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INTRODUCTION

Background

At the request of the Board of Game both the Subsistence Section and the Game Division set forth to gather data and information pertinent to making regulatory decisions regarding the subsistence use of the Nelchina caribou herd. The need for this information came as a result of the mandate of HB 960, Chapter 151 to provide for a subsistence priority in the use of wildlife resources. Subsequent to the enactment of the Subsistence Law, a court case in which the defendant was acquitted for taking of caribou out of season for subsistence use requires the Board of Game to address the subsistence harvest of GMU 13 caribou. While this document will provide information concerning public attitudes, user group characteristics, and demographic data, the Game Division will present the biological and harvest background information for the Nelchina/GMU 13 caribou herd.

A pilot study of the Nelchina caribou user groups was hastily developed in the late part of January 1981. The original format of the study included the goal of identifying the entire range of users involved with the Nelchina caribou. Several factors, of which time was the most limiting, restricted the extent to which this goal could be fulfilled. The lack of information made available to the public in order to effectively utilize their cooperation restricted the amount of data collected from this source. Considering the limited time available, there was extremely good cooperation from the local Fish and Game Advisory Committees in alerting the public and generating exceptional attendance at public hearings.
METHODS

Three general types of data were collected in this study: (a) data on the characteristics of the user groups; (b) data on hunting patterns of the user groups; and (c) public opinion.

The original research design called for information to be collected from: 1) Department of Fish and Game personnel, reports, and files; 2) telephone and informal personal interviews with permit hunt registrants; 3) public hearings conducted by local Fish and Game Advisory Committees; and 4) other state agencies and local governmental bodies. The shortage of time did not allow a telephone survey and an organized distribution and collection of surveys. No telephone interviews were conducted. Surveys were distributed only at the public hearings.

Information from past hunt records and an analysis of permit hunt number 503 will be presented in another paper by Game Division.

Public hearings were originally intended for five communities. Due to popular demand of the public and advisory committees they were held in 10 communities. They provided the opportunity for the public to testify and for the distribution of questionnaires.

Additional information on unpermitted users was collected in household interviews in six Copper River communities.
The primary purposes of the project were: (a) to identify the range of groups using the Nelchina caribou herd; and (b) to identify characteristics of these groups.

This project was a pilot study which will provide a basis for developing further research into the complete range of user groups of the Nelchina caribou herd.

Information collected in this pilot study could be used by the Board of Game at its March 1981 meeting as background to make decisions about proposed regulatory changes regarding the Nelchina herd.

The data collected in the study are a sample of the user groups being identified and do not represent total quantities in each group. Further research will be required to determine total relative numbers in each user group.

The objectives of the study were: 1) to determine the range of user groups; 2) to determine, through a stratified sampling scheme, some of the characteristics of each user group; and 3) to determine some of the hunting patterns of the groups.
Public Testimony

Public testimony was collected from meetings in ten communities in the vicinity of Game Management Unit 13. Those communities were Anchorage, Copper Center, Cantwell, Fairbanks, Glennallen, Lake Louise, Palmer, Paxson, Slana, and Valdez. These meetings were intended to collect both data regarding the times and places which hunters had in the past hunted Nelchina caribou, or any other caribou, and opinions about the management of the Nelchina caribou.

Opinions expressed at each of the meetings are presented in Figure 1. The most commonly expressed opinion was that all residents of Alaska receive an equal right to hunt not only caribou, but to harvest all wildlife resources. It was the general consensus that the permit system was a fair method of allocating the resource to all users. However, many people amended their opinion about the permit system with the fact that the fee should not be required. There were several options presented which could change the permit system such as requiring only those people who drew a permit to pay the fee even though it may be somewhat higher in order to cover administrative expenses. Another option was to disallow those people who drew a permit in any one year from applying in the following year. This would give those people who had not drawn a permit a greater chance of drawing one.

The third most commonly expressed opinion was that everyone who is an Alaska resident is a subsistence user. This opinion was derived by
Figure 1. Summarization of opinions and comments from ten public hearings on use of Nelchina caribou.

Equal Rights to all Residents 45
Permit System is Acceptable and Creates a Fair Chance for Everybody 34
Everybody that is a Resident is a Subsistence User 31

Define Subsistence User 15
Subsistence Law Violates Constitutional Rights 12
Support Proposal 105 11
Welfare, Food Stamps, Etc., is Available 10
Discrimination Against Residents 10
Subsistence Hunter is one that Hunts in Local GNU, Sport Hunter is one that Hunts Outside his Local GNU 10
Subsistence Rights Discriminate Against Working Class 7
No Fee for Applying for a Permit/if Drawn then a Fee Is Paid 6
Against Split Season (No Late Season) 6
Survey is Unfair 6
Department Is Creating an Act of Gambling 5
Draw Permit and Kill Caribou, not Allowed to Apply for Permit for 2 to 3 Years 4
300 Subsistence Permits for Nelchina Area Residents 4
Consumptive Use for Everybody 4
No Priority Use 4
Discrimination Against White Residents 3
Support Subsistence Law (1st Priority) 3
No Subsistence Hunter in Modern Times 3
Incorporate Subsistence User into Permit System 3
Hunt is Larger so More Permits 1
Close Season for 2 Years 2
No Motorized Vehicles 2
Proposal 20 2
Subsistence Hunter-Resident, Sport Hunter-Non-Resident 2
Split Season and Split Permits 2
Survey is Acceptable 1
Two Caribou per Three People 1
Every Hunting and Fishing License Should Read Subsistence 1
Discrimination Against Senior Citizens 1
Extremes Restricted Subsistence Use 1
Point System for Qualification of Subsistence Permit Based on (Income, Personal Property and Residency) 1
Domesticate a Small Caribou Herd to Provide Meat for Subsistence 1
First Come First Serve Basis for Subsistence Permit 1
Income Based Subsistence Permit ($5600/Year Income) 1
Define Meat Hunter and Trophy Hunters 1
Native Claims Act put Everybody Equal 1
Bulls Only Season 1
Subsistence is Fishing 1
Guides Give Meat to Subsistence Users 1
Regulate Harvest by Time of Year and Accessability to Animals 1
Open Season to Everybody and Close by Emergency Order 1
the fact that anyone who went hunting and killed an animal would have to salvage the meat and would eat it or share it with someone. This opinion was usually accompanied by two other comments which were that a subsistence user must be defined, and that the subsistence law violated constitutional rights. To follow in this line of argument against a subsistence priority other related comments included discrimination against residents, the subsistence rights discriminate against the working class by encouraging or rewarding people not to work, it discriminates against whites because of the language in the Federal d-2 legislation, there are no subsistence users in modern times because of the wage incomes and commercially available food sources, the subsistence law discriminated against senior citizens, that the Native Claims Act put everybody equal by virtue of the relinquishing of all aboriginal rights set forth in the Act, that subsistence was poaching, and that there should be no priority use.

Some people expressed possible ways of bringing the herd size up to a number large enough to allow everyone to hunt. These ideas included closing the season for several years, having a bulls only season, no motorized vehicles should be allowed, and that there should be no late season because of the high probability of killing cows.

A wide variety of comments and opinions either attempted to make provision for subsistence or were in favor of a subsistence priority or that people in the area of the herd receive an equal opportunity to hunt caribou. The most commonly expressed opinion was to implement proposal 105 which makes everyone a subsistence user. The second most common opinion was that a subsistence hunter was one who
hunts in his local game management unit and a sports hunter was one who hunts outside his local game management unit, i.e. the unit in which he resides. In order to provide for the subsistence need in the area the proposal to provide 300 subsistence permits for Nelchina area residents was supported as was proposal number 20 which provided a drawing hunt for Unit 13 residents only. Other suggestions for providing for subsistence were to have a split season and split permits, have an extremely restricted subsistence hunt, develop a point system to qualify subsistence users based on income, personal property, and residency, provide subsistence permits on a first-come first-served basis, and that subsistence should be based on a $5,600 annual income.

Additional comments and opinions were that the survey was unfair and might be used against people (this was a widely expressed opinion), the herd is now larger than it was several years ago and there should be more permits available, there should be two caribou allowed for every three people with reference to the number of caribou required to feed a household, that a small herd of caribou should be domesticated to provide meat for subsistence users, that meat and trophy hunters should be defined separately, the guides give meat to subsistence users so this helps meet the subsistence need, that the season should be open to everyone and closed by emergency order.

There are 17 hours of public testimony on tape. Because of this large quantity of information and the short time available it is impossible to summarize all the comments and place them in the context to which they apply. It is recommended that detailed summary of conclusions be made of the taped information.
Survey Critique

Approximately 300 pilot study questionnaires were circulated at the ten public hearings. A sample of 78 surveys has been analyzed. It was the opinion of people at three hearings that the survey instrument was unfair and tried to categorize people as subsistence users. Several people felt the questions in the survey attempted to entrap them by asking questions about illegal activities.

If further analysis of user group characteristics is required an improved version of the survey would be needed. The method of distributing the questionnaire would be changed probably to a mail-out form and/or done by telephone.

Survey Data

In developing data on a range of characteristics of the user groups some perspective of time depth of hunting caribou can be gained from Figure 2. Survey respondents were asked to indicate the times when they hunted caribou. There were 15.3% of the respondents (12) who had hunted caribou prior to 1961. The percentage remains constant until the mid 1960's, then climbs in 1966 and remains constant for seven years when it drops and then rises sharply in 1979.

The largest percentage of people hunted in the months of August and September (Figure 3).

The areas in which respondents indicated they had hunted caribou were game management units 11, 12, 13, and 19. One-third of the respondents (35.9%) did not respond to this question.
Figure 2. Percentages of survey respondents and the years in which they hunted caribou.
Figure 3. Percentage of respondents and the months in which they hunted.
When asked how they used the caribou they killed, most people (92.3%) said they used it for their own consumption. Fourteen people (17.9%) indicated sharing their caribou with other people. No one indicated using any part of the caribou as trap bait, but two people said they use trimmings, head, and bones as dog food.

Question 3 asked people whether or not they hunted for other people in their community or other permit holders in the household. This misled many people because it is illegal to hunt on someone else's permit. However, 92.3% said they did not hunt for other community members while 2.6% said they did and 5.1% did not respond. As for hunting for other household members 87.2% said they did not, 5.1% said they did, and 7.7% did not respond (Figure 4).

The amount of household meat composed of fish and game resources appears highly varied (Figure 5). Fish is a small percentage of the total meat consumption for many people. Other game species such as waterfowl, moose, deer and rabbits were indicated as making up the bulk of a few households' meat sources. Total household meat supply was comprised of 5 to 50 percent caribou for many of the respondents. The varying percentages of the total meat supply which any one species consists is probably in relation to either the size of the animal or its availability and harvest limits.
Figure 5. Annual percentage of household meat composed of fish and game resources.
Employment information was requested in question 6. There was 61.6% of the households with 1 to 2 members employed full time. Those households with members employed part time were 46.1% of the total. Forty-three point six percent (43.6%) of the households indicated having members retired or unemployed.

Question 5 asked for number of household members in various sex and age categories. There was 35.9% indicating female members less than 18 years old, and 38.5% indicating male members less than 18 years. In the 18 to 55 age group there were equal percentages (82.1%) for both male and female members. However, there were more households with 2 males and 6 males in this age group. In the greater than 55 age group there were twice as many households with males as with females - 20.5% and 10.3% respectively.
Household Interviews

General Resource Utilization—

Among those people interviewed who have hunted caribou, not everyone relied solely on caribou for their total supply of meat. Rather, in recent years they have relied on a wide variety of wild and storebought resources. With regard to the wild resources, reliance has been on whatever has been most abundant at any particular time in the Copper River area. Fish was indicated by all but one household as being part of the annual household food supply. The importance of fish in the household varied from being eaten twice a day to once a week. Most of those people interviewed either owned a fish-wheel or had access to someone who did. Other species mentioned as being used whenever they could be gotten were hares, muskrats, beaver, grouse, and moose. Muskrats and beaver are highly prized food items and hare is used in large quantities.

Everyone stated that meat was the most important part of their diet and that it was valued socially above all other foods. All households stated that meat, especially moose was difficult to get this past year (1980), as well as during the past few years. This problem was most frequently related to the large numbers of outside hunters in the area competing for the game.

In order to get at least some meat in their diet most households have had to buy some meat either in Glennallen or Anchorage. Reliance on this source depends upon the amount of income available to divert from other obligations. Some people stated that no matter
what happened they would always get game meat and would never buy meat in the store (particularly referring to cow meat).

In all cases where people shot a large animal (caribou or moose) they shared it with other people in the community. Particularly the older people were the recipients of the meat. The older people expressed an attachment to meat greater than did the younger people. The younger people who were able to do something else to get meat such as buy it, said they would rather do that than risk a violation.

Seasonal Patterns of Resource Utilization-

The time period related to here is the late 1800's and early 1900's and the information comes from the experiences of interviewees themselves and the stories told to them by their parents. At that time the major villages were at Chitina and the Ewan Lake/Gulkana area.

The older people were asked to recall whatever they could about their early days and the seasonal patterns of hunting, fishing, and gathering. Gathering food, especially for the winter months, started with the spring salmon. People would move to the river fish camps in May and June. Using traps and, more recently fishwheels, they caught salmon of all species. The fish were cut into large fillets and strips then dried or smoked. The fish were then bundled up and brought back to the village for storage.

In late summer berries were gathered in large quantities and stored in bark containers in cold places in the ground. Following the fishing
and berry picking usually groups of people would head out in groups to hunt for, depending the area in which they lived, sheep and goats in the Chitina area, and caribou in the Ewan Lake/Gulkana area. Wherever, they managed to kill a large animal they would set up a camp where they processed the meat by cutting it up and drying for transport back to the village.

The methods used in preserving fish and meat were drying and smoking. With fish, people would boil the heads for the oil which they saved and later used to dip the dried meat. Usually the fillets were prepared with the skin left on. Dried moose and caribou meat were kept until needed and then boiled to be reconstituted and eaten in stews. Considered to be a delicacy were moose bones joints which were boiled for the hours then cracked and the marrow eaten. All parts of the animal were used for some specific purpose. Hides of moose were used extensively in making moccasins, mattresses, and mittens. Particularly caribou was used in mittens and the hair left on and used on the back side of the mitten. Hides of other animals were used as trim for garments particularly hare, weasel, and mink. Much of this same usage continues today to a lesser extent than in the early days. Many people today rely on their skills of making crafts from animals products for a supplement to their annual income.

Use of The Animal Killed-

All the households were asked to explain how they used the meat and other items they got from the caribou or moose. Except for four all households had not gotten any caribou in many years. Most had gotten some caribou or moose from friends or family. All the meat
was said to be used for the household's consumption. All parts of the animal were used by most of the households; if not by that household specifically then the parts were given to other people. Parts of the animal were not said to be used for baits or dog food or just thrown away as a general practice. The antlers were the only portion not used extensively, however several people did use pieces of antlers or knife handles. The bones are cut up and put into soups, while those people who dry the meat use it also in soups. Some freeze the meat or smoke it. Hides were said to be used for clothing, crafts, mattresses, and snowshoes.

Percent of Household Meat From Game-

Five of the eighteen people interviewed relied solely on store-bought meat. Everyone else, 13 households relied upon wild game anywhere from 50% to 100%. Those who relied solely on wild meat used a variety of species to fill their needs. Some people had been able in the past to get road kills, but had not gotten meat from that source in several years. Those people who did not get a large animal relied upon most of the small game species and fish. A few people said they relied entirely on fish. One family used over two-hundred fish per year for a family of eleven. Two households purchase some of their meat in Anchorage but tried to get muskrats and beaver and used 40 to 50 salmon per year.

Do You Hunt for Other People-

In the old days the hunting effort and harvest was always shared among everyone in the family or the community. Where sheep and goat hunting took place people would go out in parties, kill the animal, cut
it up and haul it back to the village where it was divided up among everyone who needed it. This was especially common in the Chitina area. In other areas where a large animal was shot a group of people would go out and bring the meat back to be divided within the village. In particular the meat was given to the older people, but it was also used to repay debts. Some people with large families stated that they hunted primarily for their immediate family and didn't give meat to others. Some people said they did not hunt but got meat or hides from other people. In Gulkana it was stated by everyone that if they hunted and got a moose or caribou that some meat was given away.

Hunting specifically for other people who had a permit was not mentioned, but there were only two people among those interviewed who had received permits. Hunting for other people was commonly mentioned as the reason for going out. Especially for the older people and family members who could not hunt.

Caribou Hunting - Times and Places-

When asked in what places and during which times were caribou hunted people responded with a variety of answers. There are families who recall always having gone after caribou while other families remember caribou hunting as an occasional, opportunistic event. The regular caribou hunt was most commonly referred to be people in the Gulkana and Chistochina areas. People in Copper Center and south of there mentioned it less frequently. Although people in Chitina recall having crossed the Copper River many years ago to hunt caribou which moved into the Kotsina area. As to the times when people hunted caribou
they referred to that period after harvesting fish in the late summer and fall. It was also stated as an opportunistic thing where if you could get a chance at one you took it. In December and late winter as meat reserves ran low there were groups which went out to hunt caribou. Again, this was done on an as-need basis.

Regarding the times when hunting caribou would be best, responses were varied. Most people said that hunting in the fall would be good. Everyone indicated that if there was hunting in the late winter, as there once was, that the animals would be fat and that would be a good time. Because of the concern for sex ratios harvested in a late season the question was posed as to which animals would be shot. Most people responded that bulls would be taken. Largely it depended upon what would be allowed to be shot. But when asked how they would distinguish between cows and bulls in late winter there was some confusion as to how the animals could be identified. One household did respond with the fact that many of the old people did like the unborn calves and that some people might prefer a cow for that reason. Generally it was felt that people would take whatever they got a shot at if there was no restriction. Were a bulls only restriction placed on a season it would be necessary to inform everyone of the methods of identification. As for more recent years the older people could remember during the 1930's of hunting with their fathers and grandfathers. The times hunted were in the fall after fishing or in the late winter as people needed meat. The Paxson area was the most heavily hunted. Most people recall having hunted in the area between Sourdough and Paxson and usually along the road. In the late 1920's people from Chitina drove
up to the Paxson area to hunt for several days. They would go with several people and get enough meat for several families.

Most people haven't hunted in recent years either because of the low caribou numbers in the 1960's or because they would not or could not apply for the permits owing to the $5.00 fee. Several people living in the Gulkana area have traplines in the area west of the Richardson Highway or use the trail system running to the Ewan Lake area and hunt that area.

Generally it appears that people not living in Gulkana area or having family there hunt the road system along the Richardson Highway or the Lake Louise Road.

General Comments-

In the late 1800's there used to be many moose. Then there was a large starvation. Large wolf packs of 40 or so would come down the river and kill everything. Moose were scarce in the 1920's and 30's. In 1923 and 24 there was the Willow Creek fire. After this burn was over in 1925 the first caribou came into the area near Chitina. They were in the Kotsina area in 1930.

During the 1950's many caribou were shot and left lay.

After statehood things really changed. Fish and game laws changed and made it very difficult to get food during traditional time of the year. Many people had to move to get jobs in order to buy food. The regulations and availability of outside jobs changed people's diets and this affected their health. Alcoholism became more
common, destroyed family bonds as did deviating from seasonal fishing
and hunting. Self image got very bad and people resorted to bad habits.
People in the early days were not as sick as today because of all the
changes they have had.

Elderly people should really be the first ones to get the oppor-
tunity since they miss the wild game meat the most. They really don't
like the taste of beef. They can't get used to it. My mother would
rather eat fish and rabbits and does so now. Some days older people
won't eat at all because they don't feel they are getting what they
need from the storebought foods. The general health and well being
are really effected by not getting the foods they are accustomed to.

The $12,000 income idea is good. Many people who are retired or
work only part-time use the game and fish to get them through the
year. Those people who aren't working or who have low incomes should
get a preference. We grew up with this food and crave it before any
store-bought foods. Not everyone has the same degree of dependence
on the wild animals. The use of wild meat and salmon is something
learned and taught traditionally. Sharing of meat among the people
of a village is always practiced. Especially it is given to people
who can't get it like the old or women. Meat is a major part of the
diet, "ya got no meat, ya got nothing".

During the last couple of years our three family members have gone
out hunting moose but haven't gotten anything. During the fall there
weren't enough moose around in the Chistochina this year. There are
so many hunters in the area you can't get anything.
Hunting caribou in the Chistochina area used to be good, but it is difficult today. The caribou used to cross the road in this area 13 years ago. Many animals were shot and only the heads were taken. "I haven't done much hunting today because of so many other people, and it cost too much to go to other places to hunt."

In the past, hunting caribou in the Chistochina area could be done just by driving there and going a short distance from the road. Some people would use snow machines and get far away from the roads.

In talking about hunting caribou people had the following comments. During the fall there aren't enough caribou around, and there are too many hunters. Late in the fall the bulls go into rut and aren't good to eat. This family can tell the bulls from the cows in late winter by the bulls being anterless and being bigger animals. We used to hunt the Gun Creek glacier area. We also used to hunt the Sanford River area until there became so many hunters, and the lodge then I stopped hunting.

Hunting during February and March would be bad because the cows are carrying calves. A fall season as it is now is too short. One to two weeks earlier would be better. You couldn't depend on people shooting only bulls if given a choice in spring season. They would shoot whatever they could get.

Data for the households interviewed are as follows:

Total Households Interviewed - 18
Total Households with Size Data - 12
Employment Status of Interviewees:

- Full Time - 2
- Part Time - 9
- Retired/Unemployed - 3

Number of Interviews by Community:

- Gakona - 2
- Glennallen - 1
- Chistochina - 4
- Chitina - 2
- Copper Center - 3
- Mentasta - 0
- Tazlina - 0
- Gulkana - 4
Income Data from Copper River Subsistence Fishery

To provide some background data pertinent to proposal numbers 21, 23, and 100 income data for local and nonlocal Copper River subsistence fishermen is included in Figures 6 and 7 respectively.

Demographic Data

Data on populations for Copper River communities is provided in Figures 8 and 9.
Figure 6. Gross annual household income of local fishwheelers and dip netters.
Figure 7. Gross annual household income of non-local fishwheelers and dip netters.
### POPULATION—AIHTNA REGION
### DECEMBER 1977

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Villages &amp; Community</th>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Non-Native</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cantwell</td>
<td>58+</td>
<td>48*</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentasta</td>
<td>68+</td>
<td>30*</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chistochina</td>
<td>53+</td>
<td>67*</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gakona</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>158*</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulkana</td>
<td>58+</td>
<td>30*</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glennallen</td>
<td>61+</td>
<td>584*</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>59+</td>
<td>777*</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper Center</td>
<td>133+</td>
<td>273*</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitina/Kenny Lake</td>
<td>99+</td>
<td>480*</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>629 (25%)</td>
<td>1,897 (75%)</td>
<td>2,526 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- These numbers were determined by calculating that students in grade 1-8 represented 15% of the total population.
- Bantz Estimate summer 1977.
- Glennallen Volunteer Fire Department Census.

**Source:** Tribal Health Plan, Copper River Native Association Health Department

**Figure 8.** Population data for communities in the AIHTNA Region.
# NATIVE FAMILIES AS OF DECEMBER 1977

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ahtna Region</th>
<th>Cantwell</th>
<th>Chitina</th>
<th>Karmi Lake</th>
<th>Tonsina</th>
<th>Copper Center</th>
<th>Gakona</th>
<th>Glennallen</th>
<th>Glenn Highway</th>
<th>Gulkana</th>
<th>Montana</th>
<th>Tatina</th>
<th>Chitina, Santa, Nebeska</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents per Household</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number in Household</th>
<th>01.</th>
<th>02.</th>
<th>03.</th>
<th>04.</th>
<th>05.</th>
<th>06.</th>
<th>07.</th>
<th>08.</th>
<th>09.</th>
<th>10.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Households with more than one resident.
**Area covered by Copper River Native Association, Inc.

NOTE: This table shows the total village populations, including non-natives within native families. Therefore, the population totals are somewhat higher.

Source: Copper River-Wrangells Socioeconomic Overview, ISER, U of A, U.S. Forest Service

Figure 9. Household data for Native families in the AHTNA Region.
QUESTIONNAIRE

1) To the best you can remember, during which years and months, and in which areas did you hunt caribou??

2) How much (percentage) of the caribou you kill do you?
   (a) use for your own household consumption
   (b) give to others
   (c) use as trap bait
   (d) use as dog food
   (e) other

3) Do you or members of your household hunt for (a) other people in your community
   (b) other permit holders in your household?

4) Try to estimate how much (%) of your household meat comes from caribou?
   (a) Other wild game?
   (b) How much (%) of your household meat is fish?

5) How many members in your household are:
   Male   Less than 18_______; 18-55_______; Greater than 55_______
   Female Less than 18_______; 18-55_______; Greater than 55_______

6) How many members of your household are:
   Employed Full-time_____; Part-time_____; Unemployed/Retired_____

Other comments: ________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

Note: Person interviewed – Head of household_____; Hunter_____;