

00001

1

2

3

4

5

6

7 FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE BOARD

8 ANCHORAGE HILTON HOTEL

9 ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

10

11

12 VOLUME I

13

14 MAY 13, 2002

15 1:30 o'clock p.m.

16 PUBLIC MEETING

17

18 MEMBERS PRESENT:

19

20 Mitch Demientieff, Chair

21 Gary Edwards, Fish and Wildlife Service

22 Charlie Bunch, Bureau of Indian Affairs

23 Judy Gottlieb, National Park Service

24 Taylor Brelsford, Bureau of Land Management

25 Ken Thompson, U.S. Forest Service

26

27 Keith Goltz, Solicitor

00002

1 PROCEEDINGS

2

3 (Anchorage, Alaska - 5/13/2002)

4

5 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: We'll go ahead and
6 call the meeting to order and begin with introductions.

7 My name is Mitch Demientieff. I'm from Nenana. I've had
8 the pleasure of serving as Chairman of the Federal Board
9 for some seven years now. With that, we'll go around
10 with introductions. We'll start with my left.

11

12 MR. JACK: My name is Carl Jack. Native
13 Liaison.

14

15 MR. EDWARDS: I'm Gary Edwards
16 representing the Fish and Wildlife Service on the Board.

17

18 MR. BOS: Greg Bos, Staff Committee
19 member. Fish and Wildlife Service.

20

21 MR. BUNCH: Charlie Bunch, Bureau of
22 Indian Affairs. I'm sitting in for Niles Cesar, the
23 regional director.

24

25 MS. HILDEBRAND: Ida Hildebrand, BIA
26 Staff Committee member.

27

28 MR. STONEY: Raymond Stoney. I'm from
29 Kiana. I'm a RAC member.

30

31 MR. WILDE: Harry Wilde. Chairman of the
32 Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta.

33

34 MR. GUNDERSON: Paul Gunderson.
35 Kodiak/Aleutians, Vice Chair sitting in for Della
36 Trumble.

37

38 MR. HAYNES: Terry Haynes, Department of
39 Fish and Game. State/Federal Liaison Team. Marianne See
40 sends her regards, she can't be here today.

41

42 MR. KRON: Tom Kron, OSM Staff biologist.

43

44 MR. MIKE: Donald Mike, Eastern Interior
45 Council coordinator.

46

47 MS. CROSS: Grace Cross. Chair for
48 Seward Penn.

49

50 MR. SAM: Ron Sam. Chair, Western

00003

1 Interior.

2

3 MR. NICHOLIA: Gerald Nicholia. Chair of
4 Eastern Interior.

5

6 MR. GOLTZ: Keith Goltz. Solicitor's
7 office.

8

9 MR. BRELSFORD: Good afternoon. I'm
10 Taylor Brelsford. I'll be serving on behalf of Fran
11 Cherry as the BLM Board member during this meeting.
12 Thank you.

13

14 MR. THOMPSON: Ken Thompson. Forest
15 Service.

16

17 MR. RABINOWITCH: Sandy Rabinowitch.
18 Staff Committee for the National Park Service.

19

20 MS. GOTTLIEB: Judy Gottlieb. Board
21 Member, National Park Service.

22

23 MS. FOX: Peggy Fox. Office of
24 Subsistence Management, Fish and Wildlife Service.

25

26 MR. BOYD: Tom Boyd. Office of
27 Subsistence Management.

28

29 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: And he's the one
30 to blame for the spacious meeting quarters we have this
31 week. It will be a nice friendly little meeting. We'll
32 all be real up close and personal all the way through.
33 It's the budget cuts, I think, that caused us to have to
34 get this little space but we'll make it work.

35

36 Are there any corrections or additions to
37 the agenda?

38

39 Ralph, we've already done introductions,
40 maybe you'll want to introduce yourself.

41

42 MR. LOSHE: Ralph Loshe. Chair of
43 Southcentral.

44

45 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: We have one
46 request for public comments. If you do have a request to
47 testify before the Board, the table is set up outside and
48 you can pick up one of the blue request to testify forms
49 and with that we'll open up public comment on non-agenda
50 items. We have Greg Roczicka. I abuse his name as many

00004

1 times as my name gets abused.

2

3 MR. ROCZICKA: Mr. Chairman, I get to be
4 first out of the chute here, rather strange. For the
5 record my name is Greg Roczicka. I work as natural
6 resource director for Oloosikaka Native Council in
7 Bethel. (In Native), which is I've heard it explained
8 that I'm someone that spits very accurately or the
9 sparking of a match; so you can take that as you will. I
10 know there's some new faces here, I tend to be somewhat
11 politically incorrect sometimes so bear with me if I do
12 get that way.

13

14 I wanted to speak on behalf of Kuskokwim
15 Native Association and ONC on this special action request
16 that we put before you and that you addressed here a few
17 weeks ago. I'm also here in the capacity of the vice-
18 chair for RuralCAp. Needless to say we're extremely
19 disappointed that you chose to take the action that you
20 did. We were requesting a preseason approach on this and
21 it's really disturbing to us to see, essentially, there's
22 an unlimited opportunity for sportfishing where
23 subsistence is restricted. It's a very delicate issue
24 and a very hard one for people to swallow. I'm getting
25 feedback from a lot of people that are starting to
26 question, really, why should we even bother to conform
27 with these restrictions. The matter must not be serious
28 enough if sportfish don't rate getting at least equal
29 level of restrictions.

30

31 Maybe in the larger pictures of things,
32 you know, rural Alaska is really under siege on just
33 about all fronts. Management, both competition and
34 consumptive uses and even the non-consumptive users who
35 are driving policy and management decisions to prevent
36 maintaining or rebuilding game populations to a great
37 degree. So we're scared. All right, we're scared. And
38 we're just having no preseason control or setting that
39 policy, if you will, that you're not going to wait to see
40 what comes back before opening it for primarily
41 commercial operations which is the sportfish industry.
42 And we got to start looking at things in the long-term.
43 I mean anybody that's around and familiar with that
44 industry knows that in the course of a few short years, I
45 mean, they're extremely prolific and they can be in there
46 and you'll turn the Holitna into another Kenai River. So
47 it's very worrisome.

48

49 And I guess, just basing your decision on
50 the State's action, if you will, and I put that in quote,

00005

1 action, to close it to June 15th, you know, like that's
2 some kind of a concession, seems to us it's entirely
3 undeserved. But really creating a closure when a
4 migratory species is not even present, how do you justify
5 that as justifiable recognition of accommodating
6 subsistence or recognizing subsistence uses? So, you
7 know, that's really kind of strange logic to me. And I
8 understand the political pressures that come maybe on you
9 to do so and I just hope that for the future you try to
10 take a strong stand and helping those from eroding away
11 at the protection of subsistence and the subsistence way
12 of life.

13

14 Anyway, since you have agreed to, or
15 chosen to take this course and take the issue up again in
16 mid- to late-June, I would at least ask you that when you
17 do so, if you would hold your hearing or your meeting to
18 discuss that out somewhere on the Kuskokwim River in the
19 communities there where the people that you're here to
20 represent will be able to sit in and offer their input on
21 that, in Bethel or Aniak, either one.

22

23 That's all I wanted to offer at this
24 time, so thank you for your time. If you have any other
25 questions I can bounce back at you.

26

27 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: So Greg, the
28 bottom line is you don't feel that we're addressing the
29 concern timely enough? We based our decision, as I
30 recall, on waiting for in-season data to find out --
31 given the fact that the State has a closure in place
32 until the 15th of June and that's the reason why we moved
33 it off to that date. It's certainly not any intention of
34 any of the Board members to put it off for any other
35 reason. But basically that was the decision point.

36

37 MR. ROCZICKA: I could appreciate that
38 and it's one of the messages that's being sent to people
39 out there right now. They're seeing it as it's going to
40 be open, period, and the message, I feel, should come
41 across that it's going to be closed unless you have a
42 return that justifies doing so, in which case it could be
43 opened. Anyway, it's just sending a backwards message
44 that subsistence doesn't have the priority -- or has a
45 priority, only if it doesn't conflict or obstruct
46 sportfishing activities, so people are looking at in that
47 sense.

48

49 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you very
50 much. Are there any other questions?

00006

1 MR. ROCZICKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2

3 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. We
4 have no additional requests at this time for public
5 testimony on non-agenda items, which leads us to
6 statewide Proposal No. 1. I'll have to apologize if
7 we're seeming to flounder a little bit. I didn't get my
8 proposal book until Saturday and, of course, yesterday
9 being Mother's Day, I really haven't had a chance to
10 review it, but we'll find our way through this.

11

12 We have the consent agenda items. In
13 Southeast, we have Proposal No. 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11 and
14 15 that are on the consent agenda at this time. In
15 Southcentral, we have Proposal No. 17 and Proposal No.
16 20(A). Kodiak/Aleutians, Proposal No. 21, 22, 23, 47(A)
17 and (B). In Bristol Bay, we have Proposal No. 24, 25,
18 26, 27. In Western Interior, we have Proposal No. 32.
19 Seward Peninsula, Proposal 33, 34, 35 and 37. Northwest
20 Arctic, we have Proposal No. 41. Eastern Interior,
21 Proposal No. 42 and 43. And in the North Slope, we have
22 Proposal No. 44 and 45. And we have also a request at
23 this time to pull Proposal No. 17, so that will be taken
24 off of the consent agenda.

25

26 If there are other issues or other
27 requests that come up, normally, we deal with the consent
28 agenda items at the conclusion of deliberating the
29 proposals that are non-consent agenda items. So if there
30 are additional requests to pull any of these proposals
31 off, we won't take final action until after the Board
32 process here.

33

34 Okay, with that, we'll go ahead and move
35 on to statewide Proposal No. 1. Tom Kron. Go ahead,
36 Tom.

37

38 MR. KRON: Mr. Chair, members of the
39 Federal Subsistence Board, Regional Council Chairs.
40 Again, my name is Tom Kron from OSM. I'll be presenting
41 the Staff analysis on Wildlife Proposal WP02-01. This
42 proposal was submitted by Craig Fleener of the Eastern
43 Interior Regional Council. Information concerning this
44 proposal can be found under Tab A starting on Page 1.

45

46 The proposal requests that black and
47 brown bear be classified as furbearers. The proponent
48 wishes to sell hides and parts of black and brown bears
49 taken on Federal lands. This is a statewide proposals.
50 With the exception of an article of handicraft made from

00007

1 the fur of black bears, the purchase, sale or barter of
2 any part of a black or brown bear is prohibited. The
3 sale of brown bear hides has been illegal since 1925.
4 And this species has never been classified as a furbearer
5 in Alaska. The black bear was originally classified as a
6 furbearer until 1938 when it was reclassified as a game
7 species. The sale of all black bear hides has been
8 illegal since 1971.

9
10 Both black and brown bear populations are
11 generally healthy across most of Alaska, there are
12 concerns that several relatively small isolated
13 populations of brown bears -- bears have the lowest
14 population growth rates of North American land mammals,
15 significant population declines tend to be long and
16 difficult to reverse. Current harvest levels of black
17 and brown bears in Alaska appear to be fairly high when
18 compared to historic record. Native Alaskans have
19 harvested bears and competed with them for subsistence
20 resources for, at least, 14,000 years. Both black and
21 brown bears have traditionally been very important in
22 Alaska Native cultures. In certain areas of the state,
23 the harvest and handling of bears is subject to cultural
24 requirements. In the Koyukuk, Athabascan culture, for
25 example, it would be inappropriate to consider selling
26 bear hides or parts. There is a commercial market for
27 bear hides, claws, skulls, teeth and gallbladders.
28 Commercial sales of legally taken bear hides and parts
29 are allowed in parts of Canada and the Lower 48 states.

30
31 This proposal seeks a major change in the
32 approach to black and brown bear management in Alaska.
33 Such a change could be expected to impact a wide variety
34 of related programs and regulations. There are cultural,
35 biological and jurisdictional concerns associated with
36 this broad statewide proposal. Given the commercial
37 aspects of this proposal and the legal and jurisdictional
38 issues, it may be most appropriate for the proponent to
39 work with the Alaska Board of Game to address these
40 concerns.

41
42 This concludes the summary of this
43 analysis. I welcome your comments and questions. Thank
44 you, Mr. Chair.

45
46 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Any questions.
47 Summary of written public comments.

48
49 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. There
50 are a total of seven written public comments. Two are in

00008

1 support of the proposal and five were opposing the
2 proposal.

3

4 Glen Alsworth of Port Alsworth is in
5 support. He is in favor of adopting the new wording
6 changing the regulation. He believes that any time that
7 a subsistence user can derive more benefit from a legally
8 taken subsistence resource, the better.

9

10 The Lake Clark Subsistence Resource
11 Commission supports and recommends supporting Proposal 1
12 because it will allow bears taken for subsistence to be
13 more fully utilized and provide a potential source of
14 income for subsistence users.

15

16 The Aniakchak Subsistence Resource
17 Commission unanimously opposes this regulation change as
18 written. It is the feeling of the SRC that the proposal
19 could have a negative influence on subsistence and could
20 lead to the overharvesting of bears in the Aniakchak
21 area.

22

23 The Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence
24 Resource Commission opposes this proposal based on legal,
25 cultural and biological concerns.

26

27 Colonel Joel Hard, director of the State
28 of Alaska, Department of Public Safety opposes the
29 proposal. He believes that allowing the sale of bear
30 parts will increase illegal take and waste of bears.
31 Will exacerbate the black market issues or go against a
32 North American trend that is more restrictive concerning
33 sale and is not consistent with customary and traditional
34 practices. The Department of Public Safety is opposed to
35 Proposal 1, which would reclassify brown bear and black
36 bear as furbearers and allow the sale of bear parts.

37

38 The Denali National Park and Preserve
39 Subsistence Resource Commission opposes Proposal 1, which
40 includes brown bear and black bear in the furbearer
41 definition and to allow bear parts to be sold. The SRC
42 therefore approves the Staff analysis preliminary
43 conclusion for the reasons stated in the justification.

44

45 Steve Oberholtzer, Department of Law
46 Enforcement, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service opposes
47 Proposal 1. The Division of Law Enforcement opposes
48 legalizing the sale of bear parts other than fur hair to
49 be used in handicrafts. The reasons for this are basic.
50 Legalizing the sale of bear parts conflicts with State

00009

1 law, will undermine enforcement efforts in this and other
2 states and may significantly decrease the population of
3 bears in Alaska.

4

5 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

6

7 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: We have one
8 request for public testimony at this time. Roy Tansy.

9

10 MR. TANSY: Thank you. My name is Roy
11 Tansy. I'm from Cantwell, Native Village of Cantwell. I
12 represent Cantwell on the Board in subsistence.

13

14 I'm here to testify today that the
15 Proposal 1, that the subsistence representatives of the
16 Ahtna region met April 22nd and are opposed to the
17 proposition as it is written. We would like to have just
18 the skin, the claws and the teeth to be used for
19 customary and traditional use of the black and brown
20 bear, furbearer definition proposal. We support these
21 parts to be only used for customary and traditional use
22 and to include the brown bear and black bear into the
23 furbearer definition. These parts have been customary
24 and traditionally used by Ahtna people for a long time,
25 ornaments and clothes.

26

27 That's about it. Thank you very much.

28

29 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Any
30 questions. Bill.

31

32 MR. THOMAS: One question.....

33

34 REPORTER: Your mic, Mr. Thomas, please.
35 Your microphone. Thank you.

36

37 MR. THOMAS: Would you insist that I get
38 more respect from the recorder than that.

39

40 With regards to the parts and limiting to
41 the claws, the hide, the head, I am wondering what would
42 prohibit the gallbladder from being included in that,
43 just out of curiosity? I hear different levels of
44 information regarding the value of those parts. I don't
45 have any objection, I was just wondering what would they
46 do, bury the gallbladder when they got everything else?

47

48 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

49

50 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Roy.

00010

1 MR. TANSY: Yes, I would assume that
2 would probably be the correct way. Bears have been very
3 sacred in the Cantwell region for a long time. A lot of
4 the bears, not really good for us, as much as eating and
5 taking care of, but like I said it's a very important
6 issue to the elders in our area.

7
8 Thank you.

9
10 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you.
11 Gloria, is this an issue that Copper River wants to
12 testify on, Proposal No. 1?

13
14 MS. STICKWAN: My name is Gloria
15 Stickwan. I work for Copper River Native Association. I
16 put down all proposals to testify at this time if that's
17 okay?

18
19 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: You want to go
20 ahead and testify, you're not going to be here the rest
21 of the week?

22
23 MS. STICKWAN: I'm going to try and be
24 here for Proposal 17.

25
26 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yeah, that would
27 be fine.

28
29 MS. STICKWAN: We, the Copper River
30 people oppose WP02-01 as it is written. We said that we
31 only wanted the skin and claws and teeth to be used for
32 customary and traditional use and not to include all bear
33 parts in the furbearer proposal.

34
35 In response to Mr. Thomas' question, I
36 just want to add that gallbladders were used for
37 medicinal purposes for the Ahtna people. They used to
38 pour it into water, a little tiny drop, and use it in the
39 eye, mouth, just a little tiny drop mixed with water but
40 we did not support using that because we thought it would
41 be abused by people just getting the bear just for the
42 gallbladder part.

43
44 We would like to have Proposal 16 adopted
45 with the Bureau of Land Management's proposal that was
46 written but we'd like the dates changed from December to
47 March 31st. Since I understand that proposal was
48 deferred, I think we would like to go along and defer it.
49 We'll wait to see how the caribou are doing and then
50 possibly bring that back to the Board again and have it

00011

1 reconsidered.

2

3 We support Proposal WP02-19 to establish
4 a regulation for harvesting of moose for ceremonial
5 purposes in Units 11 and 12.

6

7 That's all I have.

8

9 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you very
10 much. Any questions. Thank you. We have no additional
11 requests for public testimony at this time with regard to
12 Proposal No. 1. Regional Council recommendation. Ron.

13

14 MR. SAM: Yeah, we opposed this proposal.
15 But as you will see through quite a few other proposals,
16 while it is already approved by the State and it is legal
17 under the State system, we would like to approve the
18 modification to align with the existing State
19 regulations, that part, just to provide more subsistence
20 opportunities for our users.

21

22 Thank you.

23

24 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Harry.

25

26 MR. WILDE: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. Yukon-
27 Kuskokwim Delta Subsistence Regional Council oppose 01
28 and also Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Advisory Council
29 recommends that OSM Staff write up a proposal that aligns
30 the Federal regulation with the State regulation to allow
31 for the sale of bear parts such as fur for handicraft.

32

33 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you.
34 Additional Regional Council comment. Ralph.

35

36 MR. LOHSE: Southcentral Regional Council
37 supports this proposal with modification. The Council
38 recommends that we have an amendment to this to allow
39 only black bears and not black bears and brown bears, but
40 to allow them to stay under their current classification
41 but to allow subsistence users to take and use for sale
42 the hides, the skull, the teeth and the claws. We
43 strongly oppose the reclassification of bears out of
44 respect for them, they're not furbearers. Bears don't
45 belong in the same category as rabbit and squirrels. But
46 we do support allowing subsistence hunters that kill a
47 bear for meat to make full use of the bear for the
48 support of their family. We do not recognize the selling
49 of bear gallbladders as a customary and traditional use
50 of bears.

00012

1 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you.
2 Additional Regional Council comment. Paul.

3

4 MR. GUNDERSON: Kodiak/Aleutian oppose
5 but support alignment with the State regulation regarding
6 the sale of handicraft made from black bear fur. The
7 Council believes not enough information was presented to
8 support this change that would have statewide effects,
9 particularly since some of the communities and cultures
10 have spoken against this action. Possibly the proponent
11 could develop an alternative proposal.

12

13 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Grace.

14

15 MS. CROSS: Seward-Penn Council opposes
16 this proposal. We felt that it was inappropriate for a
17 statewide regulation and should be addressed on a region-
18 to-region basis. One of the reasons why we were not
19 prepared to support the proposal was we didn't have much
20 knowledge about Athabascan traditional ways relating to
21 bears.

22

23 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you.
24 Additional Regional Council comment. Dan.

25

26 MR. O'HARA: Bristol Bay would like to
27 have some additional information on this before we
28 support it. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

29

30 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Any
31 other Regional Council comment. Gerald.

32

33 MR. NICHOLIA: Yeah, Mr. Chair, I wasn't
34 at our last meeting but I think Craig Fleener was trying
35 to have more utilization of bear parts. But in my
36 Koyukon culture, it's different than the G'witchen
37 culture and it's forbidden in our culture to sell brown
38 parts of any kind. I don't know about Craig's.

39

40 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Any
41 other Regional Council comment. Hearing none, Staff
42 Committee recommendation.

43

44 MR. JACK: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, the Staff
45 Committee recommendation has two parts. First oppose the
46 proposal consistent with the recommendations of the
47 majority of the Federal Subsistence Regional Councils.
48 The second part is, adopt the following regulatory
49 language, which would allow the sale of handicrafts made
50 from black bear fur. And this would be to align with the

00013

1 State regulations.

2

3 On Section 25, utilization of fish and
4 wildlife or sell fish. You may sell handicraft,
5 handicraft articles made from the fur of black bear. On
6 Section 25(a) definition, handicraft means a finished
7 product in which the shape and appearance of the natural
8 material has been substantially changed by skillful use
9 of hands such as sewing, carving, etching, scrimshaw,
10 painting or other means and which has substantially
11 greater monetary and aesthetic value than the altered
12 natural material while alone.

13

14 The justification is the proposal
15 generates legal, cultural and biological concerns. Legal
16 and jurisdictional issues are primary factors affecting
17 this recommendation except for an article of handicraft
18 made from the fur of black bear. The purchase, sale or
19 barter of any parts of the bear is prohibited by Alaska
20 state regulations. This proposal seems in direct
21 conflict with traditional cultural values in several
22 areas of Alaska. In the Koyukon/Athabaskan culture it is
23 inappropriate to sell items that include bear parts. In
24 the Athabaskan, Inupiat, Yup'ik and Alutiq cultures, it
25 has been reported that there is a preference for leaving
26 the bear hide and/or skull in the field. Historically
27 commercialization of wildlife has a track record of being
28 detrimental to population of large bodied species of
29 wildlife.

30

31 Biologically bear are far different than
32 furbearers that trappers harvest. For instance, brown
33 bear have the lowest population growth rates of any
34 species of North America land mammals. Brown bear
35 females may not produce their first cubs until age five
36 to 10 and then only produce subsequent litters an average
37 of every three to four years. Because of these
38 biological constraints, the reproduction rate is low and
39 except under special circumstances in limited areas.
40 Regulations governing bear harvest should be conservative
41 to avoid over exploitation. As a result of their
42 sensitivity to overharvest, there are presently concerns
43 about the health of certain Alaska brown bear
44 populations.

45

46 While black bear are more productive than
47 brown bear, similar principles apply to their management.
48 Decline in bear population may be gradual and go
49 undetected for a long period of time. The Alaska Board
50 of Game authorized the sale of handicraft made from black

00014

1 bear fur in 1998. Subsequent to that time there has been
2 no follow-up proposals to align Federal regulations with
3 these State regulations. It seems appropriate to align
4 these regulations in order to facilitate consistency and
5 reduce confusion.

6

7 Given these legal and jurisdictional
8 issues, the commercial aspect of this proposal it may be
9 appropriate for the proponent to work with the Alaska
10 Board of Game to address his remaining concerns.

11

12 Thank you.

13

14 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you.
15 Department comments.

16

17 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
18 The Department supports the Staff Committee
19 recommendation to oppose this proposal but to allow the
20 sale of handicraft items made from the black bear fur
21 consistent with existing provisions in State regulation.

22

23 The Department does not support including
24 brown and bear within the definition of furbearer. Nor
25 do we support expanding the sale of bear parts beyond
26 that currently authorized in State regulation. Allowing
27 the sale of certain bear parts could promote
28 unsustainable harvest in some parts of the state.
29 Additionally, Alaska Native traditions surrounding the
30 care, treatment and handling of harvested bears remains
31 strong in many parts of Alaska. For individuals adhering
32 to these beliefs, the sale of items that include bear
33 parts could be viewed as inappropriate and disrespectful.

34

35 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you very
36 much. Board discussion. Judy.

37

38 MS. GOTTLIEB: Gerald, maybe I could ask
39 you or maybe the coordinator knows, I was wondering when
40 Craig is expected to be back?

41

42 MR. NICHOLIA: The last I heard he was
43 being reassigned is the last thing I heard.

44

45 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Don.

46

47 MR. MIKE: Yes, Mr. Chair. Just
48 following the latest news, I understand the military is
49 demobilizing the people that are assigned to the security
50 of the international airports. There's a possibility he

00015

1 may return to Ft. Yukon. Thank you.

2

3 MS. GOTTLIEB: Mr. Chair.

4

5 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes.

6

7 MS. GOTTLIEB: I guess I would offer, I
8 think we all have a lot of respect for Craig and his
9 ideas and suggestions, so it might be good to wait until
10 he does return for a portion of the proposal as suggested
11 so that he could take into account all the comments that
12 have been made in his absence and perhaps do some further
13 work in consultation with all the Councils.

14

15 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: So you're
16 recommending a deferral of the proposal? Yes, go ahead.

17

18 MS. GOTTLIEB: Yes. We might want to
19 either defer all of it or support some of the parts where
20 there does seem to be general agreement but rather than
21 perhaps turn him down flat on some of the parts of it,
22 wait for his return for more discussion. That's an
23 option here.

24

25 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Will he be here
26 this week? Nobody knows. Any other discussion?

27

28 MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman.

29

30 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes.

31

32 MR. THOMPSON: Yes, I would be interested
33 in hearing what Staff might suggest could be some
34 repercussions if we do defer the whole thing and not
35 provide a line up with the State regulations in the
36 interim.

37

38 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Gerald.

39

40 MR. NICHOLIA: Yeah, is it possible to
41 defer part of this proposal and then adopt the black bear
42 part?

43

44 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Bill, maybe you
45 could help us out on this part? Bill's our regulatory
46 specialist. You heard the question, I guess, uh?

47

48 MR. KNAUER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. It is
49 possible to adopt the Staff Committee recommendation and
50 then allow Mr. Fleener to present a modified proposal

00016

1 that addresses his concerns. Our regulations are
2 reviewed annually and the opportunity for change occurs
3 there. So there would be no long-term adverse effect in
4 that regard.

5

6 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Ron.

7

8 MR. SAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. If you
9 remember a few years back we had some legal ramifications
10 because of arts and crafts under bear parts and I believe
11 that if we do align with the existing State regulations,
12 I believe that we could do away with most of these small
13 charges and, you know, trouble with this.

14

15 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Gary.

16

17 MR. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I guess I
18 would suggest that instead of deferring it, because from
19 my perspective and reading the comments that we received
20 from the majority of our RACs, most of them were
21 unanimously opposed to expanding the sale of bear parts
22 and I guess I would suggest that we could go along with
23 the Staff Committee and then if the individual would like
24 to come back and make a different proposal then we could
25 address it at that time.

26

27 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Other discussion.
28 Ken.

29

30 MR. THOMPSON: Is that a motion, Gary?

31

32 MR. EDWARDS: I thought we were still in
33 discussion.

34

35 MR. THOMPSON: Okay.

36

37 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Is there any other
38 discussion? Yeah, I think for myself -- well, maybe
39 we'll get a motion on the floor first. Gary.

40

41 MR. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I move that
42 we accept the Staff Committee's recommendation, thereby,
43 rejecting the proposal as written, but having a modified
44 proposal which would allow for the use of black bear fur
45 for handicraft purposes to align our regulations with
46 those of the State.

47

48 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: There's a motion.
49 Is there a second?

50

00017

1 MR. THOMPSON: Second.

2

3 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: It's been moved
4 and seconded. Discussion on the motion. Well, I intend
5 to vote for the motion for the reasons that our process
6 is very participatory. Out of respect to Mr. Fleener, if
7 it's something that he feels that we need to take a
8 further look at this year, he has the opportunity for a
9 special action request. And the fact is as was stated
10 previously, that our regulatory process is open each and
11 every year and since most of our Regional Councils are in
12 favor of the modification that's the reason that I intend
13 to vote for the Staff Committee recommendation.

14

15 Other discussion. Regional Councils, no
16 more? Gerald.

17

18 MR. NICHOLIA: Yeah, I'd say be very
19 careful in making sure they understand you may sell
20 handicraft articles made from fur of the black bear and
21 you got to mention something about the claws or the hide
22 -- I mean the claws or the skull or the teeth, the
23 gallbladder, too, because they might take too much
24 advantage of what we're trying to do right here.

25

26 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Further
27 discussion. Hearing none, all those in favor of the
28 motion please signify by saying aye.

29

30 IN UNISON: Aye.

31

32 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Those opposed.

33

34 (No opposing votes)

35

36 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Motion carries.
37 With that we move to Northwest Arctic, Region 8, Proposal
38 WO02-39. With that we'll go to Donna to do the analysis.

39

40 MS. DEWHURST: Proposal 39 was submitted
41 by the Northwest Arctic Regional Advisory Council. It is
42 making adjustments in the sheep harvest in the Baird and
43 DeLong Mountains in Units 23 and 26(A). This proposal
44 was not a biologically driven proposal but more a user
45 conflicts issue. Interestingly enough it's a user
46 conflict among Federally-qualified subsistence users so
47 it makes it a little bit more difficult.

48

49 It's gone through a lot of changes in the
50 past several months. The gist of the proposal has two

00018

1 parts. The first part is to require the destruction of
2 the trophy value of the horns by a National Park Service
3 representative and with the newest language suggested by
4 the Staff Committee, that's further defined and
5 clarified. The other aspect is to delegate authority to
6 the Park Superintendent, specifically Dave Spirites right
7 now, to be able to announce the winter season and
8 announce the harvest quotas. And the reasoning for that
9 was, the idea was to ensure -- the reason that the
10 seasons were split initially, there's a fall and winter
11 season, the reason the seasons were split was ideally the
12 fall season would be aircraft access and boat access and
13 the winter season was supposed to be snowmachine. But in
14 recent years opening October 1 there hasn't been enough
15 snow to use snowmachines so aircraft could still access.
16 So by the superintendent announcing the opening of the
17 winter season he could wait until there is adequate
18 snowfall to ensure that the winter season does provide
19 priority for snowmachine users. So that's the gist of
20 it.

21

22 It has gone through several rewrites, the
23 most recent of which was by the Staff Committee and went
24 a long ways to clarify the language further. That
25 concludes the analysis.

26

27 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you.
28 Summary of written public comments.

29

30 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
31 There were none.

32

33 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. We
34 have no request for additional public testimony at this
35 time. Regional Council recommendation.

36

37 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Raymond you get to
38 read them.

39

40 MR. STONEY: Mr. Chairman, since I'm new
41 on this I think that Helen's got more information than I
42 do if that's.....

43

44 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Would you like me to
45 read it for you?

46

47 MR. STONEY: Yes, please.

48

49 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Raymond's our acting
50 Chair and this is his first Board meeting.

00019

1 The Council supports with modification to
2 clarify the language in the regulation stating that the
3 superintendent of the Western Arctic National Park lands
4 will announce the quota and the dates of the fall and
5 winter sheep hunting season in the DeLong and Baird
6 Mountains in Units 23 and 26(A). The quota could be
7 zero. The trophy value of the horns must be destroyed by
8 an NPS or an NPS representative upon return from the
9 field.

10
11 Requiring destruction of the trophy value
12 of the sheep horns would limit or prevent local
13 subsistence users use of these horns for crafts or
14 keepsake. However, the Northwest Arctic Regional Council
15 expressed that this loss of craft value of horns would
16 not have much of an impact on the subsistence value of
17 area sheep to most users. Allowing the superintendent of
18 the Western Arctic National Park lands to set both the
19 season harvest quotas and the dates of the winter season
20 would build in more flexibility into the harvest
21 management system as long as close consultation is
22 maintained with ADF&G and BLM prior to making these
23 announcements.

24
25 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

26
27 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Staff
28 Committee recommendation.

29
30 MR. RABINOWITCH: Thank you, Mr.
31 Chairman. The Staff Committee recommends adopting the
32 proposal as modified by the Northwest Regional Council
33 with some minor word changes. I think I would
34 characterize these minor word changes as wordsmithing,
35 trying to continue along with the intent of the Council
36 but to further clarify items. One example would be to
37 further clarify the destruction of the trophy value. So
38 I know that we're going to get into this a little bit
39 more in a moment.

40
41 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. I'm
42 going to backtrack a minute. Since the North Slope
43 representative is not here at this time, we'll ask their
44 Regional coordinator to go ahead and give their comment.

45
46 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
47 The North Slope Regional Council recommendation is to
48 defer. There were concerns regarding destruction of the
49 trophy value of the horns effectively eliminating craft
50 use. More information was requested about justification

00020

1 of this aspect of the proposal. The North Slope Council
2 chose to defer their decision until the Northwest Arctic
3 met and considered the proposal.

4

5 Thank you.

6

7 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you.

8 Department comments.

9

10 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
11 The Department supports the proposal as modified by the
12 Staff Committee to reinstitute the fall season dates for
13 sheep hunts in portions of Unit 23 and 26(A). Authorizes
14 the Western Arctic National Park land superintendent to
15 open the winter season by announcement and divide the
16 harvest quota equally between the fall and winter
17 seasons. However, opening the Federal sheep hunting
18 seasons in Unit 23 and 26(A) by announcement may create
19 more differences between the State and Federal seasons
20 and will make it more difficult for the public to comply
21 with the regulations. Eliminating use of aircraft for
22 these hunts and/or delaying the winter season openings to
23 mid-October or early November are alternative measures
24 for addressing some of the problems identified in this
25 proposal that could be considered and would result in
26 more consistency between the State and Federal
27 regulations.

28

29 If this proposal is adopted as modified
30 by Federal Staff, then timely consultation by the Western
31 Arctic National Park land superintendent with the
32 Department and the BLM is essential.

33

34 Thank you.

35

36 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. We're
37 now ready to advance this to Board discussion. Sandy.

38

39 MR. RABINOWITCH: Yes, Mr. Chairman,
40 excuse me. I forgot to mention one thing and I know that
41 Judy will bring this up again in a minute. But we did
42 find two errors in the Staff Committee recommendation
43 that were inadvertently added into the record and I just
44 want to be clear and point these out in a moment, there
45 are two lines in here that were added in by mistake, I
46 actually think I'm the guilty party when we were doing
47 our editing. On Page 4, this is Tab B, Page 4 and the
48 second one is Page 5. On Page 4 on the left column
49 you'll see two large paragraphs, if you go to the bottom
50 paragraph that begins Unit 23 north, and you go down

00021

1 about 10 lines there's a sentence which reads, Federal
2 public lands are closed to the taking of sheep except by
3 Federally-qualified users. That same line is on Page 5
4 also about 10 lines down. Those were simply added in by
5 error in the editing process, they don't exist in the
6 existing regulation and there was no intent on anyone's
7 part that they be added.

8

9 So if they could just be lined out that
10 will shorten the discussion a little bit. And I've
11 checked with a number of members of the Staff Committee
12 to ensure that what I've just told you is correct.

13

14 Thank you.

15

16 MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman.

17

18 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes.

19

20 MR. THOMPSON: Yeah, Donna, correct me if
21 I'm wrong but wasn't there some element of a late survey
22 on sheep in August and the inability to have that data in
23 a manner timely for Board action or am I thinking of
24 something else?

25

26 MS. DEWHURST: I think you're thinking of
27 something else.

28

29 MR. THOMPSON: That's not a factor in
30 this case?

31

32 MS. DEWHURST: The sheeps are grazing in
33 mid-summer, yeah.

34

35 MR. THOMPSON: All right.

36

37 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Further
38 discussion. With regard to the, what do we call it, the
39 corrections to the proposal, what exactly did you want to
40 have stricken out, Federally-qualified?

41

42 MR. RABINOWITCH: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The
43 sentence that I read you'll find in three places in this
44 regulation. The first location is in the first paragraph
45 on the left side, the left column, it says Unit 23 south
46 and those words belong in that first paragraph. It's in
47 the second paragraph which begins Unit 23 north and the
48 third paragraph which begins Unit 26(A) that the deletion
49 should occur. Again, in the second and the third
50 paragraphs are where the deletion occurs.

00022

1 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay, got it.
2 Okay, is there any objection to the correction? Anybody.
3 Anybody have any objection at all to the correction?
4 We'll just go ahead and take it out like that, I don't
5 think it takes a Board action to do that if it's simply a
6 correction of an error. Further discussion.

7
8 MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman.

9
10 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Taylor.

11
12 MR. BRELSFORD: I'd like to applaud the
13 National Park Service and the Regional Council
14 representatives for working closely on a local solution
15 of this sort. I think we've heard in the last several
16 years that there is some concern about a reasonable
17 sharing of the sheep allocation between the hub community
18 of Kotzebue and the smaller communities. And I know
19 various ideas were discussed and considered as a tool to
20 achieve that end. In the first instance, I wouldn't have
21 thought destroying the trophy value of horns was a
22 primary way to achieve that goal. Because I believe
23 horns have been used in handicrafts in the region.
24 However, I recognize that the Regional Council has
25 thought this out at the local level and arrived at a
26 package of changes that they believe will be most
27 successful in achieving a better sharing of that sheep
28 allocation between the large and the smaller communities.

29
30 So on the basis of the Regional Councils
31 considered judgment on this, I'm prepared to support the
32 proposed changes as we've heard them discussed.

33
34 Thank you.

35
36 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Judy.

37
38 MS. GOTTLIEB: Mr. Chair, thank you.
39 There are about four different areas of change that we'd
40 like to point out and this proposal is a bit complex. We
41 have a handout here that illustrates, in at least a
42 couple of colors, what some of those changes are. So if
43 we can hand those out, I'll ask Sandy to go through the
44 changes so everybody's clear. Again, we really believe
45 that the intent of the RAC and the proponent is still all
46 in there, we just want to go through the changes.

47
48 MR. RABINOWITCH: Mr. Chairman, that's
49 working its way around the table so I'll give everybody a
50 few minutes to get that. And, I think, Donna and Terry

00023

1 when they come to you, if there's extras if you can just
2 pass them to anyone in the audience who might want them.
3 We also have this on a disk, Mr. Chairman, so I'll leave
4 it to you as to whether you want to try and get it up on
5 the screen or not but I brought it with me here.

6

7 (Pause)

8

9 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay, Sandy.

10

11 MR. RABINOWITCH: Okay. Let me
12 conceptually try to explain what all this yellow color
13 and there's a little blue color and the redline and
14 strikeout are trying to do. The first body of text deals
15 with the trophy value aspect that Taylor spoke about a
16 minute ago. During the Staff Committee discussions, the
17 Park Service was asked if it would try to bring to this
18 table today more specific language about how to destroy
19 trophy value of the horns. So our Staff in Kotzebue
20 worked on that. We also consulted with Fish and Wildlife
21 Service and BIA and went around and around trying to find
22 language that would accomplish the goal of the RAC,
23 result in clear regulation and then fundamentally do
24 three things. One, make clear to the hunter what the
25 hunter has to do. Make clear to the agency, in this case
26 the Park Service, what it had to do. And make clear for
27 everybody what happened to the horns when the trophy
28 value is destroyed. So those were our goals.

29

30 We also combined all the language that
31 had previously been in two or three locations in the
32 regulation together. And so the net effect is the
33 following. I think I'll just read this. The hunter must
34 deliver the horns attached to the skull to the National
35 Park Service or National Park Service representative
36 within 30 days of harvesting the animal. The Park
37 Service or its representative will destroy the trophy
38 value by removing and destroying four inches of one horn
39 from the base end of the horn. What this is trying to
40 accomplish, again, is that the hunter, the agency both
41 understand what needs to happen and when and then the
42 actual destruction gets at both the monetary value and
43 what some will refer to as the book value of the horns.
44 At the same time by only destroying one horn it leaves
45 the other horn fully available for handicrafts and, in
46 fact, possibly some of both horns. So that's the intent
47 there. And that language carries through on all three
48 paragraphs; Unit 23 north, Unit 23 south and Unit 26(A).

49

50 The second body of text has to do with

00024

1 the delegation to the Park Service superintendent. What
2 the changes shown in yellow here are primarily trying to
3 do delete some language about the annual sheep population
4 survey. The language has been in the regulation for a
5 couple of years. As far as I know it's not been a
6 problem but it was brought out during this review process
7 that someone could interpret the sheep population survey
8 being actually a requirement of the regulation. That is,
9 if you didn't do the sheep population survey you actually
10 couldn't announce a quota. We don't think that was ever
11 anyone's intent when it was brought up. We thought it
12 made sense to just delete it out of here and not go down
13 that road.

14

15 The third part we've effectively dealt
16 with and that is the language that crept into two of the
17 paragraphs by error and, Mitch, we've already taken care
18 of that. That's shown as the sort of dark blue and dark
19 blue strikeout at the very bottom of the first page and
20 toward the middle of the second page and so I won't dwell
21 on that.

22

23 And then the fourth and last area of
24 change in the right-hand column. What we've done is try
25 to add some simple language in at the request of many of
26 the users in the region who have repeatedly asked our
27 Staff in Kotzebue to try to word this in a plain and easy
28 to understand way. So the intent of adding in, for
29 example, fall season, total annual relating to quota,
30 those are all attempts to just seeking clarity.

31

32 The only other one to point out there is
33 that you see the addition of April 1st, again, this is in
34 the right-hand column. There's nothing new about April
35 1st. It's the existing closing date for the regulation.
36 So, again, the goal is just clarity, that everybody knows
37 what that is and that it remain in existing regulation.
38 I would also point out, relative to Terry's comments a
39 moment ago, April 1st is different than the State's
40 closure, which I believe is April 30th. Terry, is that
41 correct?

42

43 MR. HAYNES: (Nods affirmatively)

44

45 MR. RABINOWITCH: Okay. So again, our
46 suggestion of April 1st isn't a change it's just for
47 clarity. I think I'll stop there and see if there are
48 questions.

49

50 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Any questions for

00025

1 Sandy. Bill.

2

3 MR. THOMAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We
4 go right from the ridiculous to the sublime here. I
5 guess I'm having trouble understanding why trophy horns
6 couldn't be used for handicrafts in any case. What's the
7 need for the destruction?

8

9 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Sandy.

10

11 MR. RABINOWITCH: There might be more
12 than one of us who would like to respond to you, Bill,
13 and I don't think I'm the only one that can. The Council
14 heard -- I'm hesitating because I'm partially feel like
15 I'm answering for the Council. The Council heard from
16 within the community a number of problems about this hunt
17 last year. And as a result at their meeting there were
18 four or five, and I would welcome Helen and Donna and, of
19 course, Raymond to join in, the Council heard four or
20 five different alternative solutions to the problems they
21 heard about the hunt from the previous year. Destroying
22 the trophy value of the horns but was one of those, okay,
23 there were others.

24

25 And I think as Taylor said, that I was
26 personally probably surprised as he was, that this is
27 where the Council ended up. This is the vehicle they
28 chose to try to address the problems in, primarily
29 Kotzebue, I think. So what we've tried to do is tried to
30 craft the language to do what we believe the Council
31 wanted.

32

33 Maybe I should stop there and see if
34 others want to add anything or not.

35

36 MR. THOMAS: Let me respond to that a
37 little bit first. A couple of things. So far it all
38 sounds like guess work. It starts off with hearsay, it
39 starts off with anticipating and then you're hoping you
40 reach the conclusion that's satisfactory to the Council.
41 I never heard of anybody -- I haven't heard a violation
42 of any kind is what I'm not hearing. So I'm wondering
43 why the need to destroy trophy value.

44

45 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Helen.

46

47 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Maybe I can offer a
48 little bit of information. It was a member of the
49 Council from Noatak who asked for this because the people
50 in Noatak weren't particularly concerned with the horns

00026

1 and there was a concern that there might be people in
2 Kotzebue who cared a little bit more about the horns than
3 they did about the meat. And because there was such a
4 limited hunt with so few animals, if too many people from
5 Kotzebue got it then there wasn't going to be enough for
6 people in places like Noatak. And so that's where they
7 came up with this compromise, a solution to make sure
8 that people were going after it for the meat and not the
9 horns.

10

11 MR. THOMAS: That's good enough for me,
12 Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

13

14 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay. Grace.

15

16 MS. CROSS: I just need to make a
17 correction. Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory Council
18 has never discussed this issue although this paper said
19 it. I asked the Staff and I didn't recall ever
20 discussing this and the people that were at the meeting
21 also cannot recall ever discussing this.

22

23 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay, we'll note
24 that correction for the record. Other discussion.

25

26 MS. GOTTLIEB: Mr. Chairman, are you
27 ready for a motion?

28

29 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes.

30

31 MS. GOTTLIEB: I move that we modify the
32 recommendations of both the Northwest Arctic Regional
33 Advisory Council and the Staff Committee as reflected in
34 the handout that we just provided.

35

36 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: There's a motion,
37 is there a second?

38

39 MR. EDWARDS: Second.

40

41 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: It's been moved
42 and seconded. Discussion on the motion. No discussion.
43 Are we ready for a vote? All those in favor of the
44 motion please signify by saying aye.

45

46 IN UNISON: Aye.

47

48 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Those opposed same
49 sign.

50

00027

1 (No opposing votes)

2

3 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Motion carries.

4 That moves us to the Seward Peninsula region and we'll

5 stand down for a second while we get Staff set up.

6

7 (Pause)

8

9 MS. MCCLENAHAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

10 I'm Pat McClenahan, Staff anthropologist. We're at Tab

11 C, Page 63. This is the Staff analysis for Proposal

12 WP02-36.

13

14 This proposal was submitted by former

15 Seward Peninsula Subsistence Regional Advisory Council

16 member, Toby Anungazuk, Jr., on behalf of the Native

17 Village of Wales. This proposal would establish and set

18 in place in permanent regulations a ceremonial harvest of

19 one muskox and one bull moose for use at the Kinguitmuit

20 Festival. There are no prior temporary or permanent

21 regulations for this proposal.

22

23 The proposed regulation would be the

24 taking of one moose, bull and one muskox by the residents

25 of Wales as allowed for the celebration of the

26 Kinguitmuit Dance Festival under the terms of a Federal

27 registration permit. Permits will be issued to

28 individuals only at the request of the Native of Wales.

29 The harvest will occur between November 15th and December

30 31st in Unit 22 for moose and Unit 22(E) for muskox. The

31 harvest will count against the existing quota.

32

33 The proposed ceremonial harvest would

34 provide subsistence users in the Unit 22(E) communities

35 an opportunity to share meat as part of participating in

36 a traditional ceremonial practice that they have been

37 unable to participate in the past 57 years.

38

39 No significant negative effect is

40 anticipated on the muskox or moose populations as a

41 result of this proposed harvest because the take will be

42 part of the existing harvest goals.

43

44 The only issue regarding the proposal is

45 that the State would prefer to modify the proposal to

46 read one bull muskox as opposed to one muskox.

47

48 As background information I'd just like

49 to tell you that former Council member Toby Anungazuk,

50 Jr., and Council members Elmer Seetot and Johnson

00028

1 Eningowuk are all members of the Muskox Cooperators
2 Group. And two of them were present and were part of the
3 discussion at the Council meeting. They had no concerns
4 about the muskox population. The Council voted to
5 support the proposal as I've just presented it. With
6 respect to the muskox population Kate Persons, ADF&G area
7 biologists informed us that the muskox population is
8 healthy and is growing. Additionally muskox harvest
9 quotas have not been filled during the past several
10 years.

11
12 Mr. Chairman, that concludes my remarks.

13
14 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you.
15 Summary of written public comments.

16
17 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair, there
18 aren't any written public comments for Seward Penn.
19

20 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. We
21 have no request at this time for public testimony
22 regarding this issue. Regional Council recommendation.
23

24 MS. CROSS: The Seward Peninsula Regional
25 Council fully supports the ceremonial hunt for revival
26 and preservation of the cultural practices over there.
27 Currently the two species of animals will just be taken
28 out of the quota that's already there. As far as I'm
29 concerned there's no concern over the size of the
30 muskoxen population in that area either. And I think
31 that if there was a concern I'm sure there would be
32 immediate action taken to change the sex of the muskoxen.
33 It's just one female at this point, I mean it's either
34 one bull or one female. So both regions, both
35 communities that utilize that area for muskoxen hunts,
36 they have no concerns about it. So I think that this is
37 something that can be easily remedied in the future if
38 population concerns become evident or there's starting to
39 be population concerns, but there is none now.

40
41 Thank you.

42
43 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Staff
44 Committee recommendation.

45
46 MR. RABINOWITCH: Staff Committee
47 recommends adopting the proposal exactly as the Seward
48 Peninsula Council has just recommended. And Grace did
49 such a good job presenting the justification I really
50 don't have anything more to add.

00029

1 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you.
2 Department comments.

3

4 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, the Department
5 supports this proposal with qualification. We support
6 the Staff Committee and Seward Peninsula Regional Council
7 recommendation to adopt this proposal with the additional
8 stipulation that the requested muskox harvest be limited
9 to bulls only. Both the moose and muskox seasons are
10 open during the proposed harvest period of November 15 to
11 December 15. The proposed harvest of one moose is not
12 expected to have any significant effect on the moose
13 population in Unit 22(E). In 2001, the Department
14 authorized the community of Wales to take a bull moose
15 under terms of a cultural education permit for use at the
16 cultural dance festival. Similarly, the harvest of one
17 muskox for ceremonial purposes should not result in the
18 established harvest quota being exceeded in Unit 22(E)
19 since it has never been reached in either the State Tier
20 II or Federal subsistence permit hunts.

21

22 We do note as was discussed at the Seward
23 Peninsula Regional Council meeting that the proposed
24 harvest of one muskox during the November 15 to December
25 15 period would be inconsistent with the current Federal
26 regulation which allows the harvest of cow muskox only
27 from January 1 to March 15. To remain consistent with
28 the recommendations of the Seward Peninsula Muskox
29 Cooperators Group, the Department recommends that harvest
30 be limited only to bull muskox.

31

32 Thank you.

33

34 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Board
35 discussion.

36

37 MS. GOTTLIEB: Mr. Chair.

38

39 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes, Judy.

40

41 MS. GOTTLIEB: Well, certainly this
42 request is very consistent with others that we have
43 received from around the state and I would certainly
44 support the concept of it. Just a clarification from the
45 Department, if I might. Terry, when you were saying
46 inconsistent with regulation and we should do bull only,
47 was that just for the month where the regulation wasn't
48 consistent or you mean in general?

49

50 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, I

00030

1 missed the question.

2

3 MS. GOTTLIEB: At the very end of your
4 statement you said there was an inconsistency in the
5 regulations where, I believe, females were not allowed to
6 be taken so then your conclusion was that we should
7 recommend or pass that only male muskox be taken but did
8 you mean during the one month time period of
9 inconsistency or did you mean for this permit?

10

11 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, we recommend
12 that a bull muskox be the requirement for this hunt.

13

14 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Further
15 discussion.

16

17 MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman.

18

19 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes.

20

21 MR. BRELSFORD: Listening to the
22 Department's comments, I believe much emphasis has been
23 placed on remaining consistent with the Muskox Management
24 Plan. And I believe that is a goal that the Board has
25 upheld in most cases, that we prefer to work in concert
26 with the cooperators in that fashion. I found, quite
27 important, the information that Chair Grace Cross
28 provided having to do with the direct participation of
29 several of the cooperators representatives during the
30 deliberation of this proposal. So in the end, what it
31 appears to me is that there is not a biological concern
32 about any harm to populations that would come from the
33 flexibility in this current proposal. And I believe
34 because there was participation by members of the
35 Cooperators Working Group there would be no concern taken
36 or offense that in some way the Federal Board has failed
37 to continue to work closely with the Cooperators Group.
38 So in the end I think that concern could be set aside and
39 I'm prepared to support the proposal as it's before us.

40

41 Thank you.

42

43 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Other
44 discussion. I'm sorry, Grace.

45

46 MS. CROSS: I have one quick comment.
47 There is currently now, January through March a female
48 hunt. And the number -- there's a certain quota and this
49 muskoxen would fall into that quota too. The quotas have
50 not been changed at all, they've just stayed consistent.

00031

1 This female just happened -- if they catch a female
2 instead of a bull it would just happen to be outside of a
3 given hunt months to accommodate for the festival itself.

4

5 Thank you.

6

7 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Other discussion.

8

9 MS. GOTTLIEB: Mr. Chairman.

10

11 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Judy.

12

13 MS. GOTTLIEB: At the Regional Advisory
14 Council meeting there really was very good discussion on
15 all of these issues and so I would move that we support
16 the proposal as recommended by the Staff Committee.

17

18 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Taylor.

19

20 MR. BRELSFORD: I second.

21

22 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: It's been moved
23 and seconded. Is there any discussion on the motion?
24 Hearing none, all those in favor of the motion please
25 signify by saying aye.

26

27 IN UNISON: Aye.

28

29 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Those opposed same
30 sign.

31

32 (No opposing votes)

33

34 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Motion carries. I
35 think at this time we're just going to take a little
36 short break right now as we switch regions.

37

38 (Off record)

39

40 (On record)

41

42 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay, we'll call
43 the meeting back to order. We're going to move on into
44 the Southcentral region. The first proposal we have up
45 is WP02-16. Let's get the analysis, please, who's going
46 to do that? Okay, Donna.

47

48 MS. DEWHURST: Unit 13, caribou. The
49 primary request to go back to two caribou versus two
50 bulls, which was a change the Federal Subsistence Board

00032

1 made last year. The other change requested was to alter
2 the seasons; basically taking out the fall season and
3 going from a December 1 to April 20th. Those are the two
4 primary changes that were requested.

5

6 To kind of put this in a nutshell, what
7 we're dealing with is a population that has declined but
8 appears to possibly have stabilized with a slight
9 increase in calf production just starting last year but
10 the numbers are still well below the State's management
11 objective. Last years numbers 33,700, the management
12 objective is 35,000. So we're not too far below but
13 we're below.

14

15 The new information we do have, if you go
16 to Table 1 on Page 9 in your analysis, just to give you
17 an update for this years harvest, the State end of the
18 harvest, the State's side of the harvest it's 958 is
19 their final numbers for this year, for this past season
20 and our current numbers are at 433. Now, 433 represents
21 approximately 590 percent reporting. But we're at the
22 point that on our end, at this point this is when we
23 usually send mailout cards out to the folks saying, hey,
24 you haven't reported and we get some back but generally
25 the folks that haven't reported at this stage are folks
26 that didn't harvest. So we anticipate getting a few more
27 in but probably not a huge wave. So if we had to guess I
28 think we'll stay way below the 500 mark. I don't think
29 we'll come anywhere near that. So right now we're at
30 433, that's 59 percent reporting and those numbers are as
31 of this morning.

32

33 Originally, the Staff recommendation was
34 to oppose this proposal based on the fact that the
35 population is still depressed. There still is a
36 conservation concern and combined with the fact that the
37 harvest has done quite well despite the fact that it has
38 been under a bulls only restriction. We also oppose the
39 changes in the dates given Table 2, which is on Page 10,
40 that we saw no reason to cut out the October/November
41 harvest because it has been used by subsistence users and
42 there was no justification to restrict Federal
43 subsistence users.

44

45 Given the latest information and the high
46 harvest, we are at a record high harvest as of right now
47 and I'm sure it's going to only go up. Given that, the
48 recommendation at this point, Staff recommendation is to
49 defer, in that, we've had a lot of requests. We're
50 trying to meet the needs of the subsistence but yet at

00033

1 the same time we do have a conservation concern. We will
2 have new information as of the summer on the population
3 with additional information in the fall. So when we're
4 in this seat next spring we'll have some really good
5 information to base a better decision on. So deferring
6 it for one year, I think, will be a much more sound
7 situation on a highly controversial issue. To meet the
8 needs of conservation concerns, to see if the population
9 will indeed go back up given the fact that we are seeing
10 some calf production or not. And by then we'll have a
11 good basis for a sounder decision than right now. And
12 that's also strongly based on the fact that we did have a
13 record high harvest this year.

14

15 That concludes the Staff analysis.

16

17 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you.

18 Summary of written public comments.

19

20 MS. WILKINSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

21 There were four written comments. Three were in support
22 and one is opposing.

23

24 The Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence
25 Resource Commission supports this proposal because it
26 would streamline the process for obtaining permit -- I
27 think that's the wrong thing. I'm sorry, that's the
28 wrong one, excuse me. There's a glitch in my process.

29

30 The Wrangell-St. Elias National Park
31 Subsistence Resource Commission supports this proposal
32 with modification. To modify the season to November 1st
33 to April 20th and the harvest limit to two bulls and not
34 to two caribou.

35

36 The Paxson Fish and Game Advisory
37 Committee supports the proposal provided ADF&G believes
38 the herd can support the additional hunting pressure.
39 Taking cows can substantially hurt the population and it
40 can take years to undo the effects of one hunting season.

41

42

43 The Denali Subsistence Resource
44 Commission opposes this proposal, unanimously opposes --
45 excuse me -- the object to the change to two bull caribou
46 harvest to limit to two caribou harvest limit and to
47 change the winter season to December 1 through April 20.
48 The Commission concurs with the Staff analysis
49 preliminary conclusion for the reasons stated in the
50 justification.

00034

1 And that's the conclusion. Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. We
4 have a couple requests for public comment. Tony Lee
5 Jackson. Roy Neely or Ray Neely. And Gloria Stickwan
6 didn't make it in.

7

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There's another
9 meeting right now on Migratory Birds.

10

11 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Oh.

12

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is there a way to
14 postpone.

15

16 MS. DEWHURST: Mr. Chairman, that meeting
17 goes all the way through tomorrow, the one he's talking
18 about, the co-management Council.

19

20 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay. I'm just
21 forward looking, it looks like we probably have a good
22 chance of getting done tomorrow. I've already got a
23 request in from Southeast that there's people that are
24 flying in this evening that will be here at 8:30 in the
25 morning and want to testify on some proposals.

26

27 MS. GOTTLIEB: Mr. Chair.

28

29 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes.

30

31 MS. GOTTLIEB: I thought Gloria did
32 comment briefly on this.

33

34 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes, she did
35 earlier.

36

37 MS. GOTTLIEB: Yeah, okay.

38

39 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: But there's been a
40 couple other requests since then. As much as I'd like to
41 stop, if they're going to be meeting through tomorrow, I
42 think we'll just go ahead and move it on.

43

44 MS. HILDEBRAND: Mr. Chairman, I was just
45 going to remind the Board that Gloria did testify and
46 said she supported the BLM recommendation and that if the
47 Board had decided to defer she would agree to that also.

48

49 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Yeah,
50 I think we're just going to go ahead and proceed on.

00035

1 Regional Council recommendation.

2

3 MR. LOHSE: Mr. Chair. The Southcentral
4 Regional Council, at their meeting, with the information
5 that they had on hand at that time voted to support the
6 BLM alternative with the following amendments. We wanted
7 to change the winter season from October 21st through
8 April 20th. And we wanted to stipulate that if a hunter
9 took a cow in the fall season he wouldn't be allowed to
10 hunt again until the winter season. And that only one
11 caribou could be taken per day, that would kind of
12 prevent people from taking a cow and then going out and
13 getting another caribou at the same time. We looked at
14 the fact that in the winter season with the horns
15 dropped, most of the animals that you'd be taken would be
16 bulls, over 90 percent of the animals would be bulls.
17 And if you, in the fall, took a cow, that pretty much
18 ended your hunting at that point in time so people would
19 try to just take bulls.

20

21 With the current harvest level and
22 everything, I doubt and I'm speaking for myself, not for
23 the Council, but I doubt if the Council would object to
24 deferring on this proposal with the information that's
25 just come in. But that's strictly my opinion, the
26 Council voted to support this with these modifications.

27

28 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Staff
29 Committee recommendation.

30

31 MS. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Staff
32 Committee has recommended deferring action on this
33 proposal until the 2003 regulator year. The Staff
34 Committee, BLM Glennallen Field Office and the
35 Southcentral Regional Advisory Council have looked
36 closely at several options to provide flexibility in the
37 subsistence harvest limit allowing for a limited cow
38 harvest while promoting continuing growth of the Nelchina
39 Caribou Herd. It is acknowledged that some local
40 subsistence users object to the 2002 restriction to bulls
41 only as being biologically unnecessary contrary to
42 traditional subsistence hunting practices and as causing
43 controversy over law enforcement actions on inadvertent
44 cow harvest.

45

46 Noting the record high harvest this year.
47 With this information the Staff Committee concluded that
48 it's not time to adopt a more flexible harvest limit
49 including a limited cow take. Instead the Staff
50 Committee recommends deferring action pending results of

00036

1 the population surveys and composition in the summer and
2 fall of 2002. If the Nelchina Caribou Herd has grown to
3 meet the minimum population level of 35,000 animals from
4 the 33,700 in 2001, then additional flexibility in the
5 subsistence hunt may be warranted.

6

7 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

8

9 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you.

10 Department comments.

11

12 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, the Department
13 supports the Staff Committee recommendation to defer
14 action on this proposal for one year for the reasons
15 presented in the Staff Committee justification.

16

17 We don't support reinstating a cow
18 harvest in Unit 13 until the Nelchina herd has reached
19 the State's minimum management objective of 35,000
20 animals and the trend is stable or increasing. As was
21 noted in the Staff analysis, Department will continue to
22 monitor the herd, conduct surveys and provide updated
23 population estimates later this year. Herd growth was
24 observed last year but one year of growth doesn't
25 establish an upward trend, however, we're pretty
26 confident that there will be additional growth recorded
27 this year. Habitat and forage conditions have been
28 favorable to herd growth and we hope that that situation
29 will be reflected in the updated population estimate.

30

31 We also oppose extending the season into
32 April as was sought in the original proposal because
33 doing so would add hunting stress to cow caribou within a
34 few weeks of their calving. Even if the hunt is for
35 bulls only, cows would be subject to disturbance by
36 hunters. The low cow harvest projection cited in the
37 revised proposal would not account for some unknown
38 number of cow caribou that are wounded and left to die or
39 misidentified by hunters or taken out of season and not
40 reported.

41

42 The Department does support restricting
43 the winter hunt to antlerless caribou only although this
44 would reduce hunter opportunity to harvest some small
45 bulls.

46

47 When the Nelchina herd reaches 35,000 and
48 shows a continuing upward trend the Department plans to
49 revisit the current harvest quotas and make appropriate
50 recommendations for changing the regulations. If herd

00037

1 growth continues and approaches 40,000, the high end of
2 our population objective, the Department likely would
3 propose allowing a cow harvest in State regulations to
4 maintain the herd at a sustainable size for the available
5 habitat.

6

7 Thank you.

8

9 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Board
10 discussion. Go ahead.

11

12 MR. BOS: It does seem prudent to defer
13 action on this proposal given that the Nelchina herd is
14 below the minimum population objective and also the large
15 harvest by subsistence hunters this year. If census
16 counts this summer and fall show an increase population
17 and strong calf production, the Board could consider
18 liberalizations next year.

19

20 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Any other
21 discussion.

22

23 MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman, are we
24 ready for a motion?

25

26 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yeah.

27

28 MR. BRELSFORD: I'd like to move to defer
29 Proposal WP02-16 as recommended by the Staff Committee
30 and for the reasons laid out in that justification. This
31 is an issue that the BLM Glennallen Field Office has been
32 quite concerned about and we have made every effort, we
33 believe, to find greater flexibility while allowing herd
34 growth. The recent harvest results suggest that it's not
35 time to make this change in harvest limits and instead we
36 join in the consensus of focusing on the new survey
37 results in the fall and waiting for the population to
38 attain the minimum population objective.

39

40 I'd like to mention, too, that the BLM
41 will be working more closely with local hunters in hunter
42 education and outreach to avoid inadvertent cow harvest.
43 We'd like to overcome some of the ill-will that was the
44 result of the change last fall and I think now that we
45 see it with a little bit better lead time we'll be able
46 to add some constructive outreach with the local public
47 on that point.

48

49 Thank you.

50

00038

1 MR. THOMPSON: I'll second that motion,
2 Mr. Chairman.

3

4 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: It's been moved
5 and seconded. Discussion.

6

7 MS. GOTTLIEB: Mr. Chair.

8

9 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes.

10

11 MS. GOTTLIEB: I think with the
12 discussion on conservation concerns as well as the
13 flexibility of the Chairman of the Southcentral Regional
14 Advisory Council, it would make sense to support the
15 motion.

16

17 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you.
18 Additional discussion. Hearing none, all those in favor
19 of the motion please signify by saying aye.

20

21 IN UNISON: Aye.

22

23 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Those opposed same
24 sign.

25

26 (No opposing votes)

27

28 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Motion carries.
29 By request I had Proposal 17 taken off the consent
30 calendar. Since it's very unlikely that Gloria is going
31 to be here I'm going to go ahead and reverse myself.
32 Since only a Board member can have those pulled off of
33 the consent agenda. Since she didn't testify on Proposal
34 17, was planning on coming back for it, but I'm just
35 going to go ahead and reverse myself and put Proposal 17
36 back on the consent agenda since I was the one that made
37 the initial request.

38

39 So with that we'll give our Staff time to
40 adjust here and get ready for Proposal 19.

41

42 MS. PETRIVELLI: Mr. Chairman, my name's
43 Pat Petrivelli and I'm the anthropologist for the
44 Southcentral region. Proposal 19 was submitted -- well,
45 the Staff analysis begins on Page 32 and it was submitted
46 by the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park. It would allow
47 one moose without calf to be taken in the Wrangell-St.
48 Elias National Park in either Unit 11 or 12 by two
49 hunters designated by the Mt. Sanford Tribal Consortium
50 for the annual Batzulnetas Cultural Camp. The intent of

00039

1 this proposal is to place authorization of the harvest
2 into the Subpart D portion of the regulations eliminating
3 the need for an annual special action request. The
4 proposal would mainly impact administrative procedures.

5

6 Just for some background, the Tribal
7 Consortium has sponsored the Annual Batzulnetas Cultural
8 Camp since 1994. For the past six years the Consortium
9 has applied for and received a special permit for a moose
10 hunt and currently there isn't a regulation in place for
11 this specific camp. The Federal Subsistence Board
12 granted five special actions and then the most recent
13 one, in 2001 was granted by the Office of Subsistence
14 Management due to a regulatory change that allowed the
15 office to renew or to grant renewals to educational and
16 cultural camps.

17

18 Title VIII of ANILCA in its implementing
19 regulations are shown in Table 1 on Page 34 and while the
20 regulations that recognize subsistence use more than the
21 act of harvesting and allow for cultural and educational
22 camps. There's eight activities that are currently
23 identified in Subpart D regulations. Three of those
24 eight are for specific activities and the other five are
25 just general activities of a recurring nature.

26

27 Cultural and educational subsistence
28 activities have been recognized through 24 special
29 actions and of those, six were for the Batzulnetas
30 Cultural Camp.

31

32 The cultural considerations for the camp
33 has been documented in the previous six special permits
34 and for biological considerations in Units 11 and 12
35 where the hunt is to occur there are currently Federal
36 subsistence seasons as well as resident and non-resident
37 State seasons for bull moose. In Unit 11 the current
38 harvest level is considered sustainable and human harvest
39 have minimal effect on moose abundance in the unit. In
40 Unit 12, the moose population is described as stable or
41 slightly declined since 1997.

42

43 In reviewing the current procedure and
44 the proposed procedures for granting the permit adoption
45 of this proposal would streamline the process of
46 obtaining an annual permit for the Batzulnetas Cultural
47 Camp by removing the involvement of the Office of
48 Subsistence Management and would retain oversight by the
49 Wrangell-St. Elias National Park Staff. Additional
50 information presented at the Southcentral Regional

00040

1 Council meeting held in March emphasized the documented
2 history of the cultural camp, the building of a
3 relationship with the local National Park Service office
4 rather than the distant office in Anchorage. The
5 continuing involvement and participation by the local
6 National Park Service Staff in the event as well as the
7 streamlining of the permit process is factors that would
8 benefit the camp participants.

9

10 And that concludes the analysis.

11

12 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you.

13 Summary of written public comments.

14

15 MS. WILKINSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

16 Well, now, I can tell you that the Wrangell-St. Elias
17 Subsistence Resource Commission supports this proposal
18 because it would streamline the process for obtaining the
19 permit to hunt the ceremonial moose for the Batzulnetas
20 Cultural Camp. They state that the new OSM regulations
21 are still more cumbersome than the proposed regulation.
22 Chistochina Village and the National Park Service have a
23 government to government relationship and the SRC feels
24 that it's important to recognize that special
25 relationship.

26

27 That's the end of the comments, sir.

28

29 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. There
30 are no requests for additional public testimony at this
31 time. Regional Council recommendation.

32

33 MR. LOHSE: Mr. Chair. The Regional
34 Council supports this proposal. We're referring to a
35 well-established, well known cultural camp that operates
36 on the edge of Wrangell-St. Elias National Park. The
37 National Park Staff takes part in the camp or at least is
38 present at the camp, it's not like something's going to
39 be going -- they're the ones that would be issuing the
40 permit and it's not like they would be issuing a permit
41 to a camp that might not be in existence that year.

42

43 This would streamline the process for all
44 involved and would take the process into the local area.
45 The National Park Service has a station right there in
46 the local area and it would establish good relationships
47 between the National Park and the people involved.

48

49 Thank you.

50

00041

1 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Eastern.

2

3 MR. NICHOLIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

4 The Eastern Interior Regional Council supported this.

5 The Council's in support of streamlining the permit

6 process. The process regulation will eliminate the

7 permit process for a special request for the Batzulnetas

8 Cultural camp to harvest one moose. The Council supports

9 having the local agent work with Mt. Sanford Tribal

10 Consortium organizers of the Batzulnetas Cultural camp.

11

12 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Staff

13 Committee recommendation.

14

15 MS. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The

16 Staff Committee recommends the Board adopt the proposal

17 in support of the recommendations of the Southcentral and

18 Eastern Regional Advisory Councils. Adoption of this

19 proposal would streamline the process of issuing permit

20 renewals to Mt. Sanford Tribal Consortium for their

21 annual cultural camp while allowing the residents of

22 Mentasta and Chistochina to continue to build their

23 relationship with the local National Park Service

24 officials. This change would benefit the subsistence

25 users and the local management agency.

26

27 Thank you.

28

29 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Department

30 comments.

31

32 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, the Department

33 does not support this proposal. Although we continue to

34 support the issuance of the special permit authorizing

35 the harvest of moose for use at the Batzulnetas Cultural

36 Camp and we have from the outset of the provision in

37 Federal regulation, we recommend it continued to be

38 administered as provided for in Subpart D, Section 25(g)

39 of the subsistence management regulations for public

40 lands in Alaska.

41

42 We agree that delegating authority to the

43 National Park Service could and would streamline the

44 process but we're concerned about the precedent that this

45 would establish for a camp that may not occur every year.

46 One alternative that should be considered is for the

47 National Park Service to work with camp officials to

48 facilitate the submission of the annual request to the

49 Office of Subsistence Management since this requirement

50 appears to be a primary concern of camp officials.

00042

1 Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. We're
4 ready to advance this to Board discussion.

5

6 MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman.

7

8 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes, Bill.

9

10 MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, I think the
11 proposal is really written well and it's not asking for a
12 lot. The grounds for not supporting this by the State is
13 taking us back historically to where communities that use
14 subsistence for these different occasions as a negative
15 characterization. I don't think that's fair. I don't
16 think that's justification to deny them that opportunity.
17 So I would certainly support the proposal.

18

19 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you, Bill.
20 Other discussion.

21

22 MS. GOTTLIEB: Mr. Chair.

23

24 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes.

25

26 MS. GOTTLIEB: I just wanted to say that
27 the Park Service does not expect the harvest of this one
28 moose to have any adverse effect on the population within
29 Units 11 and 12 and that, earlier, I believe Gloria did
30 state that CRNA supported this proposal as well.

31

32 I also want to remind and invite the
33 Board members that we hope to go to the Batzulnetas site
34 in mid-July.

35

36 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Good. Further
37 discussion.

38

39 MS. GOTTLIEB: Mr. Chair.

40

41 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes.

42

43 MS. GOTTLIEB: I will move that we adopt
44 the recommendation submitted by the Southcentral and
45 Eastern Interior Subsistence Regional Advisory Councils
46 and the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve
47 Subsistence Resource Commission for Proposal 19.
48 Adoption of this proposal would establish a special
49 provision in regulation that allows the National Park
50 Service to issue an educational and cultural and moose

00043

1 harvest permit for Units 11 and 12 within Wrangell-St.
2 Elias National Park and Preserve.

3

4 And so the regulation would read, it's a
5 little bit different than what's in the book, but that,
6 two hunters designated by Mt. Sanford Tribal Consortium
7 from either Chistochina or Mentasta Village, one moose
8 without calf may be taken in Wrangell-St. Elias National
9 Park and Preserve in either Units 11 or 12, June 20th to
10 June 30th. Permit will be issued from the Wrangell St.
11 Elias National Park and Preserve headquarters or one of
12 the offices closest to the site. And we welcome that
13 continued relationship with those villages.

14

15 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Is there a second.

16

17 MR. THOMPSON: Second.

18

19 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Discussion.

20 Hearing none, all those in favor of the motion please
21 signify by saying aye.

22

23 IN UNISON: Aye.

24

25 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Those opposed same
26 sign.

27

28 (No opposing votes)

29

30 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Motion carries.

31 Proposal 20(B).

32

33 MS. DEWHURST: Proposal 20(B) was
34 submitted by Mr. Bill Stockwell of Cooper Landing. It is
35 dealing with grouse in Unit 7, which is the Seward side
36 of the mountain range on the Kenai Peninsula. The
37 modification would reduce spruce grouse limits from 15
38 per day, 30 in possession to 10 per day, 20 in possession
39 and eliminate the Federal subsistence ruffed grouse
40 season. That's the two aspects.

41

42 On the ruffed grouse season there is no
43 effective ruffed grouse population in that area. The
44 surveys, I've only heard a couple during drumming surveys
45 and they basically weren't on Federal public lands so
46 it's pretty simple to understand the reason to eliminate
47 the ruffed grouse season. As far as the spruce grouse
48 limit in the take, the bag limits, it was brought up in
49 concern, that spruce grouse numbers have declined.
50 Granted spruce grouse are notoriously cyclic and that

00044

1 they will have their ups and downs, a little bit longer
2 cycle than with ruffed grouse, but they do have their ups
3 and downs, but the current down isn't so much from the
4 normal cycle, the current down is more representative of
5 habitat loss and that there has been a very significant
6 loss in spruce on that portion of the Peninsula by the
7 spruce bark beetle. And it's going to take a number of
8 years before that habitat will naturally restore itself.

9
10 So based on that, it's more likely that
11 this cyclic decline will stay down for a longer period
12 and so reducing the harvest limit would be biologically
13 sound with the conservation concern that habitat loss has
14 caused the decline in the population, not just the simple
15 normal ups and downs that we would expect to see. So
16 based on that, we are supporting the Staff
17 recommendation, which is to support the proposal.

18
19 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Written public
20 comments.

21
22 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman, there are
23 none.

24
25 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: We have no request
26 for additional public testimony at this time. Regional
27 Council recommendation.

28
29 MR. LOHSE: Mr. Chair. For Proposal
30 20(A) [sic] Southcentral Regional Council supports it.
31 There is no history of customary and traditional use of
32 this recently introduced species. In fact, some of the
33 people were even wondering why the species was
34 introduced.

35
36 For Proposal 20(B) the Council sees no
37 need to change spruce grouse harvest limits. In the
38 lower end of the cycle people are not able to take as
39 many birds as the regulation allows. We feel it's
40 generally pointless to try to micromanage small game
41 species like grouse and rabbits; they cycle, they go up
42 and down.

43
44 Personally, myself, I'll say for things
45 that I've studied in other states, they've come to the
46 same conclusion, micromanaging small game species of the
47 cyclic nature, whether it's habitat or non-habitat,
48 because of their limited access to them just doesn't make
49 much sense. So we oppose changing the bag limit. We
50 don't think it will have any effect on the harvest or on

00045

1 the return of the species.

2

3 Thank you.

4

5 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Staff
6 Committee.

7

8 MS. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The
9 Staff Committee recommends the Board adopt the proposal
10 and in addition, we'd like to see the public booklet
11 contain a diagram of ruffed grouse tail feathers similar
12 to the diagram used in the State regulation booklet and a
13 notice that ruffed grouse are not available to
14 subsistence users in Unit 7 and 15.

15

16 The Staff Committee noted that the
17 recommendation of the Southcentral Council that they saw
18 no need to change the harvest limits of spruce grouse,
19 however, the Staff Committee recognizes a conservation
20 concern as described by Donna. That we have a situation
21 where the spruce bark beetle infestation has
22 significantly reduced spruce grouse habitat. Spruce
23 grouse population surveys have indicated a marked
24 decrease in grouse populations within areas traditionally
25 hunted along road systems. So reducing the Federal
26 subsistence harvest limits would address these
27 conservation concerns and align with State regulations
28 while still providing some subsistence harvest
29 opportunities.

30

31 With regard to ruffed grouse, since they
32 were introduced on the Kenai between '96 and '98, there's
33 been no evidence of a viable population on Federal public
34 lands thus creating a conservation concern to continue a
35 subsistence harvest. Eliminating the Federal harvest
36 would allow this introduced population a further chance
37 to become viable in the future.

38

39 Thank you.

40

41 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you.
42 Department comments.

43

44 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, the Department
45 supports the Staff Committee recommendation to adopt this
46 proposal which will align the State and Federal
47 regulations for spruce grouse in Unit 7 and help to
48 conserve this resource. Closing the Federal season for
49 ruffed grouse is appropriate as this species was not
50 transplanted to the Kenai Peninsula until the mid-1990s

00046

1 and is found primarily on non-Federal lands.

2

3 We also recommend and support the notion
4 or the idea of having a diagram of ruffed and spruce
5 grouse tail feathers published in the Federal regulation
6 booklet to aid hunters in distinguishing between these
7 two species.

8

9 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Board
10 discussion.

11

12 MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman.

13

14 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes.

15

16 MR. THOMPSON: I think the discussion and
17 arguments presented are pretty persuasive about the
18 conservation concerns relating to both the spruce and the
19 ruffed grouse and the advisability of aligning the
20 regulations to make them more understandable by the
21 users, therefore, I'd move that we adopt the proposal.

22

23 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: There's a motion
24 to adopt, is there a second.

25

26 MR. BOS: Second.

27

28 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Discussion.

29

30 MR. BOS: I'd like to comment, I think
31 Ralph's observation, he accurately characterized normal
32 situations with cyclic species like grouse and the effect
33 of hunting generally lightly hunted areas, birds in
34 lightly hunted areas can repopulate than more heavily
35 hunted areas. I think in this situation on the Kenai,
36 though, we have a different circumstance. We have a very
37 large scale loss of habitat. It's going to take many
38 years for that habitat to come back so I'm not sure that
39 the large lightly hunted areas on the Kenai can really
40 serve to repopulate birds that are taken from the more
41 heavily hunted road side system. And so I think there is
42 a conservation concern.

43

44 Also I heard testimony at the Regional
45 Council meeting from the audience and comments from the
46 Council as well that generally subsistence hunters rarely
47 take as many as 10 grouse. So this, in effect, I don't
48 believe will constitute a significant restriction on
49 subsistence use. I think it is prudent to take a
50 conservative approach to managing grouse in this

00047

1 instance.

2

3 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you.

4 Additional discussion.

5

6 MR. LOHSE: Mr. Chair.

7

8 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes.

9

10 MR. LOHSE: Mr. Chair, while I don't
11 disagree with that and I'm sure the Council doesn't
12 disagree with that either and we recognize there can be
13 some concerns, our idea basically was that we have a
14 tendency in our culture to try to micromanage everything
15 and some micromanaging is effective, most micromanaging
16 is not effective. And in this case, I think that the
17 hunters themselves will micromanage their take of grouse
18 a lot more than making the bag limits 10 or 15 because I
19 don't think either bag limit makes any difference at all.
20 And so to change regulation is just to change regulation
21 doesn't make sense to us.

22

23 Thank you.

24

25 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you.
26 Additional discussion. Hearing none, all those in favor
27 of the motion please signify by saying aye.

28

29 IN UNISON: Aye.

30

31 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Those opposed same
32 sign.

33

34 (No opposing votes)

35

36 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Motion carries.
37 Proposal 48.

38

39 MS. DEWHURST: Proposal 48 was submitted
40 by Mr. George Covell of Cordova. It involves the moose
41 harvest in Unit 2(E) which is basically the Cordova area.
42 The original request was to amend the starting date from
43 August 15 to September 1 and he also requested to split
44 the bull allocation to a 75 Federal, 25 percent State, so
45 75/25 split, where currently the bull permits are totally
46 administered by the State. The concern there was that
47 there is more and more competition from other areas as
48 moose harvest has gone down, moose availability has gone
49 down statewide. The few moose hunts that are open to
50 urban users are getting more scrutiny and more use and

00048

1 this being one of them. So there's been a big influx in
2 the number of people in Anchorage, specifically that have
3 put in for this harvest because it was done with a
4 lottery. And based on that the Cordova folks were
5 getting less of the piece of the pie, so to speak, so
6 that's why they requested the Feds to step in and insure
7 that they would still get what they consider to be
8 adequate to meet their subsistence needs.

9

10 The aspect of the 75/25 split, I think
11 was worked out in the community, given a large
12 cooperative effort between the U.S. Forest Service, ADF&G
13 and the local users, that I think that this is pretty
14 well accepted by everybody at this point.

15

16 The change of the starting date to
17 September 1 really had no opposition either. I contacted
18 the original proponent and they said originally the
19 thought was that commercial fishermen would be able to go
20 in August but they realized that that wasn't real viable
21 so they had no problem with going to the September 1. So
22 that really isn't contended either. For the most part,
23 this has gone along nicely. We did make a change to the
24 cow season to cut it off early to October 31st, which
25 would allow a monitoring study done by the lead agency,
26 the Forest Service, but cooperatively with Fish and Game
27 to monitor population status there which involves radio-
28 collaring and capture drugs. So we did put the October
29 31 closing date on cows to allow that to continue. That
30 really isn't contested either.

31

32 The only issue of contention at this time
33 is the ending date of the Federal bull season. The way
34 the proposal reads right now would be September 1 through
35 December 31st. The existing State season ends on October
36 31st, so the Federal season would extend two months past
37 the existing State season.

38

39 The pro side of it, the reason to keep
40 the December 31 is because it would benefit the Federal
41 subsistence user, it's a -- there's a limited number of
42 permits given so it's not going to change the harvest.
43 It's just going to change when the harvest is taken. And
44 allowing the hunt to go into November and December would
45 allow the hunt to go past the rut. The rut,
46 traditionally, we're dealing primarily with October and
47 allowing a later hunt would allow people to harvest bulls
48 after the rut. So it would benefit the Federal
49 subsistence user.

50

00049

1 On the other side of the coin, the
2 concern was that the State season would close October
3 31st so we would not be consistent with the State hunt
4 and that in the past all of the animals have been
5 successfully taken by October 31st. Of course, the
6 opportunity to take them afterwards was never provided
7 before.

8
9 So based on all these considerations, the
10 Staff recommendation is to stick with the December 31
11 ending for the bull season to provide maximum opportunity
12 for the Federal subsistence user without causing any
13 biological repercussions. That concludes the analysis.

14
15 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Written public
16 comments.

17
18 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman, there were
19 two written comments. Both were in support with
20 modification.

21
22 The Cooper River Prince William Sound
23 Fish and Game Advisory Committee supports the proposal
24 with the following amendments. Change the bull harvest
25 in Unit 6(C) from a statewide draw of 100 percent to a
26 statewide draw of 25 percent of the allowable harvest to
27 be determined by winter surveys and the remaining 75
28 percent become a Federal subsistence drawing conducted in
29 conjunction with the Federal subsistence cow drawing by
30 the U.S. Forest Service also determined by winter
31 surveys. And only one subsistence moose may be harvested
32 per household. The advisory committee thoroughly
33 discussed this proposal at a public meeting and the
34 amendment was approved by the proponent. The advisory
35 committee believes that these amendments will provide
36 more opportunity to area residents that the percentages
37 used following historical averages and consider private
38 land ownership conflicts.

39
40 The Native Village of Eyak supports
41 Proposal 48 because subsistence use of moose is important
42 to the Native Village of Eyak and to the residents of
43 Cordova.

44
45 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. We
46 have no additional requests for public testimony at this
47 time. Regional Council recommendation.

48
49 MR. LOHSE: Mr. Chair and Board members.
50 The Southcentral Regional Council supported this with

00050

1 modifications. We supported to close the cow season of
2 October 31st and to authorize the U.S. Forest Service
3 Cordova Office to set and announce number of bull and cow
4 permits issued annually after consultation with the
5 Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

6
7 This proposal concerns allocation of a
8 stable, healthy moose population. There are no
9 conservation concerns. It has the support of the local
10 residents and the agencies.

11
12 As a little bit of extra on this, I'd
13 like to remind the Board that this basically was a
14 community moose herd. Mudhole Smith flew the original
15 calves down from the Kenai Peninsula. They were raised
16 on the post office lawn. The local school kids fed them.
17 They turned loose out there, this was to be a community
18 moose herd. It was established for the community, it was
19 watched over by the community, they were protected by the
20 community, they were fed by the community and they've had
21 lots of community input into the objectives for the herd
22 for maintaining what kind of growth and what kind of
23 level they wanted to reach and for the end use. And out
24 of this came a herd that has been used mostly for local
25 use. That says 75 percent. I think if you go back and
26 look at the total averages you'll find that Cordova's
27 harvested over 75 percent of these moose.

28
29 So I think that you're well within the
30 reasons of what this moose herd was put there for.

31
32 Now, as far as December 31st is
33 concerned, like she said, it doesn't change the harvest,
34 it allows people to take moose after the rut. By going
35 to Federal land, the moose hunters are going to be
36 limited to a smaller area than they were allowed to hunt
37 moose on before. There's State land out there, there's
38 private land out there and a fair percentage of the moose
39 have been taken on State and private land. The Federal
40 hunt is going to have to take place on Federal land. It
41 may take longer to get the moose on Federal land, it's
42 going to be harder to do it. And I question the need to
43 close a season just so that we're consistent with the
44 State. In this case here it's a permit drawing, there's
45 only so many moose.

46
47 And another example of why this is a
48 community moose hunt, if you have a permit in Cordova
49 everybody knows who has the permits. And if somebody's
50 driving out the road and they see the moose and you're

00051

1 not out there, you'll get a phone call at home to tell
2 you that your moose is at Mile 11 standing alongside the
3 road, would you please hurry up and get out there and go
4 get it and everybody will share in helping you get it to
5 the road and you're expected to share what you get, too.
6 So this is probably or has been in the past the most
7 community hunted moose hunt in the state.

8

9 I know for a fact that you get plenty of
10 help if you've got a permit so thank you.

11

12 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Staff
13 Committee.

14

15 MS. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The
16 Staff Committee recommends adoption of the proposal in
17 support of the recommendation of the Southcentral
18 Council. In Unit 6(C) the bull harvest is currently
19 managed through a State run drawing hunt open to all
20 Alaska residents. Change in the allocation of bull
21 harvest permits to 75 percent Federal, 25 percent State
22 would provide more subsistence opportunities for rural
23 residents of Cordova and still allow some harvest on
24 State and private lands.

25

26 The current season dates of August 15th
27 to December 31st were originally requested in 2000,
28 however, if Federal subsistence users no longer feel a
29 need for this earlier opening date, changing the opening
30 date to September 1st would parallel existing State
31 regulations. Closing the Federal subsistence cow moose
32 season on October 13st in Unit 6(C) would reduce harvest
33 opportunities for local users. However, much of the high
34 quality moose biological information used to evaluate
35 population condition reproductive success and calf
36 survival is derived from use of radio collared moose
37 cows, generally captured in November. Federal laws
38 require a 60 day gap from when capture drugs are used on
39 animals until any harvest is allowed. Keeping the
40 current cow harvest closing of December 31st would pose a
41 human safety issue or alternatively, effectively
42 eliminate the ability to capture and examine moose cows
43 in November greatly hampering future population data
44 gathering.

45

46 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

47

48 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you.
49 Department.

50

00052

1 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
2 All of my objections have already been addressed. The
3 Department supports two of the three parts of this
4 modified proposal. We support changing the fall cow
5 moose season dates in Unit 6 to September 1 to October 31
6 consistent with the corresponding State season dates. We
7 also support creation of the bull season by Federal
8 registration permit only as well as the Federal
9 allocation of 100 percent of the cow permits and 75
10 percent of the bull permits with an overall harvest limit
11 of one moose permit per household.

12
13 We continue to recommend the Federal bull
14 season be September 1 to October 31 consistent with the
15 State season. Hunters currently harvest about 95 to 100
16 percent of their moose in the bull hunt and normally
17 harvest a moose by mid-October. Virtually all Cordova
18 residents who obtain a permit also harvest a moose and
19 almost always do so before the end of October. We also
20 note that most of the land along the road system between
21 Cordova and the airport is managed by the State and
22 therefore would not be opened to hunters with a Federal
23 registration permit. The area south of the road also
24 closed to the use of snowmachines thereby making access
25 to Federal lands more difficult.

26
27 Thank you.

28
29 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Board
30 deliberation.

31
32 MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman.

33
34 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Ken.

35
36 MR. THOMPSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I've
37 very recently been advised of the extent to which the
38 community of Cordova has come together, not only in the
39 long-term but more recently in developing this regulation
40 there has been a lot of community input that's really to
41 be applauded. I think they've worked out all of the
42 rubs, if you will, that might have occurred had we not
43 had all of this consultation.

44
45 So I'd like to move that we adopt this
46 proposal as modified and as recommended by the
47 Southcentral Council. I believe the net effect of the
48 modified proposal is to improve the subsistence
49 opportunity and I believe it also accommodates research
50 ongoing over there that's designed to protect the long-

00053

1 term health of the moose herd in Unit 6(C), that's, as I
2 understand it, as an important element as well.

3

4 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: There's a motion,
5 is there a second?

6

7 MS. GOTTLIEB: Second.

8

9 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Discussion on the
10 motion.

11

12 MS. GOTTLIEB: Mr. Chair.

13

14 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes, go ahead,
15 Judy.

16

17 MS. GOTTLIEB: I also appreciate Ralph
18 giving us the full background on this population and do
19 want to commend the community council for their consensus
20 and collaboration. It's another example of why this
21 program does work so well because people are willing to
22 put in the time to solve these problems and bring us some
23 good solutions.

24

25 Thank you.

26

27 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Greg.

28

29 MR. BOS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just a
30 question for clarification. As worded in the proposed
31 regulation, the number of 15 permits has been identified,
32 would that be just for this year, I suppose, because as I
33 understand the State and Federal managers would jointly
34 decide on the quota of permits based on the moose counts;
35 is that correct?

36

37 MS. DEWHURST: I'm not sure where you're
38 getting the 15. The proposed language is on Page 57
39 under the Staff -- oh, okay, that's wrong. If you're
40 looking at Page 56, that is incorrect.

41

42 MR. BOS: Yes, thank you.

43

44 MS. DEWHURST: The proposed regulatory
45 language is on Page 57 which doesn't list a number of
46 permits.

47

48 MR. BOS: Thank you.

49

50 MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman.

00054

1 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes.

2

3 MR. THOMPSON: Yeah, I'm getting a nod
4 over here from our local managers that that is the case.

5

6 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Further
7 discussion. No discussion on the motion. All those in
8 favor of the motion please signify by saying aye.

9

10 IN UNISON: Aye.

11

12 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Those opposed same
13 sign.

14

15 (No opposing votes)

16

17 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Motion carries.

18 Well, we're moving through rather quickly. I'm hesitant
19 to jump regions in case there are people tracking that
20 may intend to testify. We do have people, I know, flying
21 in from southeast. If anybody knows of anybody from the
22 Delta, Western or Eastern interior that may want to
23 testify on any of the proposals, let them know they
24 better be here tomorrow because we're on track to finish
25 up tomorrow, it's looking like that right now. But we
26 are going to adjourn early today, recess early and we
27 will start again at 8:30 with Southeast.

28

29 (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

30

31

* * * * *

