48 states with  
19 one statewide voice. There's some real positive  
20 advantages of that. The other side of that coin is  
21 the management body representatives would need to  
22 be familiar with issues statewide. And so there  
23 would be a lot of area to cover and to be familiar  
24 with under that model.

25 The statewide management body would  
26 have one Native representative and up to three  
27 Federal and up to three State representatives on  
28 that body.

29 Model No. 2. Model No. 2 also had  
30 one statewide management body. The difference here  
31 is that instead of using the regional nonprofit  
32 associations as partners, we would use the Regional  
33 Advisory Councils. So that you would be,  
34 basically, the Regional Migratory Bird Committee in  
35 this particular situation. You would address the  
36 issues for this region, and then one member of this  
37 Council would be appointed to the statewide  
38 management body.

39 The way it probably would work is  
40 that when you have your regular meetings, you would  
41 be extended for another day or two days, whatever  
42 is required, to address migratory bird issues. At  
43 that point, it would require changing of hats;  
44 because the way that that management body would  
45 operate would be very different from the way that  
46 you operate as a Regional Advisory Council. And  
47 here are some points to consider: There is the  
48 very distinct possibility of a lot of confusion  
49 between the way that the migratory bird program  
50 would be managed and Title VIII. Since this is



1 what most people are accustomed to dealing with.  
2 The recommendations that you would make as a  
3 statewide body would not go to the Federal  
4 Subsistence Board; they would go, again, directly  
5 to the flyway Councils and to the Fish & Wildlife  
6 Regulations Committee in Washington, D.C. The  
7 regulations do not apply strictly to Federal lands;  
8 they apply everywhere, so there would not be  
9 Federal licensed priority here.

10 The fact that the statewide  
11 management body has Federal and State  
12 representatives on it -- it would be working on a  
13 consensus basis -- really changes the way you would  
14 do business; and whether or not the subsistence  
15 hunters in the field would understand the  
16 differences in these functions remains to be seen.

17 Some advantages of this is the fact  
18 that the Regional Advisory Councils are already in  
19 place; the structure is there; the people are  
20 knowledgeable on the resource issues, and so this  
21 would be the fastest way to getting programs  
22 established. It would be the easiest way, and it  
23 would be the least expensive way of getting a  
24 program started. That's the other side of that  
25 particular coin.

The question, of course, that keeps  
coming up with all of the issues that also you're  
dealing with is: Do you want to deal with one more  
issue, that being migratory birds? So we would  
really like to hear your comments on that today.

This particular statewide body would  
have 10 Native representatives on it rather than  
12, up to 2 Federal and up to 2 State  
representatives. And, again, there would be a  
regular representative attending the Pacific Flyway  
Council meetings from the statewide body.

Model No. 3. Model No. 3 is quite  
different in that it has seven management bodies;  
and the areas are identified somewhat according to  
the resources that are located in those areas and,  
also, with some reasonable grouping of cultural  
backgrounds for those areas as well. On page 19 --  
actually, in Tab L as well, but on page 19, you can  
see where those regions are located.

Again, we would be entering into  
funding agreements with the 12 regional partners.  
And on page 21 of the red book, you can see how  
those regional partners would be grouped according  
to management body. This is where this model  
becomes quite different than Model 1.



1                   And so the management body No. 1 at  
2 the top of page 21, Chugachmiut, Cook Inlet Tribal  
3 Council, Copper River Native Association, and the  
4 Southeast Native Subsistence Corporation would all  
5 be partners providing assistance to management body  
6 No. 1. You can see through the table how the rest  
7 of this was taken out. This particular model  
8 recommendations are the same in that they would go  
9 directly to the flyway Councils and to the Fish &  
Wildlife Regulations Committee. The difference  
here is that the recommendations would not be going  
forward with one statewide voice. They would be  
going forward with seven different voices. In  
order to consolidate the recommendations, they  
would go through the Fish & Wildlife Service  
migratory bird coordinator and the State of Alaska  
waterfowl supervisor for consolidation.

10                   Because there are seven management  
11 bodies, there would not be any specific  
12 representation on the flyway councils in the Lower  
13 48 states. It would be a matter of each management  
14 body would send a representative to whichever  
15 Council the issues seem to relate to the most. So  
16 it would be a case-by-case basis. The other thing  
17 about this proposal is it would be the most  
18 expensive to operate. As you can see, it would  
require a total of 48 Native representatives, and I  
haven't added up the Federal and State  
representatives there; but a lot of people would be  
required to make this particular model work.

19                   The advantage of this one, the  
20 people seem to like that it brings the  
21 decision-making process closer to the local  
22 regions; and this has a lot of appeal to some  
23 people.

24                   Model 4, and the final model. Model  
25 4 really becomes, in our minds, anyhow, the  
compromise between Models 1 and 2 and Model 3.  
This has three management bodies. These are very  
distinctly set up according to resource values.  
Again, recommendations would go forward in the same  
manner; except in this case there would be specific  
representatives to the flyway councils. The  
northern management body would send a  
representative to the Central Flyway Council. The  
western management body would send a representative  
to the Pacific Flyway Council; and the south body,  
which would entail this area here, would send a  
representative to whichever Council the issues  
addressed at that time. So, it would be a



1 case-by-case basis, with those specific  
2 representations.

3 Management partners, again, would be  
4 the 12 -- or the nonprofits and the North Slope  
5 Borough; funding agreements would be entered into  
6 the same as Models 1 and 3.

7 On page 25 of the red book, you can  
8 see how the partners would be grouped according to  
9 management body. And so, once again, management  
10 body 1, which is the southern one, would have the  
11 same partners as Model 3, Chugachmiut, Cook Inlet  
12 Tribal, Copper River, Southeast Native.

13 I think probably the best thing for  
14 me to do at this point is to just back off and let  
15 you ask any questions regarding these models.  
16 Again, we appreciate your time; and anything that  
17 you can do to provide comment or input regarding  
18 one or more of these, we would be grateful for  
19 that.

20 MR. LOHSE: Bob, could I start off?

21 The only problem I see with  
22 management Model 2 that makes use of the RAC  
23 action -- the Regional Advisory Councils, is this  
24 treaty calls for Native representation --

25 MR. STEVENS: That's correct.

MR. LOHSE: Your Regional Advisory  
1 Councils are rural. They're not necessarily  
2 Native; so, consequently, you would be -- I don't  
3 think you'd be in accordance with the treaty.

MR. STEVENS: This is a question  
1 that has come up, and I don't have a firm answer  
2 for you on that. The reason there was no  
3 questioning it right now is that when the treaty  
4 was -- the amendments were negotiated, the term  
5 indigenous inhabitants was used through part of the  
6 treaty. When it came to management body  
7 representation, the terminology used was Native.  
8 When it went to the Senate for ratification,  
9 Senator Murkowski said that he would approve this  
10 only if the term "indigenous inhabitants" was  
11 interpreted to determine nonracial. That does not  
12 produce the term "Native" when it comes to the  
13 representation of management on that. Whether or  
14 not you as a Regional Advisory Council would be  
15 able to appoint a non-Native to that Council, I  
16 can't honestly answer that. It may be the Native  
17 would need to be appointed. We're going to have to  
18 get an explicit opinion on that one.

MR. LOHSE: Yeah, but would even --  
1 to me, when I look at this, would even a non-Native



1 be able to enter into the discussion as part of the  
2 Regional Advisory Council? Because it basically  
3 calls for a -- it calls for a Federal, Native, and  
4 State association or working body.

5 MR. STEVENS: That is correct. That  
6 is for the management body itself. Remember that  
7 the Regional Advisory Councils would be serving as  
8 a Regional Migratory Bird Committee; that can be  
9 non-Native, Native. Non-Natives will be able to  
10 participate in the hunt. It's very important that  
11 we have that non-Native input on this process.  
12 It's on the statewide management body itself where  
13 that becomes an issue.

14 MR. LOHSE: Can I ask one more  
15 question?

16 You just threw a curve out that I  
17 didn't come up with when I read through the treaty,  
18 and you just said that basically non-Natives would  
19 be able to participate in the hunt.

20 MR. STEVENS: That's true.

21 MR. LOHSE: Under what kind of a --

22 MR. STEVENS: The fact that this is  
23 open to indigenous inhabitants, which is now  
24 defined as permanent residents of subsistence  
25 harvest areas. It is nonracial.

MR. LOHSE: Okay.

MS. SWAN: Mr. Chairman, then if a  
tribal person, a Native person, doesn't live in a  
rural area, no deduct? I mean, it cannot --

MR. STEVENS: No duck.

(Laughter.)

MR. STEVENS: No goose either.

What the treaty language states is  
this: And I thought maybe you'd want to ask this  
question. This is the first RAC that I've been to  
that is in what the treaty language refers to as an  
omitted area. The treaty language -- you're  
wondering why you're going to be on this if it's an  
omitted area. The treaty language says that  
generally areas north and west of the Alaska Range,  
lower Alaska Peninsula, the Aleutian Islands, and  
the Kodiak archipelago would be included.  
Generally, omitted from the treaty language would  
be Anchorage, Fairbanks, North Star Borough, Mat-Su  
Borough, the roaded -- roaded area of the Kenai  
Peninsula, the roaded area of the Kenai Peninsula  
and Southeast in its entirety. Now, where they  
come into play is that there is a process set up in  
the treaty language that allows for villages within  
the omitted areas, if they feel that they have a



1 long-term customary and traditional use of a  
2 resource -- and how they became aware of this is  
3 that Hoonah has an egg-gathering tradition out  
4 there -- then they can apply to be included in this  
5 process. So nobody is automatically excluded, but  
6 those geographic areas would generally be omitted;  
7 and they would be handled in a different way. And  
8 it would be the management body that would make  
9 that decision.

10 MR. LOHSE: So, we're back,  
11 basically, to establishing customary and  
12 traditional the same as we had to for -- for what  
13 we've done here?

14 MR. STEVENS: We are very hopeful it  
15 will not be as complicated or as detailed as that.  
16 Again, the management bodies will have an active  
17 role in making that determination. That is another  
18 reason why how these management bodies get  
19 established is very important to you and to the  
20 subsistence hunter, because these are the people  
21 who will be making these determinations.

22 MR. JOHN: Could you give me a  
23 definition of indigenous people of Alaska again?

24 MR. STEVENS: The definition? The  
25 way it's defined is permanent residents of a  
26 subsistence harvest area.

27 MR. JOHN: So, non-Natives are  
28 indigenous to it in this treaty?

29 MR. STEVENS: That is correct. This  
30 is nonracial.

31 MR. LOHSE: But that's just for  
32 purposes of this treaty?

33 MR. STEVENS: For the purposes of  
34 the ability to take spring and summer birds, yes.  
35 Yes. This is another difference with Title VIII;  
36 there are some very significant differences, so  
37 Model 2 becomes an interesting model to you. The  
38 reason Model 2 is in here, we did not originally  
39 include the Regional Advisory Councils in this. As  
40 we were going around to meetings, that came up; why  
41 don't you use the structure that is already in  
42 place? It becomes a valid alternative.

43 MS. SWAN: It would seem that is the  
44 simplest way to do it since we're already  
45 established; and, as you put it, we're experienced  
46 and cheap --

47 MR. STEVENS: Cheap, yeah.

48 MS. SWAN: But, it just reminds me  
49 that somebody said that -- that a camel is really a  
50 horse; but it was put together by a committee. So,



1 you know, the simpler, the less people involved. I  
2 don't know; this is a little overwhelming.

3 MR. STEVENS: If I may,  
4 Mr. Chairman, just to share a couple of comments  
5 that also we've got in both last year and so far at  
6 the RAC meetings this year. One of the concerns  
7 that has surfaced a lot is the fact that the RACs  
8 are overloaded, and there are so many things going  
9 on that they just don't think they can handle any  
10 more.

11 The other side of the coin that  
12 keeps surfacing at all the meetings is, well, if  
13 you go up and set up separate management bodies,  
14 it's going to be the same people. So, whether you  
15 do it through the RAC structure or do it through  
16 separate management bodies, we always end up with  
17 the same people on the health boards and the  
18 education boards and the resource boards and the  
19 migratory bird boards; so that's the other point to  
20 be considered here. It's just a matter of whether  
21 or not you want to, as a body, directly deal with  
22 this. And we have no preferences on this. There  
23 is no preferred alternative here.

24 MR. DEMENTI: Mr. Chair, I think the  
25 Southcentral Conference -- I mean, the Southcentral  
26 Advisory Committee will be overloaded the way it is  
27 with the fisheries and Fish & Wildlife; and I don't  
28 know if we'll be able to tackle this. That is my  
29 opinion.

30 MR. STEVENS: That's important to  
31 know. You can certainly do one of several things;  
32 you can either just say, "No, we are not interested  
33 in Model 2"; or you can go ahead and vote on what  
34 model you do prefer. What we would like to have  
35 from you both a decision and why you choose what  
36 you choose; the why is going to be very important  
37 in making this decision, such as you just stated.

38 MR. DEMENTI: The, "why you said it,  
39 would be a longer meeting; and I think with  
40 fisheries added to our Fish & Wildlife -- I mean,  
41 you know, game -- I think it will be longer; and  
42 with the migratory treaty, it will be even longer.

43 MR. LOHSE: I'm in concurrence with  
44 Gilbert that we don't even have any idea yet how  
45 much fisheries is going to add to our work load.  
46 We've even discussed the fact that we may end up  
47 have to make another council possibly in the future  
48 to handle fisheries; and this migratory bird one  
49 could be just as big or bigger than any of them.

50 The other thing is -- again, I guess



1 I have that -- I have difficulty because I was  
2 under the impression that this was set up as a  
3 joint -- you know, Native, State, and Federal; and  
4 I don't like to see it mixed with the Regional  
5 Advisory Councils, which are rural and not  
6 necessarily Native. And from that standpoint, I  
7 would -- myself, I would feel very uncomfortable  
8 serving on this one here; because this is not --  
9 you know, spring hunting of birds is not part of my  
10 tradition or part of anything that I've done; and I  
11 would be afraid I would take my biases into the  
12 meeting. So, from that standpoint, I would prefer  
13 not to see the model has the Regional Advisory  
14 Councils involved.

15 You're right. In a lot of the areas  
16 you're going to have the same people serving on  
17 that as you are on the Regional Advisory Councils.  
18 I'm not so sure that's going to be true in  
19 Southcentral because we have a larger body -- a  
20 larger body to pool from. We have good, strong  
21 Native associations that you can go to for  
22 representation; and, you know, from that  
23 standpoint, my personal preference would be not to  
24 have Model 2; but that's strictly my own.

25 Any other comments?  
Fred?

MR. ELVSAAS: Well, I have to lean  
to not get involved. We're just starting a new  
venture, if you want to know, in fisheries; and it  
seems when you look at the Southcentral area, the  
migratory birds are basically north and west of  
us. So, maybe the Councils there may have a far  
greater interest than the Southcentral Council; but  
there was a question come up about the indigenous  
people, and you said a permanent resident. How  
does somebody get to be a permanent resident? I've  
seen a lot of permanent residents through my life  
where they come in for a week or two, and they're  
permanent residents; and after four, five years, or  
ten years they're discouraged; and they go back  
south. What makes a permanent resident?

MR. STEVENS: That has not been  
defined yet; and, again, we would rely on the  
management bodies to do that. I would say that we  
would probably be looking at some of the things the  
State looks at in defining permanent resident; that  
would be voter's registration, driver's license,  
permanent address. We're not looking for somebody  
that comes in for the summer and back out again.  
These are people that are living in those



1 communities.

2 MR. ELVSAAS: That -- you know, too  
3 often we see these permanent residents; and they  
4 leave when the snow falls; and, anyway, thank you.  
5 But that's my preference, Mr. Chairman.

6 MR. STEVENS: Thank you.

7 MR. LOHSE: Any other questions for  
8 Bob? Any other comments? Does anybody have, out  
9 of these -- we haven't had time to look at this,  
10 really, Bob; so what we could do is I could ask the  
11 rest of the Council to look through this book and  
12 get ahold of you and let you know what their  
13 personal preference is; or if it's the wish of the  
14 Council, we would quickly glance through these and  
15 pick what we would think would be our preference at  
16 this point in time. Does anybody on the Council --  
17 I see one hand being raised out there. I'll get to  
18 you in just a second, Carol. Does anybody on the  
19 Council at this point in time have any strong  
20 feelings towards one or the other of these  
21 management -- I won't say schemes, management  
22 bodies presented to us?

23 MR. VLASOFF: No. 4 looks good to  
24 me.

25 MR. LOHSE: No. 4? That looked like  
the one -- that would have been the one that I  
would have picked too. Fred, do you have anything  
to say?

MR. JOHN: No, I don't know much  
about it.

MR. LOHSE: I'm going to let Carol  
speak for a second, then what we're going to do,  
I'll just ask the Council to -- either through  
Helga or directly to you, let you know what the  
individual Council members' feelings are. At the  
same time, I'd like to say, now, the public out  
there has heard the same thing that we've heard;  
and this -- when did you say the comment period and  
decision is going to be made, Bob?

MR. STEVENS: The comment period  
ends October 29th, and the decision will be made in  
November.

MR. LOHSE: So, if any of you in the  
audience have any strong feelings or comments that  
you wish to make about it, you have until October  
29th to get those comments in. And since it  
directly affects individuals and groups that are  
represented out in the audience, I'd suggest that  
you do that.

I'd like one more clarification.



1 The Southcentral is left out as an area, but it's  
2 not left out as communities. Each community will  
3 have to present their -- present their -- for lack  
4 of a better way of putting it -- input as customary  
5 and traditionally. They would have to present it  
6 to the bodies.

7 MR. STEVENS: That would be for  
8 specific activities and specific treaties. Again,  
9 what caused that was the Hoonah gathering in the  
10 Southeast, gull eggs.

11 MR. LOHSE: If they're included,  
12 they're not included for all duck and goose hunting  
13 and everything else; they're included to continue  
14 the activity that they've done in the past?

15 MR. STEVENS: That is correct. The  
16 reason that those areas were identified, as you  
17 were saying earlier, was to fulfill one of the  
18 purposes of the treaty which was to not allow an  
19 increase in the subsistence harvest or to increase  
20 the geographic areas in which the subsistence  
21 harvest occurs; and areas south and east of the  
22 Alaska range tend to have birds in the fall where  
23 there is a fall hunt already available.

24 MR. LOHSE: Thank you. Carol, do  
25 you wish to speak while he's up here? Did you want  
26 to ask him something?

27 MS. DANIEL: That's fine.

28 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is  
29 Carol Daniel; and I represent the Native Migratory  
30 Bird Working Group, as well as the Rural Alaska  
31 Community Action Program which provides staff and  
32 technical support to the Migratory Bird Working  
33 Group. That group has worked hand in hand with  
34 U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service throughout the process  
35 in working toward achieving amendments to the  
36 migratory bird treaties with Canada and Mexico.  
37 And we participated with Fish & Wildlife Service in  
38 conducting a number of hearings last fall and  
39 spring around the state and getting comments that  
40 led to Fish & Wildlife Service putting forward this  
41 red document that sets forth four options.

42 What has not happened in this  
43 process is the equal partnership between the  
44 Native, Federal, and State representation in  
45 determining which management bodies to put forward  
46 or which examples or options to put forward; and  
47 once this document has -- was released to the  
48 public, the Native Migratory Bird Working Group has  
49 met on a number of occasions over the last couple  
50 of months discussing various options; and they are



1 prepared to put forward comments which support a  
2 model that is a variation of the four models that  
3 are presented in that document; and in their last  
4 meeting, which occurred earlier this week, they  
5 directed me to come to this body and present,  
6 basically, their option for the Migratory Bird  
7 Working Body; and that's what I would like to have  
8 permission to do at this time.

9 I notice there's a couple of members  
10 of the Migratory Bird Working Group in the  
11 audience. That group, I might add, was composed --  
12 was put together in the early 1990s when the  
13 efforts to amend the two treaties came about and is  
14 made up of members from the various geographic  
15 regions around the state that have an interest in  
16 migratory bird activities. And I know Gloria  
17 Stickwan is here, and I earlier saw Patty  
18 Swollenburg; and there may be others, and there are  
19 individuals that are very actively involved in  
20 management in their regions and are certainly here  
21 and available to answer questions that you might  
22 have about what their option -- what their ideas on  
23 migratory bird management bodies is.

24 MR. LOHSE: With the consent of the  
25 rest of the board, we'd like to hear your option;  
and that way they hear it too.

MR. STEVENS: Gloria, do you want to  
come up?

MS. DANIEL: Thank you, Mr.  
Chairman. Basically the Native Migratory Bird  
Working Group, through a series of meetings and  
review of the various options, has decided that we  
need a variation in the models that have been  
presented. First of all, none of the models -- I  
guess in our early discussions the group favored  
Model 1, which would allow for a management body  
for each of the geographic regions and then one  
statewide management body; but that model puts all  
of the management control, basically, in the  
statewide management body; and the Native Migratory  
Bird Working Group believes that the management  
responsibility and the on-the-ground management  
responsibilities and funding priorities should be  
at the regional level, local -- closer to home.

So, what they've proposed is -- and  
they also recognize that creating 12 regional  
management bodies may be difficult in terms of  
funding. So, what they have -- are prepared to  
propose to Fish & Wildlife Services is the creation  
of seven regional management bodies along the lines



1 of Model 3; and the geographic boundaries would be  
2 set up just as they are in Model 3, but they also  
3 propose to have the statewide management body that  
4 would coordinate and oversee -- coordinate the  
5 information from the seven regional management  
6 bodies and act as a clearinghouse for conflicts  
7 between regions, although any regional  
8 recommendation that affects only one region, that  
9 regional management body would have the last word  
10 on a proposal out of that region; and it would only  
11 be in situations where there were conflicts between  
12 regions that the regions would have to get together  
13 and coordinate a unified position.

14 The main point that the Migratory  
15 Bird Working Group will be presenting to Fish &  
16 Wildlife Service is that the treaty amendments  
17 contemplated that these management bodies be put  
18 into place through a cooperative effort between the  
19 three management partners. So, we think the way  
20 the management body should ultimately be decided is  
21 for the three groups to get together after the  
22 public comment period and sit down together and  
23 make a decision based on the public comments and  
24 having a back-and-forth conversation about the  
25 realities of funding and work out the finer details  
as management partners and that it not be made  
independent of the input of the Native Migratory  
Bird Working Group.

16 The -- I guess the other point is,  
17 again, I'd like to emphasize that the primary  
18 decision-making authority would be vested in the  
19 regional partners; and it would be their  
20 responsibility to involve the tribal Councils in  
21 their regions, and we feel that they're in a better  
22 position to do that than a statewide body and that  
23 there would be more regional and local input with  
24 seven management bodies as opposed to three  
25 management bodies.

20 The funding -- sufficient funding is  
21 critical for the Native participation, which is  
22 supposed to be equal. In order for it to be equal,  
23 the Native partners need sufficient funding to hire  
24 their own technical people and to be able to come  
25 to the table as an equal participant. And so we  
are advocating in our comments that Fish & Wildlife  
Service take that into consideration and that the  
funding priority be given to the regional  
management bodies so they can hire and train their  
own technical personnel and be able to send a  
representative to participate, as necessary, to the



1 flyway councils and to the regulations committee on  
2 issues that are related to their region.

3 And, finally, just to speak briefly  
4 on the one proposed option which you've discussed  
5 pretty thoroughly, is to use the Regional Advisory  
6 Councils as the regional partners in this  
7 co-management plan for migratory birds, the  
8 Migratory Bird Working Group rejected that idea and  
9 will be opposing that option for many of the  
10 reasons that you have brought forward this  
11 morning. We -- we think that your table is going  
12 to be too full to take on migratory birds as an  
13 additional issue and that there are people in the  
14 community or in these regions that have worked on  
15 this issue -- like the waterfowl -- what is it  
16 called; I've forgotten -- the waterfowl committee  
17 in the Delta Region has been working on this issue  
18 for years; and there are similar groups that have  
19 been working on it in the North Slope, in the  
20 Ninilchik and Bristol Bay areas. There are people  
21 out there that have been working on these issues  
22 that are familiar with the issues; and to add that  
23 burden to the Regional Councils at this time, we  
24 don't think is a wise idea.

25 And there's also the possibility, a  
very real possibility of confusion between what the  
treaties call for in terms of preventing hunting of  
birds being confused with the rural priority under  
Title VIII of ANILCA.

That concludes my comments.

Gloria, do you have anything to  
add?

MS. STICKWAN: We all approved of  
this and worked on it and recommend it.

MR. LOHSE: Any questions from the  
Council members?

It's interesting that your  
disagreements with management plan No. 2 are the  
same as ours. And it seems logical that the people  
who have been working on it would be also the  
people who would be most interested in serving on  
it.

MS. DANIEL: Yes, Mr. Chairman,  
Gloria just pointed out to me that I failed to  
mention that our recommendation to -- to Fish &  
Wildlife Service to choose this option is that the  
initial statewide management body be composed of  
the members of the Native Migratory Working Group  
who actually helped in getting the treaty  
amendments; and once the regional bodies are



1 established, those members would appoint people to  
2 replace the people who are now serving. The  
3 statewide management body would start immediately  
4 with people who have already been involved with  
5 this issue and are very interested in seeing that  
6 the treaty amendments are implemented in a way that  
7 serves the purpose that the amendments were  
8 intended.

9 Thank you very much.

10 MR. LOHSE: Thank you.

11 Any comments?

12 Thank you.

13 At this point in time, like I said,  
14 we don't have to make a decision on this; but as  
15 individuals and as members of the Council, I would  
16 have -- we would have until October 29th to let our  
17 views be made known; and we could let them be made  
18 known to you, Helga?

19 MS. EAKON: Mr. Chairman, I will be  
20 out of state until October 29th; and Rachel Mason  
21 has consented to be your contact, and she has the  
22 same toll-free number -- you already know it; it's  
23 on our letterhead.

24 MR. LOHSE: Same one as yours?

25 MS. EAKON: Same one as me.

MR. LOHSE: We can contact Rachel  
and let her know our feelings on it.

Yeah, I think a break would be nice  
at this point in time, so we will take a break.  
The next thing on our agenda is USDA Forest  
Service, and Steve has said that he has nothing in  
particular. His report is in the book. So, we  
will probably go on in the National Parks Service  
when we come back. Ten minutes.

(Recess.)

MR. LOHSE: Bob, can you hang on  
just a second? We have a question from one of the  
Council members for you.

Clare?

MS. SWAN: I'm just wondering if --  
with the model -- with the RACs in it, is that  
designed to use -- so that there will be more  
money? Does that mean -- are you low on funds for  
this project, for the migratory bird?

MR. STEVENS: Bob Stevens, U.S.  
Fish & Wildlife Service. The only reason I was  
mentioning most expensive, least expensive is  
because in that book, we did lay out a table just  
comparing different aspects of the model. We're  
always low on funds as far as that goes. One



1 thing, with the money we currently have in the next  
2 fiscal year, if we were to fund 12 regional  
3 partners, as we proposed in those models, it would  
4 only be partial funding. With the Migratory Bird  
5 Working Group is working toward getting more  
6 funding for those activities, so the funding is  
7 short.

8 The other thing that we're not at  
9 all sure of is how the State of Alaska is going to  
10 comment on this or participate, because they  
11 received no funding for their involvement as well.  
12 So, there are a lot of questions to be answered yet  
13 as far as how much funding it's going to take to  
14 adequately do this.

15 Model 2 is in there because, as we  
16 went around to the meetings last year, the Native  
17 Migratory Bird Working Groups, State of Alaska  
18 Fish & Wildlife Service was asking, everybody was  
19 asking, "Why don't you use the structure that's in  
20 place?" The other thing you heard at the meeting  
21 was "Whatever you do, keep it simple." That's hard  
22 to do. That's one of the reasons that's in it. We  
23 need to know whether or not the RACs are actually  
24 wanting to take that responsibility.

25 MS. SWAN: Well, I just don't see  
how this Council can do that for time and  
everything. Saying that you're short of money  
doesn't necessarily -- everybody's always short of  
money, but is there funding for that, and I guess  
that's not so. I mean, there's enough money --

MR. STEVENS: It's going to be the  
same amount of money regardless of which model is  
selected.

Carol made a good suggestion. You  
are not limited to commenting on just those four  
models. If you are limiting, you're certainly  
welcome to get that as well.

MS. SWAN: Thanks.

MR. STEVENS: Thank you.

MR. LOHSE: With that, I think I  
forgot -- I forgot to call this meeting back into  
order after our recess, but we're back in order, I  
think.

Like I said, the next item on the  
agenda is the USDA Forest Service by Steve; and  
Steve asked me yesterday -- he said he didn't have  
much to give us except for the report that's right  
here in our booklet, right following the migratory  
bird. It mostly applies to residents of the  
Chugach Forest District, which would be Clare,



1 myself.

2 If anybody has any comments on it or  
3 questions on it, you can take a look at this report  
4 and get back -- I think his phone number is -- I  
5 don't see his phone number right here. I thought  
6 his phone number would have been right on it. His  
7 phone number is not there.

8 But it would be US Department of  
9 Forest Services. It's basically issues that are  
10 taking place in the Chugach Forest, tree cutting  
11 and those -- building of camp sites and things like  
12 that. As to how you feel that they'll affect  
13 subsistence uses in your area, you can comment on  
14 that.

15 With that, we're going on to the  
16 National Parks Services, Wrangell-St. Elias.  
17 Heather is going to --

18 Devi and Heather both, okay?

19 MS. SHARP: Devi Sharp, chief of  
20 resources, Wrangell-St. Elias.

21 I'd like to -- move -- I'd like to  
22 update you on the Mentasta caribou. The herd  
23 continues to decline. In contrast to other  
24 declining caribou herds, we've not seen a decline  
25 in the bull/cow ratio; and the pregnancy rates  
26 remain high, and the calf weights are also normal.  
27 Calf survival is poor due to predation. We began a  
28 radio telemetry study of the bulls to investigate  
29 their movements throughout the year. We have  
30 suspected for a while that the Mentasta bull mingle  
31 with the Nelchina herd and our preliminary data  
32 supports that.

33 Questions?

34 MR. LOHSE: Two. Now, when you say  
35 they mingle with the Nelchina herd, is that on the  
36 summer range; or do they mingle with them on the  
37 winter range?

38 MS. SHARP: Winter.

39 MR. LOHSE: On the winter range.  
40 And the fact that the calf weight is normal  
41 basically indicates that the range is in okay  
42 shape; so the problem, probably, is aging cows and  
43 predators?

44 MS. SHARP: That's exactly correct.

45 MR. LOHSE: Any questions for her on  
46 the Mentasta caribou herd -- how far below the  
47 threshold level are we right now?

48 MS. SHARP: I don't have the answer  
49 to that up here, but I do at my seat.

50 MR. LOHSE: What's --



1 MS. SHARP: We are below.  
MR. LOHSE: What's our level right  
2 now on the Mentasta herd? Do you have that --  
MS. YATES: Do you want me to get  
3 it?  
MS. SHARP: Yeah.  
4 MR. LOHSE: I didn't mean to put you  
on the spot.  
5 MS. SHARP: I should have known  
you'd ask a hard question.  
6 In the meantime, as we reported  
before, Rachel, Heather Yates, Hunter Sharp, and I  
7 went to Cordova in mid-September; we took the  
applications. We received -- Heather and I  
8 received seven applications for 13.44 permits. We  
are reviewing and processing them now and look  
9 forward to receiving some more.  
MR. LOHSE: So seven applications,  
10 that's a lot less than a hundred.  
MS. SHARP: People, as they started  
11 to realize what the parameters were, they would  
voluntarily drop out. Clearly not all seven are  
12 going to make.  
MR. LOHSE: The numbers are going to  
13 be very low.  
MS. SHARP: The numbers are going to  
14 be very low.  
MR. LOHSE: Any questions for her on  
15 that issue?  
MS. SHARP: I'll look up the caribou  
16 stuff while Heather gives her report. The last  
issue, as you know Jon Jarvis, our previous  
17 superintendent, has transferred from superintendent  
position in Wrangell-St. Elias to superintendent at  
18 Mt. Ranier; and our new superintendent, Gary  
Cundelaria, will start in the Wrangells in  
19 December. Gary spent ten years as the chief ranger  
at Sitka National Historic Park. He's got a very  
20 strong history, a strong interest in subsistence  
issues; and he appears to have a great sense of  
21 humor, and I look forward to getting into the  
complex issues of subsistence.  
22 MS. YATES: Heather Yates,  
subsistence coordinator for the park. Just to give  
23 you an idea, we had 14 goat permits that we issued  
for Unit 11; and last year, I believe, we issued  
24 about 5; so people are aware of them, and they're  
coming in; but we're still significantly lower than  
25 the 45 that can be taken from that area. And  
the -- that closes in the end of December, and we



1 also issue permits for the 60-year-old and over  
2 sheep permit, sheep hunt; and we've only had two  
3 people come in. So far I haven't gotten any hunt  
4 reports back from either of those hunts, so I'm not  
5 sure if anything has been taken.

6 Currently, our -- we worked on the  
7 Healy Lake environmental assessment; and this is a  
8 proposal to add Healy Lake to the resident zone for  
9 Wrangell-St. Elias. Today is the first day for the  
10 public period, which is a three-day period and ends  
11 November 15th. The proposal alternative adds Healy  
12 Lake to the resident zone. The community works  
13 with the superintendent for two years to define a  
14 boundary around the community; and alternatively  
15 after two years, the U.S. Census designated-place  
16 boundary will become a community boundary if they  
17 have not designated their own. But they've  
18 expressed that they are willing to designate their  
19 own boundary; and that will, indeed, happen. So,  
20 I'm going to hand out a copy of this for each of  
21 you to look at, and the name and address is on here  
22 for any comments.

23 MR. LOHSE: Does anybody -- you have  
24 something else after Heather?

25 We'll wait for questions after  
you're all done.

Devi?

MS. SHARP: In the meantime, the  
Mentasta Caribou Plan calls for, as one of the  
elements, 80 calves, survival of 80 calves into the  
winter; and we counted 25. And then there's other  
components of cow/calf ratio which get a little  
more complicated.

MR. LOHSE: So, we're a long way  
below calf survival?

MS. SHARP: That's correct. And  
with the number of calves that are of reproductive  
age going down, and the fact that there haven't  
been new calves -- enough new calves added to the  
population-bearing generation, it's probably not  
going to turn the corner backwards.

MR. LOHSE: The question I have: I  
wasn't the impression that bull/cow ratio was part  
of that plan too.

MS. SHARP: It is.

MR. LOHSE: There's not a threshold  
at which bull/cow ratio overrides that  
consideration, since it's a bull hunt anyway?

MS. SHARP: It is a bull hunt  
only -- actually it's not -- it's sort of a flow



1 chart. It would take a while to explain it, and  
2 bull/cow ratio is part of it; but then something  
else has to kick in to add to it.

3 MR. LOHSE: Just the bull/cow ratio  
will not trigger a hunt?

MS. SHARP: That's correct.

4 MR. LOHSE: Okay. Thank you.

5 MS. YATES: Any questions concerning  
the Healy Lake assessment?

6 It's basically the same as the Upper  
Tanana EA that was completed. Northway, Dot Lake,  
this will extend the area up to Healy Lake.

7 MR. LOHSE: We will be dealing with  
this, if I remember right, in our winter meeting?  
8 Or is this taken care of -- we are already done  
with this. We're done with this.

9 MS. SHARP: No decision for you.

10 MR. LOHSE: This is no decision for  
us. This is you're working with them to implement  
the decision we've already made.

11 MS. YATES: But we're looking for  
any comments that you might have concerning --

12 MR. LOHSE: Okay. Fred, you need to  
read through this and make comments on this.

13 Lastly -- lastly, during the last  
fall and winter meeting I brought some hunter  
14 maps. I'm not sure if you are familiar with  
those. I forgot to bring them this time. They're  
15 laminated, you might remember. We, again, did  
these maps for both Northway, Tanacross -- and  
16 that's the second year for that area -- but we've  
also extended our distribution list out to McCarthy  
17 and also the villages as we had proposed to do, and  
this is now complete.

18 That's all I have.

Any questions for Heather?

19 Just a couple. The goat hunts are  
mostly taking place in the McCarthy area?

20 MS. YATES: Right.

21 MR. LOHSE: That's up to December, a  
hunt on Federal land?

MS. YATES: I think December 31st.

22 MR. LOHSE: December 31st. And then  
the elder sheep hunt, did we have anybody apply for  
23 it last year at all?

24 MS. YATES: I believe we had two  
last year.

25 MR. LOHSE: Two last year and two  
this year.

MS. YATES: Right.



1 MR. LOHSE: Was there any the last  
year?

2 MS. YATES: No, that ends October  
21st.

3 MR. LOHSE: That's over October  
21st. That's the hunt where the elder has to take  
4 it himself. He can't have a designated hunter?

MS. YATES: Correct.

5 MR. LOHSE: Any other questions for  
Heather? Thank you.

6 MR. LOHSE: At this point in time,  
we come back to Denali Park.

7 MR. TWITCHELL: Hollis Twitchell.  
I'm with Denali National Park. The last two  
8 Councils I went to, I think we scared them when  
they saw us carrying all the paperwork. I assure  
9 you that I'm not going through the plan page by  
page, take that time. So, it's there for your  
10 reference.

I don't have anything that requires  
11 action on the part of the Council; it's just  
informational. It's information for you. The SRC  
12 in Denali has been working to put together the plan  
for the Denali National Park area, which you have  
13 now for review and comment; although the comment  
date on the plan, I believe, is December 10th.  
14 This plan is really a living document. As the SRC  
works to develop programs in Denali, the plan is  
15 revised and updated almost on an annual basis. So,  
if you care to comment on the plan within the time  
16 frame, we would appreciate it; but they welcome  
your comments at any time in the future.

17 The other item that is with the plan  
is the user guide. This was requested by the  
18 Commission themselves; and it's directed,  
primarily, towards our subsistence users in the  
19 Denali area. The Commission's concern was for all  
the NTS regulations, the Federal program  
20 regulations and State regulations on the preserves  
that we needed something with a little bit of  
21 information to help our users understand what the  
programs are; and so that's what the audience is  
22 for that user guide.

At the last SRC meeting, the  
23 Commission asked that we do a smaller version of  
that, a brochure. They identified it as directed  
24 towards the public. The visitors that come into  
Denali, most of them are from outside and are not  
25 familiar with cultural groups and subsistence use  
in the Denali area. They felt we should put



1 something together to help inform people who visit  
2 the park areas of subsistence programs and cultural  
3 groups associated with Denali. So we will be doing  
4 that this year. We'll have that out sometime later  
5 this spring.

6 The only other thing I was going to  
7 mention is that in terms of fishery assumption and  
8 one of the provisions within the regulations which  
9 identified selected lines within conservation units  
10 would be open to Title VIII subsistence use. That  
11 is a significant advancement for Denali. The SRC  
12 and the park have been concerned for many years  
13 about selected lands around Cantwell which were  
14 excluded from Title VIII subsistence. We now have  
15 14,000 acres adjacent to and around Cantwell within  
16 the park that are now open to subsistence use.  
17 These lands were selected for various reasons,  
18 particularly because of their resource value. We  
19 went to a moose habitat, caribou and furbearers; so  
20 that has been a significant advancement for the  
21 Cantwell area users.

22 Farther out to the west, we have  
23 about 4,000 acres of selected land out towards Lake  
24 Machuga that are now open to the Federal program.  
25 Although Denali is fish for -- in terms of fish  
populations and spawning areas and runs, that  
provision within the regulations, in terms of  
opening those selected lands, has been a very  
significant advancement in our area.

That was all I had to mention. If  
there's any comments or questions, I'll try to  
answer them.

MR. LOHSE: Any questions for  
Hollis?

Hollis, let me go over one thing.  
This brochure that you're thinking of making is not  
for the subsistence user, it's for the visitor to  
explain to them that subsistence use takes place in  
the park, right?

MR. TWITCHELL: That's correct.

MR. LOHSE: Do you get many people  
come running to the park office to say somebody has  
been killing moose out in the park or something  
like that?

MR. TWITCHELL: Our biggest  
information request is for the fishery; and with  
publicity in the Lower 48 in terms of hunting and  
trapping of wolves in Denali, that has been an  
issue that has been pushed for a number of years.  
We have well over 2,000 inquiries about why we



1 allow wolves to be harvested in Denali. That's  
2 where our greatest arena of questions come from.  
3 Other than that, we do have some interpretive  
4 programs where people talk about cultural needs and  
5 subsistence that we provide to the visitor centers  
6 and talks. So, that would be the arena that we  
7 generally get; but what the Commission was  
8 concerned about is that we do even more to try to  
9 get the information out of the importance of  
10 subsistence resources and the cultural way of life  
11 and the relation of the Native peoples associated  
12 with the Denali area.

13 MR. LOHSE: In other words, most of  
14 your questions have come from people not that have  
15 observed something, but that have read something?  
16 You don't -- you haven't had many incidences where  
17 somebody has come across somebody taking a  
18 subsistence animal and then objected or come  
19 quickly to report to you or something like that?

20 MR. TWITCHELL: No, we haven't. It  
21 has not been an issue at Denali. The closest we  
22 would come to that would be concerns about hunting  
23 in the Kantishna area, the development area of  
24 Kantishna; but that would be the closest we would  
25 have; that's where the issue is raised.

MR. LOHSE: Any other questions for  
Hollis?

Hearing none. Thank you.

MR. TWITCHELL: Thank you.

MR. LOHSE: We'll go on with our  
agency reports. We'll go on to wildlife, Steve  
Machida.

MR. LOHSE: Steve.

MR. GRIESE: I'm obviously not Steve  
Machida. Steve wasn't able to make it today and  
asked me yesterday afternoon. The name is Herman  
Griese. H-e-r-m-a-n G-r-i-e-s-e, wildlife  
conservation division with the Department of Fish &  
Game in the Palmer office. Just a few things that  
we'd like to bring before the Regional Council,  
Mr. Chair, members, is the -- one -- this past  
winter there was a substantial snowfall in the  
coastal areas affecting the ungulates in the 7, 15,  
Unit 6, the southern portion of 14(C); and we did  
see a decline in ungulates, and we're seeing  
evidence of substantial decline in deer in Unit 6  
in the Kodiak Island. The moose on the Kenai also  
suffered, primarily calves and yearlings --

The second topic, many of you may  
have heard that in Unit 13 the caribou was closed



1 by emergency order by the State; it's scheduled to  
2 open up the 21st of October. The population is  
3 estimated currently at 31,000 post hunt. The  
4 objective for that population is 35,000 to 40,000.  
5 Below that the calf/cow ratio is the lowest we've  
6 observed in the Nelchina herd since we've been  
7 collecting data; and the current harvest objective  
8 for that -- for this past season was 2,000 animals,  
9 500 cows, 1500 bulls. The reported harvest on the  
10 state Tier 2 permit system exceeded 500. I think  
11 the number is around 570, thereabouts. The bull  
12 harvest objective was 1500, and we're currently  
13 approaching 1400 in reports.

14 We assume that the Federal harvest  
15 will bring that harvest up and probably exceed the  
16 total harvest objective for that population.

17 The third item is a situation that  
18 has been with the state since '81. The dog-biting  
19 louse is not -- was not naturally occurring in the  
20 state of Alaska, but in 1981 the louse was found on  
21 wolves and coyotes on the -- coyotes on the Kenai  
22 Peninsula. The State attempted to stop that  
23 occurrence by eliminating wolves. The plan to  
24 remove the wolves, the infected wolves, were  
25 stopped. We then began to treat those animals.

Now, the reason for our concern was  
that the dog-biting louse which naturally occurs on  
domestic dogs, we believe that was the source of  
the louse on the wolves on the Kenai. It causes  
the pelt of the animal to become useless as far as  
trapping is concerned. It causes -- it appears to  
cause some level of hypothermia in primarily the  
pups and yearlings, although we haven't been able  
to document a substantial mortality on those  
younger animals; and the populations that do  
currently have lice are -- those packs that do have  
lice appear to remain fairly stable.

But what happened within the state,  
the Governor's office decided to not act and remove  
those animals and directed us to find a way to  
treat them. We attempted to treat them, and the  
short of it is that within a couple of years all  
the lice -- all the packs on the Kenai had lice.  
And the decision was made by the department to try  
to maintain the infestation just to the Kenai  
Peninsula.

In '91, we treated two wolves that  
escaped the Kenai and showed up by chance, were  
observed by hunters on the Knik River, which is  
14(A). We treated those animals, and by all



1 appearances we had stopped the infestation of  
lice. We sampled wolf packs throughout  
2 Southcentral, throughout the state for that matter;  
and there was no indication that there was lice in  
3 any other pack in the state.

4 Last year in December, trappers  
turned in animals that had lice from the Parks  
Highway area between Willow and Talkeetna. We went  
5 in and determined in looking at 12 different packs  
that there were three packs that had lice. We  
6 asked the Governor's office for approval to treat  
or remove. We were given approval to do that, and  
7 we've treated three packs that had lice.

8 We can't be sure that we treated all  
the animals, and we can't be sure that the  
treatment lasts. The issue here is that we're not  
9 sure that we have been able to stop the infestation  
of lice and the spread of that infestation, and we  
10 suspect that it will inevitably move into the rest  
of the state; and there's a potential impact to the  
11 trapping industrial interests; and those that are  
willing to take wolves, whether there's value in  
12 them or not is questionable. The key is that at  
some point it's going to affect our ability to  
13 influence predator populations that also influence  
ungulates. And that's just what I have on short  
14 notice.

15 MR. LOHSE: Any questions for  
Herman?

16 MR. JOHN: I've got a question. Did  
you say that the two you picked up in 14(A), were  
they from Kenai?

17 MR. GRIESE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, one  
of those individual wolves was actually caught on  
18 the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge; and that's why  
we were interested in locating the animal to begin  
19 with; because, for one thing, we know it came from  
the Kenai because of the description of the caller  
20 of a wolf that was missing from the Kenai. And  
upon observation from the air, it obviously had  
21 lice. The characteristic shake like a dog coming  
out of water, frequently because of the skin  
22 irritation, and the effect is that the area between  
the shoulder blades typically gets rubbed; and  
23 there's a diamond-shape worn pattern even on the  
adults that are affected. The pups and yearlings  
24 will tend to have even more hair loss, almost from  
neck to tail.

25 MR. JOHN: Another question, are  
those wolves that were transplanted to Kenai



1 Peninsula -- one can escape -- I don't know how far  
2 it made it -- but is there any other that you know  
3 of that escaped? And if they did escape, did they  
4 carry lice with them up to the other areas that are  
5 outside of Kenai?

6 MR. GRIESE: Mr. Chair, that's a  
7 good question. There was, obviously, one that did  
8 escape. It escaped before it was able to pick up  
9 lice, and that was the one that was in the media.  
10 There was another one that escaped that was killed  
11 that was not in the media, but it did not have lice  
12 either. But there are animals that -- I think the  
13 majority of the animals or many of the animals that  
14 were released from the 40-mile pack now have lice.  
15 There were several animals that were looked at  
16 earlier this year that had lice and had apparently  
17 picked it up from locals on the Kenai.

18 MR. JOHN: So, you think -- one last  
19 question, you think that those wolves from Kenai  
20 will infect the rest of the state?

21 MR. GRIESE: Mr. Chair, the question  
22 of whether or not the wolves on the Kenai are going  
23 to infect the rest of the state goes to one --  
24 whether or not the source is actually coming from  
25 domestic dogs; and we suspect -- there's two  
potential sources for the lice that we see in the  
Matanuska Valley now. Either they got lice from  
the numerous dog kennels or dog lots in that area,  
stray dogs that are pretty common in that area as  
well; or there were wolves from the Kenai that  
dispersed to that area, and there are a number of  
wolves over time that have dispersed from the Kenai  
to other parts of the state. So, in my opinion, I  
think the opinion of most of the biologists in the  
state, it's inevitable that Kenai wolves will  
eventually disperse at some rate to other parts of  
the state and potentially take the lice with them.

MR. JOHN: Thank you.

MR. LOHSE: Any other questions for  
Herman?

I have two questions. The first  
question was the inability to maintain some control  
of the predator population. That will basically be  
because, as the wolves become valueless, the  
economic incentive for anybody to -- and a lack of  
a bounty -- that you don't have anymore incentive  
will be there for private interests, right?

MR. GRIESE: That's correct. That's  
our interpretation of what is likely to happen.

MR. LOHSE: The other question I



1 have is: Have you put out a call for information  
2 to the trappers around the state to report  
3 anything -- I'm thinking we got one of the diamond-  
4 shaped spots in the middle of the back in the  
5 Chitina Valley last year. We had a neighbor that  
6 got one that had a big rub spot right here  
7 (indicating). Has a call gone out that if you get  
8 something like that to isolate it or something like  
9 that; and, you know, throw it in a bag with some  
10 Bouac and save the samples and bring it to you?

11 MR. GRIESE: Mr. Chair, there hasn't  
12 been an effort by the division or the department to  
13 make it a statewide issue or to give any kind of  
14 notice. Locally, area biologists typically talk to  
15 the trappers. Bob Toby in Unit 13 talks to most of  
16 the trappers that he comes in contact with and  
17 reminds them to keep an eye out for that kind of  
18 issue. We were aware of animals taken over in Unit  
19 11 that did have that appearance; but apparently  
20 Bob was able to inspect those, was unable to find  
21 lice. The problem is, many of these animals that  
22 have lice have low populations of lice, make it  
23 very difficult to find. We found animals that were  
24 in packs that were infested and found it very  
25 difficult to find the individual louse without a  
great deal of effort; but they still show the  
symptoms on the back, the wear in the back and in  
the groin area. There were other animals found in  
other parts of the state that had similar symptoms,  
and wolves have a variety of ectoparasite and skin  
conditions that might also cause it; so it's  
difficult to say all the time that it is a  
dog-biting louse that's causing the problem unless  
you find one on it. But we are currently looking  
at -- we have a news release that we're putting out  
at least inviting people, not trappers, in the  
Southcentral to keep us aware of what they're  
finding.

20 MR. LOHSE: You have a news  
21 release.

22 What would an individual trapper --  
23 what would be the proper way to handle something  
24 like this so that you could get the best  
25 information from it? You know, I'm thinking of the  
ones that I saw last winter. Maybe by the time Bob  
Toby sees something like that, we all know that as  
an animal dies, it cools; the fleas jump off of it,  
for example. They have no interest in staying on a  
cold hide. Do the lice do the same things? I  
mean, by the time it gets to Bob Toby, would the



1 lice have migrated off the hide to the point where  
you wouldn't have that evidence?

2 MR. GRIESE: Until this past year,  
3 we were under the impression that once the body  
4 temperature reached a certain point, the lice would  
5 die. However, we had a coyote that had lice and  
6 was left in the back of a truck overnight; and over  
7 a 24-hour period it had a chance to freeze in  
8 subzero temperatures, and we found live lice on  
9 it. There's potential that lice may migrate off if  
10 left in a room; but typically once they've died,  
11 the lice die with them; and the best way to get  
12 that animal, determine whether or not it has lice  
is to get it to someone who knows what they're  
looking for while it's fresh. The problem that  
also we've run into are hides that are heavily  
salted makes it very difficult to pick out the lice  
when you have all the salt on there. Or one that's  
been run through a washing machine, obviously, once  
it's been cleaned or brushed by the trapper, it  
makes it very difficult to find the lice. The  
fresher the pelt the better it is to find those  
animals.

MR. LOHSE: The other question is:  
Basically, from what I understand from listening to  
you, is even if we find them, it's just a matter of  
knowledge; it's nothing you can do about them.

MR. GRIESE: Mr. Chair, that's a  
question that I don't think our division has been  
able to answer amongst themselves. There's certain  
of us that believe that there is a potential to try  
to eliminate lice on wolves given the authority to  
do so.

We're not sure -- well, many of us  
believe that treating alone is not likely to  
produce that effect. There are others that believe  
that it's inevitable that wolves in Alaska will  
have to go through the process of adapting to  
lice. The wolves on the Kenai, however, since  
1981, when they first were observed having lice  
have still not adapted; and they still show very  
poor pelt conditions. So it could be a very long  
process for adaptation.

MR. LOHSE: Would the fact that some  
of these wolves are going to take place in  
Federal -- on Federal land and actually in national  
parks and reserves limit your ability to treat  
them, definitely limit your ability to eradicate  
them?

MR. GRIESE: There's no question



1 that once you involve a number of agencies and  
2 different levels there's likely to be less of an  
ability to make a quick decision to do something  
like that.

3 MR. LOHSE: I guess the reason I  
4 asked all those questions is we just went  
through -- we just went through a proposal to do  
5 away with leg-hold traps in the Federal government,  
and the only thing that stopped that proposal was  
6 the fact that fur is a big part of the subsistence  
resource in the state of Alaska. And that -- I  
7 mean, that was the argument that, basically, killed  
the bill. If fur becomes valueless that argument  
8 will go away; and they will have even less  
resources on hand to control predators that affect  
our ungulates.

9 MR. GRIESE: Mr. Chair, I wasn't  
specific in describing the effect. The dog-biting  
10 louse has only been found on coyotes and wolves.  
It doesn't affect any other furbearers.

11 MR. LOHSE: Okay. Any other  
questions for Herman?

12 Thank you.

13 MR. LOHSE: We have subsistence by  
Jim Fall. The report's in the notebook. Jim's  
14 right here. I think it's under Tab L, isn't it?

15 MR. FALL: It's under Tab L. Thank  
you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Jim Fall. That's  
16 F-a-l-l, and I'm with the division of subsistence  
with the Department of Fish & Game. I'll be  
17 brief. My written report is under Tab L towards  
the back after the material on migratory birds; and  
18 it's called Subsistence Harvest Salmon Programs,  
Prince William and -- Cook Inlet and Prince William  
19 Sound as background areas. We prepared this as  
background for Federal staff, as well as you, to  
20 become more involved in fisheries management. And  
it's our view that it's very important for  
21 everybody to have background on what programs  
already exist out there. As was pointed out  
22 yesterday, I believe it is the intent as new  
programs develop that they be integrated with to --  
23 with existing programs to support them, to  
complement them, not to duplicate them or replace  
24 them. This is basically an overview for your  
information as a tool as you get more involved in  
this.

25 In your region for subsistence  
salmon fisheries there are long-standing harvest  
assessment programs run by the Department for all



1 of them. For the most part, they have very high  
2 levels of participation; fisheries do get permits,  
3 do return the permits; and overall we're very  
4 confident that we get a pretty good handle on the  
5 level of effort and the level of harvest in these  
6 fisheries.

7 They work pretty much the same way  
8 and the people get permits from the Department or  
9 from vendors in local communities or from local  
10 village governments or some combination of those --  
11 of those different methods, and the permits are  
12 also harvest calendars; and then people write down  
13 on those calendars their harvest in any particular  
14 day.

15 So, this handout basically lists  
16 each fishery and gives, basically, five pieces or  
17 six pieces of information about each one. If you  
18 just take a look on the first page as an example,  
19 the subsistence fishery for salmon for the Tyonek  
20 Subdistrict in the Upper Cook Inlet area, marine  
21 waters, the responsible division in this case is  
22 the division of subsistence; and there are three  
23 divisions within the Department that share  
24 responsibilities, depending on the fishery, for  
25 harvest assessment: Subsistence, commercial  
fisheries, and sport fish. This one happens to be  
subsistence. The assessment method is a  
subsistence permit, and people write their daily  
salmon catches on the calendar; and then there's  
reminder letters that are sent out at the end of  
the year to basically remind people to send in  
their permits, and that's basically how we achieve  
a pretty high return rate of 80 to -- 80 to 90  
percent for most of these fisheries. In this case  
how people can get permits, we go over to Tyonek in  
the springtime; and the village Council sets up a  
place where we can sit up close and people can get  
the permits, and permits are left with the Council  
so people who aren't around that day can get one.  
You can also get a permit at our office in  
Anchorage, and that's how it works in a number of  
other communities as well.

26 Then for each fishery, we give the  
27 average -- for the last five or six years or so of  
28 how many permits we issue and who gets most of  
29 those permits. Is it mostly people in a particular  
30 village -- excuse me, or local residents for a  
31 region, or is it some mixture of nonlocal and local  
32 people? And then for each fishery I have an idea  
33 of how many fish are taken in an average year. In



1 the case of Tyonek, 2,000 king salmon and other  
2 salmon are taken. That's variable on the size of  
3 fishery.

4 That's all that I was going to do.  
5 You can see each fishery is listed here.

6 Now, these are all fisheries in your  
7 region. Most of these fisheries take place in  
8 marine waters or in fresh water, such as the  
9 Susitna River. Looking at the maps they are not  
10 subject to any Federal jurisdiction in the past or  
11 presently or in the future. There are a few  
12 exceptions to that, but I wanted to show the broad  
13 range of ways that -- that the harvest assessment  
14 methods are applied.

15 And with that, that's really all I  
16 have to say. And I'll be happy to answer any  
17 questions you might have.

18 MR. ELVSAAS: How was the  
19 subsistence fishery this year at Tyonek? I had  
20 heard from the people there that they had a very  
21 poor season.

22 MR. FALL: We could ask Ron Stanek.  
23 Ron, do you want --

24 MR. STANEK: It's over 800, 850  
25 kings were reported thus far; but that's only half  
the permits in so far.

MR. ELVSAAS: That don't sound too  
bad to me.

MR. STANEK: It's up over a  
thousand. It should be over a thousand fish.

MR. LOHSE: Any other questions for  
Jim?

I have two questions. First of all,  
I noticed that you said something that was brought  
up to me before is that most of these fisheries  
don't take place on Federal land and are not under  
Federal jurisdiction. But the one fishery that  
we're going to be dealing with is the Upper Copper  
District which does take place on Federal land; and  
when I look at the subsistence permits that are  
here, I see that 916 of them, about 55 percent of  
them are to the Copper Basin residents; and that  
would mean about 45 percent of them to other  
residents of the state. One of the things that was  
brought up to me on the last closure is that with  
the Federal takeover, the Federal Government has  
different regulations for qualification for  
subsistence permits. Basically you have to be a  
rural resident, and the State doesn't have that.  
Do you see that affecting the number of permits



1 issued?

2 I mean, we didn't ask the Federal  
3 Government -- didn't ask Tom Boyd when he was here;  
4 but are we going to -- is the Federal Government  
5 going to issue -- do you see a problem with the  
6 Federal Government issuing permits under State  
7 regulations; and yet they have to apply Federal  
8 standards, which is they have to be a rural  
9 resident?

10 MR. FALL: Not necessarily. These  
11 are the kind of details that haven't been worked  
12 out yet; but it could be as in many hunts where  
13 regulations are basically the same in terms of  
14 season and bag limits, harvest limits, and gear  
15 types that the Federal program requires a State  
16 permit. So, the Department would continue to issue  
17 subsistence permits regardless of where a person  
18 lives. It would only be if there's a divergence in  
19 the rules for that. There would probably need to  
20 be some additional permit requirement issued by a  
21 State agency. Once again, I -- or I don't think  
22 anybody else in the Department has talked directly  
23 with anybody in the Federal program about how  
24 exactly this will work, but it isn't necessarily  
25 the case that there would be any difference in the  
short term.

14 MR. LOHSE: Yeah, because in most of  
15 the hunts, State regulations apply on Federal lands  
16 for State hunters that are not subsistence  
17 qualified; and the only time that only Federal  
18 regulations apply is when there's a shortage and  
19 the hunt is limited to straight subsistence users.  
20 And so from that standpoint, that might be what  
21 will affect -- you know, only in times of shortage  
22 when 804 goes into effect would that take effect on  
23 limiting the State's regulations for subsistence  
24 use on the river?

20 MR. FALL: That's right, and an  
21 example from Game would be in Bristol Bay where  
22 State and Federal rules for caribou hunting are  
23 essentially the same; and the Federal rule is you  
24 get a State hunting license and harvest tickets and  
25 report it that way. There's no separate permitting  
or harvest reporting from the Federal side, because  
the rules are the same.

24 MR. LOHSE: Yeah, I was thinking of  
25 the caribou hunt in Unit 13 where you have both  
State hunters and subsistence hunters; but  
subsistence hunters have an advantage at certain  
times of the year and at certain areas, but State



1 hunters are allowed to hunt in those areas; and  
that is on different occasions.

2 MR. FALL: That is a situation where  
there are two permit hunts.

3 MR. LOHSE: Any other questions for  
Jim on the subsistence fisheries?

4 It's a nice overview. It really  
5 brings out -- you know, a lot of times we -- and I  
know we talked about that in the past -- we  
6 sometimes, the big subsistence fishery in our  
district is Copper fishery; and we sometimes think  
7 of that as the only subsistence fishery. We forget  
there's Chenega Bay Subsistence Fishery, because  
8 the numbers are so overshadowed by the Copper River  
Subsistence Fishery.

Hearing no other questions or  
9 discussions, Jim, thank you much for the report. I  
found it very interesting.

10 MR. FALL: Thank you.

11 MR. LOHSE: At this point in time,  
we'll have a report on the commercial fishery,  
12 Ellen Simpson. And you can find that in Tab L --  
Ellen Simpson -- last page.

13 MS. SIMPSON: My name is Ellen  
Simpson. I -- I'm a biologist for the Alaska  
14 Fish & Game -- all right, and I submitted this  
report about a month ago; and I don't think the  
15 numbers have really changed very much. Recently we  
assumed reporting responsibilities for the Upper  
16 Copper River Subsistence Fishery, so I thought I'd  
give you those numbers today. The permits aren't  
17 due until the end of the month, so these are  
preliminary numbers; and in 1999 we issued 11 hunt  
18 permits for the Upper Copper Subsistence Fishery,  
and so far 573 have been returned as of a couple of  
19 days ago; and the preliminary catch is about 44,000  
sockeye; and based on what we've seen in the past,  
20 it appears that the total catch is going to come  
close to the top level of the end-escapement goal  
of between 50 and 75,000 sockeye.

21 You just got through asking Mr. Fall  
about the percentage of permits that were issued to  
22 non-Copper Basin residents, and these numbers are  
real preliminary. I just made one fast cut through  
23 the data and came up with about 25 percent of the  
permits being issued to Anchorage residents, 7  
24 percent to Fairbanks, about 11 Mat-Su residents;  
and the remainder would be either to Copper River  
25 Basin residents or other communities in the state.

And Tom tells me that I didn't



1 include all the Copper River communities, so I came  
2 up with 35 percent for Copper River Basins; and  
3 that's probably low. It is probably closer to  
4 about 50 percent.

5 The number of permits being issued,  
6 this is the second highest year. The only year  
7 that there were permits issued was in 1997 and  
8 that's just a few more from this year.

9 Any questions?

10 MR. LOHSE: Any questions for  
11 Ellen?

12 So, 11 hunt -- this is subsistence;  
13 this does not include personal use. This is 11  
14 hunt subsistence permits.

15 MS. SIMPSON: Does not include  
16 personal use.

17 MR. LOHSE: It's about 50 percent  
18 basically Copper Basin -- it's pretty close to a  
19 50/50 split.

20 MS. SIMPSON: That's what it looks  
21 like, yeah.

22 MR. LOHSE: Can you give your name  
23 and everything, spell it for her?

24 MR. TAUBE: Tom Taube, T-a-u-b-e.  
25 I'm a biologist for the Copper River Sport and  
Personal Use Report. I didn't issue a written  
report; everything was preliminary. I'll highlight  
the personal use. We issued a total of 9,946  
permits, which was a slight decline from 198 where  
we issued 10 -- 1998 -- 10,006 permits. Our  
preliminary estimates for total harvest is 154,636  
salmon total. Of that, 5,6- -- 6,243 chinook,  
146,336 sockeye, and 2,035 coho with 21 other  
species or nonidentified salmon included in that.  
We've had a return rate of 85 percent so far, and  
that was permits that were due at the end of  
September; and we usually end up with about 98  
percent return from our personal use harvests. The  
season started a little bit slow. It's all based  
on sonar counts, so it's abundance-based  
management. Early on we had two short openings,  
and in June we opened up a continual lead for the  
remainder of the season. This briefly summarizes  
sport fisheries now. Sockeye harvests in the last  
three years have been around 12,000, the majority  
of that taken in the Gulkana. Chinook harvests  
have been around 8,000 the last three years.  
Again, the majority in Gulkana/Gakona. We had  
somewhat of a decline in participation of sport  
fisheries. Our estimates of harvest on the sport



1 fisheries are based upon a statewide harvest  
2 survey. They're sent out to a proportion of  
3 licensed anglers, both nonresident and resident.  
4 We ended up getting those results actually a year  
5 after the fact. This year for 1999 we won't get  
6 those until next year this time for 2000 for 1999.

7 The chinook return was a little bit  
8 delayed this year based upon low water levels; and  
9 the harvest in 1999, having to just give a rough  
10 estimate, were priced slightly less than we'd seen  
11 in past years due to water conditions in the  
12 Gulkana River. We had high cloudy water. If I had  
13 to give a rough estimate for chinook harvest, I  
14 would say probably around 7500, which would be  
15 slightly below the three-year average. That's all  
16 I have. I'll take any questions.

17 MR. LOHSE: The first numbers you  
18 gave us were actually for 1998, the 12,000 and  
19 8,000?

20 MR. TAUBE: That was the three-year  
21 average from 1996 through '98.

22 MR. LOHSE: Okay. Any questions?  
23 Have you done any escapement  
24 estimates on chinook or --

25 MR. TAUBE: Yes, I fly aerial  
surveys during the peak of the escapement period or  
when the peak number of fish are out of the  
spawning grounds between June 20th and July 31st.  
This year my surveys were a little late due to  
weather conditions. It looks like the escapement  
was average or below average for chinook. In sonar  
the escapement was about 100,000 above what it was  
estimated. Meeting the escapement objective has an  
allocation of 100,000. Since they were over,  
that's where the 150,000 harvest.

MR. LOHSE: So, that means that out  
of the -- you said you were about 100,000 over?

MR. TAUBE: Right.

MR. LOHSE: Out of 100,000 they took  
54,000?

MR. TAUBE: Right now, the way the  
management plan -- there is no allocation directed  
to what the surplus -- which fishery can take the  
surplus; so technically the personal use fishery  
can take 100 percent of the fishery or the  
subsistence fishery or the sport fishery. There is  
a proposal in this meeting of sport fishery come  
November to reduce that to 25 percent of the  
personal use fishery which was what it had been  
prior to 1996.



1 MR. LOHSE: Any other questions?  
Thank you.

2 MR. LOHSE: At this point in term --  
3 at this point in term -- at this point in time, we  
4 would like to open the floor to proposals to change  
Federal subsistence regulations, and I think this  
would include both game and fish, and --

5 MS. EAKON: No. Wildlife.

6 MR. LOHSE: Just wildlife. I'm  
sorry, I stand corrected.

7 And I would also like for Helga to  
tell us what the -- for the public's information,  
8 what the final date is that a person could submit a  
proposal to change subsistence regulations.

9 MS. EAKON: A completed form should  
be submitted by 5:00 p.m. on November 5.

10 MR. LOHSE: Okay. So you have until  
November 5, 1999, 5:00 p.m. -- that's postmarked by  
that date or in your office?

11 MS. EAKON: Received by. I think  
postmarked is okay.

12 MR. LOHSE: Postmarked is okay.

13 So you have until then, if you have  
any subsistence proposals that you'd like to make,  
on game.

14 At this point we open the floor to  
proposals from the public.

15 MS. DEWHURST: I'm not from the  
public, but from the Office of Subsistence  
Management --

16 MR. LOHSE: You're next then -- is  
there any public, first of all --

17 MS. DEWHURST: Sorry.

18 MR. LOHSE: I don't have any public,  
so then it goes to agencies.

19 MS. DEWHURST: Sorry about that.  
20 We've been looking at trapping regulations, mainly  
because of the recent scare that there could be a  
trapping ban put on the national wildlife refuges;  
21 but it didn't go through; but it did make us take a  
hard look at trapping regulations, the Federal  
22 ones. We found a discrepancy in the Southcentral  
regulations with beaver; it's in Unit 6, 13, and  
23 16; and in all three cases -- that's why we're  
proposing to lump all of them. The Federal  
24 regulations are more restrictive than the State  
regulations. This proposal would be to change the  
25 Federal regulations to match the State regulations  
both in season and bag limits. In the case of bag  
limits on all three, the State regulations has no



1 limit. The Federal regulations say in Unit 6 it's  
2 20 per season; in 13 and 16 it's 30 per season,  
3 which is still pretty liberal; but we figured it  
4 seems like we might as well make it no limit.

5 Similarly, with seasons, all of the  
6 Federal seasons are more restrictive than the  
7 existing State seasons. For example, in Unit 6,  
8 the Federal season ends March 31st; and the State  
9 season ends April 30th. It's similar in the other  
10 two units. So, what the office is bringing to you  
11 as the Council, if you think this is a concern, if  
12 the Council -- we wanted to ask if you wanted to  
13 make this a proposal to go ahead and just lump all  
14 three units, all beaver trapping regulations and  
15 basically say let's match the Federal regulations  
16 with the State regulations; and in all cases, both  
17 the season and the bag limits, let's liberalize the  
18 regulations, making them broader, which makes sense  
19 because the State regulations are usually good on  
20 Federal land anyway; so it would seem to make sense  
21 to make it easier for trappers that the two  
22 regulations would read the same.

23 MR. LOHSE: When do they have the  
24 start of those seasons? Do you have that in front  
25 of you?

MS. DEWHURST: Yeah. The starting  
14 dates are the same with both Federal and State,  
15 with the exception of Unit 16; the Federal starts  
16 November 10th, and the State season starts October  
17 10th. So that would be a case where we would back  
18 it up a month and open a month earlier in Unit 16.  
19 And Unit 6 and 13, we currently do match starting  
20 dates with the State.

21 MR. LOHSE: Any comments from the  
22 Board? I have one comment on that, we've heard --  
23 we've heard testimony from all over the state; and  
24 I don't remember Fred John talking about it, you  
25 know, extremely high beaver numbers simply because  
there is no economic incentive to take beaver at  
this point in time to the point where they actually  
are affecting salmon escapement, salmon spawning  
like on the -- where you're at. They basically  
dammed the creek up to where the water doesn't come  
down anymore. I was wondering if there was any way  
that we could, for lack of a better way of calling  
it, encourage subsistence take for meat, like I  
know they have a camp in the summertime. If they  
could take beaver to have at their camp legally,  
then that would be an incentive to take some of  
these beaver that are affecting the whole systems;



1 and I was just wondering, would it be possible as a  
2 Federal subsistence thing to allow beaver to be  
taken for meat all year-round?

3 MS. DEWHURST: It's possible; it  
4 certainly could be a proposal; you could  
5 potentially change these seasons to be year-round  
6 seasons. Right now they all are basically winter  
seasons, trapping.

7 MR. LOHSE: And as Federal seasons  
8 put in there that we will salvage either the meat  
9 or the hide.

10 MS. DEWHURST: It would depend how  
11 you want to take them in the summer, by shooting or  
12 by traps as to whether or not it would be in the  
13 shooting regulation -- the hunting regulations or  
14 the trapping regulations.

15 MR. LOHSE: That's a very good  
16 point. In the summertime you want to shoot them,  
17 not trap them. Wouldn't you, basically? If a  
18 person was taking beaver in the summertime? I  
19 mean, people -- you don't want to carry traps  
20 around --

21 MR. JOHN: You're right. You're  
22 right.

23 MR. LOHSE: Yeah.

24 MR. JOHN: Probably shooting them.

25 MR. LOHSE: That's something that we  
could put in as a proposal for hunting  
regulations.

MS. DEWHURST: That would probably  
be separate from this one. This could be one  
proposal, and that might be another proposal; you  
have to decide what units you wanted it, if you  
wanted it across the board and basically --

18 MR. LOHSE: And what limits?

19 MR. DEWHURST: And what your season  
20 is, but you certainly would be open to do that.  
21 That's an option.

22 MR. JOHN: Would this be just for  
23 saving the fish, or would this be just for eating  
24 of the meat?

25 MS. DEWHURST: Well, traditionally,  
the Federal Subsistence Board is not like -- does  
not like to change subsistence regulations to deal  
with nuisance species. It's to provide  
opportunities for subsistence. So, I would  
recommend that, if you make the proposal, you term  
it as far as increasing opportunity for getting  
meat and not to rid yourself of a nuisance species;  
because they traditionally have not liked to take



1 proposals up along those lines because that's not  
2 what our goals under Title VIII are. We're not  
3 supposed to be dealing with nuisance species; that  
4 would be more something that would be sent to the  
5 State, the State Board & Game.

6 MR. LOHSE: I was thinking of it  
7 more in the line of meat. A lot of different  
8 places have kids' camps and summer camps and  
9 culture camps and things like that that they'd like  
10 to serve traditional foods at. One traditional  
11 food is beaver, and that would make beaver  
12 accessible to those -- you know, legally accessible  
13 to those kind of camps and things like that in a  
14 manner that would be --

15 MS. DEWHURST: It could be done  
16 either way too. We've dealt with the cultural  
17 camps and things with moose harvest and other  
18 things. We do -- we deal with those with special  
19 acts. It could be done on a case-by-case basis for  
20 a particular camp to request open beaver harvest by  
21 that camp or whatever, or some limit. Or you  
22 could -- or you could make it as a broad-based  
23 proposal. My guess would be it would go through  
24 smoother if it was done on a case-by-case basis  
25 with the camps versus just making a wide-open  
26 proposal. Although I am aware -- I think that  
27 there are proposals going to the Board of Game that  
28 are going to vastly liberalize beaver hunting and  
29 trapping, so there is that movement statewide.

30 MR. LOHSE: I think Sandy has got  
31 something that he wants to add to this.

32 MR. RABINOWITCH: Thank you. Sandy  
33 Rabinowitch with the Park Service. I just want to  
34 point out that the Federal Board did support a  
35 beaver season a number of years ago. I remember  
36 this. It went very much along the lines of what  
37 Donna said. It initially started out with a high  
38 bag limit. There was some resistance about that.  
39 The proponent said he was more apt to be eating  
40 moose in the summertime. On page 146 in the  
41 Federal park, Unit 25, it's April 26th to October  
42 31st, one beaver a day, possession limit of one. I  
43 just point that out that it's on the books.

44 MR. LOHSE: Thank you.

45 What we really have in front of us  
46 is whether we want to support the proposal to align  
47 the Federal seasons with the State seasons which  
48 are more liberal in Unit 6, 13, 16, and --

49 MS. DEWHURST: Just those three?

50 MR. LOHSE: Just those three.



1 Helga.

MS. EAKON: I wanted to clarify that  
2 just because you put your name on this proposal  
3 doesn't mean that when you deliberate it at your  
4 winter meeting that you're going to recommend to  
5 support it. This is just for the purpose of  
6 putting it through on --

MR. LOHSE: Putting it in the  
7 book -- if we wish to put this in the book, a  
8 motion is in order.

This has nothing to do with hunting  
9 beaver; this is just lining the -- aligning the  
10 trapping seasons up with the State seasons which  
11 are more liberal than the Federal seasons. So, do  
12 I hear a motion? If not, it just dies.

MR. ELVSAAS: I move.

MR. LOHSE: It's been moved. Do I  
13 hear a second?

MR. ELVSAAS: Second.

MR. LOHSE: Seconded by Fred.

14 Basically, what this would do is line up the  
15 season -- the bag limits with the State season and  
16 bag limits which currently are more liberal than  
17 Federal bag limits. 6, 16, and 13. Any  
18 discussion?

We're not voting on whether we  
19 support this or not. We're just voting on whether  
20 we want to put it in the book.

MR. ELVSAAS: When you say Unit 6,  
21 that means all of the subunits of 6?

MR. LOHSE: Right. If I don't hear  
22 any discussion, question's in order.

MR. JOHN: Question.

MR. LOHSE: Question has been  
23 called. All in favor of submitting it in the  
24 proposal books.

SPEAKERS: Aye.

MR. LOHSE: Opposed, signify by  
25 saying "nay."

Motion carries.

If we wish to put a proposal as a  
26 group to allow summer hunting for food, we can do  
27 that. We can do that as an individual or anything  
28 like that. That's not under the topic. I was just  
29 commenting on that because it deals with the  
30 surplus beaver.

Okay. So any other agencies that  
31 have a proposal to suggest?

Okay. The next thing we have is:  
32 Are there any proposals, suggestions from the



1 Regional Council?

2 Does the Regional Council have any  
3 game proposals they wish to put on the floor?

4 Hearing none, I will make a proposal  
5 as Chair that we follow the lead of the proposal  
6 that went in for Unit 25 to allow the taking of  
7 beaver for food from the end of trapping season to  
8 the beginning of trapping season with the limit of  
9 one a day per person with the aid of a rifle. If I  
10 get seconded, if I don't --

11 MR. ELVSAAS: I'll second that  
12 question.

13 It would be a good idea to put some  
14 type of a time lag between the season and the  
15 food-gathering so that you have closure of the  
16 season and then, you know, the opportunities to get  
17 the food. I think there should be a definite  
18 separation of that.

19 MR. LOHSE: That's a good idea.

20 So that somebody just doesn't  
21 continue to extend the beaver season for trapping?

22 MR. ELVSAAS: Yes.

23 MR. LOHSE: What would you suggest,  
24 Fred, a month?

25 MR. ELVSAAS: I think 30 days.

MR. LOHSE: 30 days?

MR. ELVSAAS: I'm just weighing it  
now. I don't have anything to --

MR. LOHSE: This is just a proposal  
to put it in the book; discussion comes from when  
we discuss it at the winter meeting.

MR. ELVSAAS: I think we could start  
it 30 days after the end of the season.

MR. LOHSE: I'll -- as the maker of  
the proposal, I'd be willing to amend or change my  
proposal to 30 days -- 30 days after the closure of  
the spring trapping season, 30 days prior to the  
opening of the fall trapping season.

MR. ELVSAAS: That's fine with me.  
Seconded.

MR. LOHSE: It's fine with a  
second. We'll have discussion on it, then, at the  
winter meeting.

Okay. Any other discussion on  
that?

This will be included in the  
proposal book. The question has been called; all  
in favor signify by saying "aye."

SPEAKERS: Aye.

MR. LOHSE: Opposed signify by



1 saying "nay."

Motion carries.

2 Does any other Regional Council  
3 member have any other proposal they'd like to put  
4 on the table?

5 Again, I'd like to reiterate that  
6 this does not stop any -- this is not your only  
7 opportunity to do this; you have until November  
8 5th, and any Council member or any member of the  
9 audience or even any member of the agency is  
10 entitled to put in a personal proposal prior to  
11 November 5th.

12 Okay. Other new business?

13 At this point in time, do we have  
14 any new business that any Council member wants to  
15 bring up?

16 MR. ELVSAAS: Mr. Chairman, I don't  
17 know if this is new business; but I was looking at  
18 the agenda here, and I don't see any place to bring  
19 this up; but when Mr. Taube was talking about  
20 subsistence he said that -- something to the  
21 effect, I don't remember exactly how he said it --  
22 was that the areas within the Cook Inlet marine  
23 waters, as I understood it, marine waters, were not  
24 subject to the Federal subsistence. When we get to  
25 the fisheries, I think we're going to be addressing  
that in the future, aren't we, the jurisdiction  
areas?

16 Seems to me that, as I understand  
17 it, the waters that drain from the public land to  
18 Federal lands are subject to the subsistence  
19 program. I'm not exactly sure how that's going to  
20 go, but I think you should keep an eye out for that  
21 in the future as to whether we're precluded from  
22 subsistence activities in those areas.

23 MR. LOHSE: Are you asking for --

24 MR. ELVSAAS: I'm asking: Am I on  
25 the right track or wrong track? Are we going to  
address it in our training session?

26 MS. MASON: Yes. Chair?

27 MR. LOHSE: Yes, we will address it  
28 in our training session. I think, that comes under  
29 extraterritorial jurisdiction. I think currently,  
30 they are not under the Federal jurisdiction,  
31 because they're State waters.

32 MS. MASON: Yeah.

33 MR. LOHSE: So, any other -- some  
34 that will be on our -- that will be on your  
35 training session.

Any other new business that anybody



1 can think of from the Council?

2 From the agencies and staff, does  
3 anybody see any new business that the Council needs  
4 to take up in future meetings?

5 And, lastly, is there anybody in the  
6 public that sees any new business that the Council  
7 needs to take up in future meetings? This is your  
8 chance, as the public, to talk, tell us what we  
9 need to do.

Silence, definitely.

10 Okay. Well, I, myself, personally  
11 don't have any new business. The only thing  
12 that -- the only thing that I can think of is that,  
13 you know, in the future I'm sure that we're going  
14 to need more flushing out of how -- the plan for  
15 implementing the subsistence is actually going to  
16 take place, who's going to do what, when, and where  
17 in real life. But I think that will probably be  
18 covered in future meetings.

19 At this point in time, what we need  
20 to deal with is when and where we're going to have  
21 our next meeting.

22 The where has been decided, that we  
23 should it have it on the Kenai Peninsula; but we  
24 need to decide where on the Kenai Peninsula. Any  
25 suggestions, Fred?

MR. ELVSAAS: My recommendation is  
that it be in Kenai because it's a Kenai issue.  
It's the tribe that's based in Kenai. I would  
recommend that we not have a Kenai Peninsula even  
though it's on the Kenai --

MR. LOHSE: Kenai is more centrally  
located.

MS. SWAN: Easy to get to.

MR. LOHSE: Better access.

Does Kenai have the facilities to  
host a meeting like that?

MS. MASON: We've had public  
hearings there before.

MR. LOHSE: Okay. Is there a motion  
that we hold it at Kenai?

MR. ELVSAAS: I would so move.

MS. SWAN: Second.

MR. LOHSE: Moved and seconded by  
the people who live on the Kenai Peninsula that  
live in Kenai that it be in Kenai. Discussion?  
Any comments from anybody?

MR. ELVSAAS: Question has been  
called.

MR. LOHSE: We will have it at



1 Kenai.

2 MS. EAKON: You do have a calendar  
3 in your supplementary packet, so we should go ahead  
4 and pick a spot so that the world is put on  
5 notice.

6 MR. LOHSE: Our window opens  
7 February 21 and closes March 24th.

8 MS. EAKON: The question was for  
9 your meeting to be sometime in late February or  
10 early March.

11 MR. LOHSE: Early February. It  
12 looks like we have a late February -- looks like we  
13 have two Seward Peninsula and eastern interior, and  
14 you need to be present at either one of those?

15 MS. EAKON: No, I do not have a  
16 conflict with those.

17 MR. LOHSE: You have no conflict  
18 with those. But other staff may.

19 MS. MASON: Probably not.

20 MR. LOHSE: We can hold it exactly  
21 the same time if we wanted to?

22 MS. MASON: Yeah.

23 MR. LOHSE: So, there actually is  
24 no -- there is no blackout dates except -- not even  
25 the Kodiak is a blackout date for us.

MS. MASON: Actually, the eastern  
interior would be a problem.

MR. LOHSE: Eastern interior would  
be a problem?

MR. LOHSE: So February 22nd and  
23rd, probably the day before and after is out.

Any suggestions as to when?

Now, we need to get in and out of  
the Kenai probably by either airplane or car from  
Anchorage, right?

What is the preference of the  
Council?

Are we going to need a two-day or  
three-day meeting?

MS. EAKON: Your plate is going to  
be full because you're going to deliberate the  
proposals; you're going to issue a call for fish  
proposal, and you're going to hear probably lots of  
testimony on the Kenai rural/nonrural topic. So, I  
would say at least three day -- three-day window.

MR. DEMENTI: How about March 1st  
until --

MR. LOHSE: March 1st until -- yeah,  
that sounds okay to me.

MS. SWAN: Sounds good.



1 MR. LOHSE: We could carry it over  
2 to Saturday if we had to. Hopefully, we don't have  
3 to carry it over any farther than that; so March  
4 1st, 2nd and 3rd, easy numbers to remember.

5 Is there a motion to that effect?  
6 No motion --

7 MR. JOHN: I make a motion.

8 MR. LOHSE: To move. Everybody was  
9 waiting --

10 MS. SWAN: Second.

11 MR. LOHSE: It's been moved and  
12 seconded that we have March 1st, 2nd, and 3rd at  
13 Kenai.

14 All in favor, signify by saying  
15 "aye."

16 SPEAKERS: Aye.

17 MR. LOHSE: Okay. At this point in  
18 time a motion to adjourn is in order. I'd like to  
19 thank everybody that took part in this meeting.  
20 I'd like to thank you for your comments and the  
21 ideas both in the meeting and in the closures  
22 between the meeting. And I'd like to invite all of  
23 you to come again.

24 Now, motion --

25 MS. SWAN: So moved, Mr. Chairman.

MR. LOHSE: So moved. The meeting  
of the Southcentral Subsistence Advisory Council is  
adjourned.

(Time noted, 12:05 p.m.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



1 I, Sandra M. Mierop, Court Reporter,  
2 hereby certify that the foregoing pages comprise a  
3 true, complete, and correct transcript of the  
4 proceedings had

5  
6 WITNESS MY HAND this the 20th day of  
7 October, 1999.

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
Sandra M. Mierop  
Court Reporter

