

0001

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

SOUTHCENTRAL SUBSISTENCE  
REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

PUBLIC MEETING

VOLUME II

HYATT PLACE  
Anchorage, Alaska  
January 14, 2026

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Richard Encelewski, Chair  
Judith Caminer, Acting Chair  
Kirk Wilson  
Andy McLaughlin  
Faye Ewan  
Dennis Zadra  
Angela Totemoff  
Hope Roberts  
Michael Opheim  
Edward Holsten  
Edward GreyBear

Regional Council Coordinator, Nissa Pilcher

Recorded and transcribed by:

Lighthouse Integrated Services Corp  
787-239-0462  
Info.@lighthouseonline.com

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Anchorage, Alaska - 1/14/26)

(On record)

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay, folks, if you could have a chair, we'll get going here. Good morning, Hope. We're missing Angela. Is that it? Looks like one person.

(Talking)

Okay. Couple items I'm going to do before we get started. First of all, we'll do -- we'll start -- Kirk has volunteered to do a little prayer before we start for Invocation. So, if you want to go ahead, we'll accommodate.

(Invocation)

Amen. Okay, now I'm going to say a couple things here just to get started. In one minute, we're going to do any public comments that we have that are not on that agenda. But we do have quite an agenda left. We could have used an extra day in this meeting probably, but some of us have to leave kind of early. I got a commitment. I'd like to get through the proposals by 2. And Judy will be here to cover. There's still nine proposals on the docket, and then there's also some other action items. So, if we could stay focused and get through it. And just for the RAC, reminder on the back of your card here, it shows the process we go through every one of these proposals. So, when the Council discussion that's your turn to talk and ask questions about the proposals. So anyway, just reminder, might be helpful. But if not, I'll remind you once more. Thank you. Okay. Public comment are welcome for each agenda item for the Regional Council. Did you want to read this Nissa, or do you want me to? Okay. We just-- we're just going to open it up for any public comments that are not on the agenda.

(No comment)

Okay. Hearing none. We're going to go ahead and go back to where we were. We're going to try and kind of get back on track on agenda. We do have action items for some statewide stuff, and then we'll go back to. But we're going to go ahead and work on the

1 proposals that we have before us. We're going to work  
2 on the regional proposals first, I believe. And if I got  
3 my agenda right, the first one is going to be WP26-11.

4  
5 MR. UBELAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good  
6 morning, everybody. For the record, my name is Brian  
7 Ubelaker. I'm a Wildlife Biologist with the Office of  
8 Subsistence Management. And as Greg stated, I will be  
9 presenting a summary of Wildlife Proposal WP2611, which  
10 is regarding Black Bear and Unit 6D. If you are  
11 interested, the announced -- the proposal analysis  
12 starts on page 43 in your meeting books. This proposal,  
13 submitted by the Native Village of Eyak, seeks to close  
14 federal public lands on Hawkins and Hinchinbrook  
15 backpack in Unit 6D to the harvest of black bear by non-  
16 federally qualified subsistence users and to require a  
17 federal registration permit for harvest. The Native  
18 Village of Eyak states that increased harvest pressure  
19 on black bears in eastern Prince William Sound by non-  
20 federally qualified users, and declining black bear  
21 density on Hawkins and Hinchinbrook Islands have  
22 resulted in federally qualified users being unable to  
23 meet their subsistence needs.

24  
25 Black bears are rare on Hawkins and  
26 Hinchinbrook Islands, as well as the smaller islands in  
27 the Central and Eastern Sound. There are currently no  
28 estimates of black bear numbers in Unit 6, and their  
29 status is primarily assessed through harvest monitoring,  
30 local knowledge and observations. Federally qualified  
31 users show low effort in harvesting black bears in Unit  
32 6D. From 2020 to 2023, an average of 5.5 users annually  
33 obtained permits. No black bear harvests have been  
34 reported from Hawkins or Hinchinbrook Islands by any  
35 users since reporting began in the year 2009. There is  
36 no conservation concern for black bears in Unit 6D, and  
37 harvest effort by federally qualified users is low.  
38 Black bears are rarely found on Hawkins or Hinchinbrook  
39 Islands, with most subsistence study participants  
40 reporting no sightings. Closing these islands to non-  
41 federally qualified hunters will likely not impact the  
42 black bear population or subsistence use. Requiring a  
43 federal permit would burden managers, subsistence users,  
44 and law enforcement without increasing subsistence  
45 opportunities.

46  
47 Therefore, the OSM preliminary  
48 conclusion is to oppose WP26-11, as black bears are rare  
49 on these islands with no reported harvest in the past  
50 15 years. Closing federal public lands to non-federally

1 qualified users is unnecessary and does not address  
2 subsistence or conservation concerns, and federal  
3 permits and administrative burdens and complicate  
4 reporting's. And with that, I am happy to answer any  
5 questions anybody may have.

6

7 MS. PILCHER: We did not receive any  
8 public comments either on time or after the deadline.

9

10 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. All  
11 right. We're going to go ahead and move down the list  
12 and tribal and ANCSA Corporations' consultation report.  
13 First of all, the tribal under comments. We got the  
14 Alaska Department of Fish and Game. Are they online or  
15 here?

16

17 MR. POETTER: Good morning, Mr. Chair.  
18 Aaron Poetter, Federal Subsistence Liaison with the  
19 state of Alaska. Again, as I mentioned yesterday, we are  
20 still in the process of drafting our staff comments for  
21 proposals to the Subsistence Board -- Federal  
22 Subsistence Board. The state would -- we agree with  
23 comments and analysis that was provided by OSM. This is  
24 unnecessary closure request. It would not impact  
25 subsistence uses or conservation of the resource, as  
26 there's been no documented harvest there in the last 15  
27 years. So that's what we have this morning. Thank you.

28

29 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Very  
30 good. Thank you. How about federal agencies, any reports  
31 there or comments?

32

33 (No comment)

34

35 Okay. We're going to move on to tribes  
36 or ANCSA corporations. Anyone want to talk to this  
37 proposal?

38

39 (No comment)

40

41 We're going to move to advisory groups  
42 then. Was there any other RACs that commented on this?

43

44 MR. UBELAKER: Mr. Chair, no, this has  
45 not been brought up at any other Council meetings.

46

47 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay, great.  
48 Fish and Game Advisory Councils. Nissa, do you have  
49 anyone?

50

0005

1 MS. PILCHER: No, there were none  
2 received. Thank you.

3  
4 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. How about  
5 Resource Commission? Anyone? No.

6  
7 MS. PILCHER: Nope.

8  
9 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. I'm going  
10 to ask you one time now, did you get any written public  
11 comments?

12  
13 MS. PILCHER: We did not.

14  
15 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Thank you.  
16 Okay. Would anyone like to have public testimony on this  
17 proposal?

18  
19 (No comment)

20  
21 Hearing none. We'll take it to the  
22 Council. Council's motion to put it on the table.

23  
24 UNIDENTIFIED: I'll make a motion to put  
25 26-11 on the table.

26  
27 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: An affirmative  
28 matter is.....

29  
30 (Simultaneous speech)

31  
32 UNIDENTIFIED: Yeap.

33  
34 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Second

35  
36 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Seconded by  
37 Andy. Thank you. Okay, it's up for the Council discussion  
38 at this time. So, Andy, you want to start?

39  
40 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, I can say I've  
41 hunted Hinchinbrook. Never even seen a black bear on  
42 Hinchinbrook. It's kind of -- is interesting. If  
43 somebody got it in their craw about competition for  
44 hunting resource they could run an 804 analysis, which  
45 would give you -- there's already the residents have a  
46 C&T designation already seeing no black bears on  
47 Hinchinbrook. I'm going to oppose this.

48  
49 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Thank you, Andy  
50 Is there any other comments on the proposal? Excuse me,

0006

1 Dennis.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. ZADRA: For the record, Dennis Zadra and I just want to reiterate what Andy says. I've been hunting both Hinchinbrook and Hawkins for 35 years for both bear and deer and I have never seen a black bear on either island.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Interesting. Thank you. Thank you for that comment. Is there anyone else on the Council want to speak to that one? You go ahead, Faye.

MS. EWAN: This black bear proposal is submitted by who? Native Village of Eyak?

MR. UBELAKER: Through the Chair. It was Native Village of Eyak. Yes.

MS. EWAN: Okay. And that island is where? This land is where?

MR. UBELAKER: Through the Chair. It's Hawkins and Hinchinbrook Islands which are west of Cordova and farther west of Cordova. Yeah. Correct. Very close.

MS. EWAN: They have C&T already?

MR. UBELAKER: Through the Chair. Yes. There's already -- its -- yeah.

MS. EWAN: I support it. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Alright. Anyone else have a comment on it? If not, we have a motion. We have a second. We've finished discussion. We'll take a vote. All in favor of this proposal? Say aye.

Just you. You want to push your button so, you've got the record?

MS. EWAN: Aye, Faye.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Thank you. Okay. All opposed say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye

0007

1 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Motion -- the  
2 proposal fails. Thank you. The next one, Brian, I guess  
3 we got here is Wildlife Proposal 26-12/13A/14A.

4  
5 MR. UBELAKER: Nope. That one was done  
6 yesterday.

7  
8 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Oh, excuse me,  
9 I do have a check mark by that. We gotta [sic] go down  
10 to -- let's go to WP26-15. Is that correct?

11  
12 MR. UBELAKER: Yes, sir. That's what I  
13 have on my list.

14  
15 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: okay, I have  
16 that also now.

17  
18 MR. UBELAKER: A quick question for you.  
19 Are you purposely skipping over 26-01?

20  
21 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Yeah.

22  
23 MR. UBELAKER: Okay.

24  
25 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: We're going to  
26 go back to it.

27  
28 MR. UBELAKER: Okay. Very good.

29  
30 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: We haven't  
31 forgot it. We figured it's going to take some doing, so  
32 we are putting it toward the end.

33  
34 MR. UBELAKER: Okay, get lunch-in  
35 everybody first. aright

36  
37 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: So, something  
38 like that. Sorry.

39  
40 MR. UBELAKER: Okay. Thank you, Mr.  
41 Chair. For the record again, Brian Ubelaker and this  
42 will be a summary of Wildlife Proposal WP26-15 regarding  
43 deer in Unit 6D. This analysis begins on page 83 of your  
44 meeting books. This proposal, also submitted by the  
45 Native Village of Eyak, seeks to close federal public  
46 lands on Hawkins and Hinchinbrook Islands in Unit 6D to  
47 the harvest of deer by non-federally qualified  
48 subsistence users. The Native Village of Eyak states  
49 that increased harvest pressure on deer in eastern  
50 Prince William Sound by non-federally qualified users

1 and a declining deer density on Hawkins and Hinchinbrook  
2 Islands have resulted in federal users being unable to  
3 meet their subsistence needs. This competition issue has  
4 occurred for many seasons, but an additional  
5 conservation concern arising during the 2024-25 hunting  
6 season prompted the proposal.

7  
8 Deer populations in Unit 6 fluctuate  
9 more drastically than compared to their native range.  
10 In harsh winters, snow forces deer on the beaches,  
11 leading to high harvest rates. The winter of 2024 and  
12 '25 was warm and mild, but snowy winters over the  
13 previous five years have caused modest declines in the  
14 Prince William Sound Deer Pellet Index. In 2025, surveys  
15 were conducted only on Hawkins Island, Hinchinbrook  
16 Island, and the north end of Montague Island. The density  
17 estimate for Hawkins Island was low, while Hinchinbrook  
18 Island had a moderate estimate. Three out of four survey  
19 zones showed decreases from 2024 survey. In Unit 6D most  
20 deer were harvested from Hawkins, Hinchinbrook and  
21 Montague Islands, which have extensive winter habitats.  
22 From 2015 to 2024, reported deer harvests on Hawkins and  
23 Hinchinbrook Islands ranged from 267 to 807 deer.  
24 Federal users accounted for 72.9% of all deer harvested,  
25 with 70.2% by Cordova residents. In 2024, 71% of deer  
26 were harvested by federally qualified subsistence users.

27  
28 Subsistence priority includes a late  
29 January deer hunt after the state season ends. Though  
30 federally -- though, federal users noted competition and  
31 displacement issues in Unit 6, winter weather likely  
32 impacts federal opportunities, more significantly. Deer  
33 abundance and mortality depend more on winter severity.  
34 The mild winter of '24-'25 likely caused deer to remain  
35 in mid-elevation timber, leading to lower sightings by  
36 hunters. The OSM preliminary conclusion is to oppose  
37 WP26-15. There are no significant conservation concerns  
38 or severe impact expected on subsistence uses. Although  
39 the deer population index on these islands is low to  
40 moderate, it fluctuates with winter conditions and  
41 should recover after the recent mild winter. State  
42 hunters harvest few deer here and their percentage has  
43 declined over the past decade. Federal users are  
44 generally successful harvesting deer and closing federal  
45 public lands would not increase federal opportunities  
46 and would unnecessarily restrict non-federally qualified  
47 users. With that, I'm happy to answer any questions.

48  
49 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Brian,  
50 did you receive any public comments related during the

0009

1 open period?

2

3

MR. UBELAKER: No, sir.

4

5

6

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Thank you. How about tribal, ANCSA corporations' consultation?

7

8

MR. LIND: Good morning, Mr. Chair.

9

10

11

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Good morning, Orville.

12

13

14

15

16

17

MR. LIND: Orville Lind, Native Liaison. Sorry I couldn't be there this morning, but we did not have any questions or comments on that proposal. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

18

19

20

21

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Thank you, Orville. Okay, we're going to go to agency and tribal comments. We'll start with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

MR. POETTER: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chair. Aaron Poetter, again, for the record. The department would highlight a lot of the comments made in the OSM analysis about deer populations and how they fluctuate with the winter conditions. The patchwork of state and federal lands and the opportunities that are currently provided. Would also point out that during winters of heavy snowfall, a lot of deer tend to congregate down along the tidal areas and may be found below mean high water, which still allows them to be harvested by all state users. So, things to consider for this proposal. Thank you.

35

36

37

38

39

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Thank you. How about federal agencies? Any comments -- any tribe or ANCSA corporations want to comment?

40

41

42

43

44

45

(No comment)

Okay. We're going to go to other comments. Advisory groups. Was there any other RACs on this one?

46

47

48

49

50

MR. UBELAKER: Yes, Mr. Chair, this was presented to Kodiak/Aleutians, and they decided to take no action and defer to the home region.

00010

1 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Thank  
2 you. Fish and Game Advisory Councils, anyone?

3  
4 (No response)

5  
6 How about Subsistence Resource  
7 Commission? You got one?

8  
9 MS. PILCHER: Nope.

10  
11 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Nope. Okay. Was  
12 there any written public comments?

13  
14 MS. PILCHER: There was. Thank you.  
15 Actually, so in your -- in your meeting, materials  
16 received on page 53 is a copy of the public comment. It  
17 is multiple pages, but the summation of it is the  
18 gentleman was in opposition. And additional materials  
19 received was a document that was sitting here when you  
20 guys got into the meeting space.

21  
22 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. There was  
23 one opposition to the closure of the deer hunting. All  
24 right. Thank you Nissa, is there anyone wants to have  
25 public testimony here? Raven Cunningham, you on the  
26 phone? Go right ahead.

27  
28 MS. CUNNINGHAM: Yeah. Thank you. And I'm  
29 sorry I missed our previous proposal. I was caught up  
30 on something. I wanted to just talk on both the bear and  
31 deer and reiterate the increase of pressure on the island  
32 ecosystems within the Prince William Sound. And it's  
33 important to uphold our tribal subsistence priorities  
34 and rural subsistence priorities. While current harvest  
35 data shows that there's limited black bear harvest on  
36 Hinchinbrook. The proposals that we submitted were  
37 solely based on the fact of the trend of increasing  
38 hunting activity on the islands that are traditionally  
39 relied on by subsistence users within Cordova. In recent  
40 years, Native Village of Eyak and other communities in  
41 the region have observed an increase of non-local and  
42 non-subsistence hunters accessing Hinchinbrook and other  
43 islands within the sound. This is facilitated because  
44 of improved access, chartering and larger vessels and  
45 shared information. This increase of human presence  
46 affects our deer populations, small game, habitat use  
47 and overall ecosystem balance. And the proposals were  
48 intended to be proactive and not reactive by  
49 establishing a clear management boundary. And we're  
50 hoping to seek that we can prevent future resource

00011

1 depletion by reducing user conflict and ensuring  
2 federally qualified subsistence users continue to have  
3 meaningful access to our resources that roam the island.  
4 This proposal aligns with the State of Alaska's  
5 responsibility to manage wildlife sustainably, while  
6 recognizing the priority of subsistence needs of  
7 federally qualified users.

8  
9 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Ok. Thank you,  
10 Raven. Just a quick question for you. Your comments to  
11 be from the tribe.....

12  
13 (Simultaneous speech)

14  
15 MS. CUNNINGHAM: Thank you. That's all.

16  
17 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Was that to be  
18 from the tribe or the public testimony from you?

19  
20 (No response)

21  
22 Did she hang up on me? We got the comment  
23 anyway. I guess we'll go forward. Oh. Oh, okay. Raven,  
24 can you hear me? This is the Chair here. I just wanted  
25 to clarify. Are you make -- was your testimony on the  
26 tribal side, or was it just public testimony?

27  
28 MS. CUNNINGHAM: The tribal side. I'm  
29 representing Native Village of Eyak.

30  
31 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. For the  
32 record that's what.....

33  
34 (Simultaneous speech)

35  
36 MS. CUNNINGHAM: Sorry. I.....

37  
38 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: That's -- yeah,  
39 I we blew through it, but that's fine. That's good.  
40 We'll put that down. Thank you. Okay. Any other public  
41 testimony?

42  
43 (No comment)

44  
45 Hearing none. The Council, you guys are  
46 up. Would someone like to put a motion on the table for  
47 this?

48  
49 MR. ZADRA: I move to adopt wildlife  
50 proposal 26-15.

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

MS. TOTEMOFF: This is Angela. Second.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Angela, you seconded? Okay. I think you Ed tried to beat you, but I'm not sure who won. But anyway, we'll go ahead and we'll proceed. Judy, you got a comment?

MS. CAMINER: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I guess I just want to bring everybody back to what ANILCA says. And I'm sure there are follow up regulations within the Subsistence Program as to closures to non-federally qualified people. And the closures are to be done only if necessary for reasons of public safety, administration, and or to assure the continued viability of such population. And I guess I didn't hear that the viability of the population is being threatened at this moment. And I appreciate Raven and NVE wanting to be proactive, but I don't think that's how we -- that's not the sequence of how we act, unfortunately.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Thank you, Judy. Is there other comments? Go ahead, Dennis and then Andy.

MR. ZADRA: Yeah. For the record, Dennis Zadra. I could go either way on this, and I see it. What this is about is just increased transporter activity and from people out of Cordova. And so, they're just hunting closer to town where the residents hunt. So, there's a lot of pushback toward that. The one transporter has been taking -- he was taking quite a few just Alaska residents. But what he found is when you take Alaska residents and show them where to hunt next year, they show up with their own boats and all that. So, he's backed off and is just mainly doing a non-resident business. There is a proposal to the Board of Game for this area to take -- to change a non-resident deer harvest, which is currently you can take up to four bucks, and they want to reduce that to one buck, as they've done in Kodiak. Most likely that's going to pass too. So, I think there's going to be a forced reduction in use with that. But I'm also very concerned of the increased use because it's obviously something that's working in. And it just, you know, too much advertisement on Facebook and all that just continues to open up the doors. So, but, you know, as Judy said, they -- I don't know that this is the way to go, so. I'll entertain, listen to more discussion.

1                   CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Very good.  
2 Dennis. Yeah. Great to have the local knowledge and the  
3 response. Andy, you want to go ahead.  
4

5                   MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.  
6 Chair. I just -- I have sympathy for Cordovans in this  
7 type of situation. I can say welcome to my world because  
8 in Western Prince William Sound, we have a marginal  
9 habitat compared to some of the nicer habitat that's on  
10 Hinchinbrook and Montague, where there's a contiguous  
11 forest, which is a big factor in winter survivability.  
12 Deer density per square mile is bigger over that way.  
13 And we have non-federally qualified subsistence users  
14 rampant, coming from the Whittier Tunnel over where we  
15 are. And that's going to push them into a habitat that  
16 doesn't have as many deer per square mile, which is  
17 interesting. You know, knowing that that habitat is  
18 better over there in Hinchinbrook and Montague is a  
19 factor. But we also need data that warrants such  
20 restrictive regulations. So, I'm going to oppose this.  
21

22                   CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Is there  
23 -- go ahead, Michael.  
24

25                   MR. OPHEIM: In talking to Raven and some  
26 other folks there. Some of the spots they were concerned  
27 about were places that they were taking their youth to  
28 hunt, you know, to get them used to hunting. And you  
29 know, they've gotten kind of pushed out of those areas  
30 because of the people coming in, you know, from the  
31 different areas and the charters and things like that.  
32 So, they don't go to those spots, you know, as much as  
33 they were. So, I think if this is some way to help their  
34 youth you know, and educational purposes, I think I could  
35 definitely see supporting this. Thanks.  
36

37                   CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Alrighty. Any  
38 other -- Andy will go ahead.  
39

40                   MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah. Thank you again,  
41 Mr. Chair. Yeah. I used to back my son up in Western  
42 Prince William Sound when he was small enough to be on  
43 my back. And, you know, suddenly the places that were a  
44 great bastion of deer encounters became gut piles and  
45 empty three 300-win mag cartridges and places where  
46 people the drag deer out of. They used to be kind of  
47 like sanctuary secluded places. It just goes with the  
48 territory of increased pressure on a limited resource.  
49

50

00014

1 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: You go ahead,  
2 Faye.

3  
4 MS. EWAN: What's his name? Brian, what  
5 is the population of the -- deer population in that  
6 area? Do you know?

7  
8 MR. UBELAKER: Through the Chair. I don't  
9 believe there is a population estimate. They use pellet  
10 counts as -- for trend surveys. You know, the more  
11 pellets they count trend goes up and down, but it does  
12 not give an estimate, or they cannot form an estimate  
13 from that survey. And I will also note that Andrew  
14 Sanders of the Forest Service authored this one, and I  
15 am just reading his notes that he sent me. So, if he is  
16 online and has anything to contradict what I said he  
17 could speak up and answer that better.

18  
19 MS. EWAN: It's not a conservation issue  
20 or -- on this -- on the deer? I don't know, I'm not deer  
21 hunters. I'm just asking questions.

22  
23 MR. UBELAKER: It does not sound like  
24 there is, what his analysis showed was that the -- oh,  
25 hold on, I am on the wrong -- I moved ahead one.

26  
27 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: I do have Andrew  
28 on if you want to.

29  
30 MR. UBELAKER: No muskox this time it was  
31 beaver, though we're closed. So, in 2025, the surveys  
32 that were conducted on Hawkins, Hinchinbrook -- oh,  
33 excuse me. The density estimate for Hawkins Island was  
34 low, while Hinchinbrook Island had a moderate estimate  
35 of density. As far as that goes, I don't know what the  
36 metric is, what they're comparing that to other than the  
37 year before. Maybe if Andrews online, he can fill in  
38 some data.

39  
40 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: We do have  
41 Andrew. So, Andrew, would you like to fill in some data  
42 here?

43  
44 MR. SANDERS: Yeah. Can you -- can  
45 everyone hear me?

46  
47 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Yes, we can.

48  
49 MR. SANDERS: So, the deer pellet index  
50 is relative to itself. We look at how each year's count

1 compares to a long-term average. Those pellets have been  
2 -- those surveys have been happening in pretty much the  
3 same way they still do since the 80s. And they don't  
4 really tell us how many deer there are, but they tell  
5 us if the population is going up or down, and there are  
6 a lot of things to consider with that data. So last year  
7 was very warm and wet winter and green up happened really  
8 early. So, we never do the surveys earlier than May  
9 17th. And so, we went out and did them on May 17th,  
10 before there was too much leaf cover to be able to see  
11 the ground very well. So, there was a lot of leaf out  
12 early, which made it hard to site pellets. And it also  
13 rained a lot, which really rains out the pellets and can  
14 turn them into mush and make them harder to see also  
15 when they're not preserved under the snow. So, there's  
16 reason to believe that the numbers we saw were a little  
17 bit lower than maybe we would have expected if it had  
18 been a little bit colder and snowier just to preserve  
19 the pellets. The other thing is that my personal  
20 observation, which I don't have great data on this, but  
21 what I did notice was that the pellets were very dense  
22 in a band of elevation that was like maybe around 800ft  
23 high. So, there weren't a lot of pellets down low and  
24 then you get up to probably about where the snow line  
25 was on the islands, and it just seemed like the deer had  
26 been hanging out in that tight band right below the snow  
27 and just mowing down all of the browse at that elevation.

28  
29 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay, Andrew,  
30 that's good info. Faye did that help out? Yeah. Okay.  
31 Angela.

32  
33 MS. TOTEMOFF: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And  
34 thank you, Raven, for the presentation and the  
35 additional information. I am not convinced that it's not  
36 a conservation issue. I think that, you know, there's  
37 no hard evidence for or against whether or not it is a  
38 conservation issue. What I do like is it is showing good  
39 stewardship of the land. And yeah, for that reason I  
40 will be supporting this proposal.

41  
42 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Thank  
43 you. Is there anyone else? Ed.

44  
45 MR. GREYBEAR: I'm also in agreement with  
46 Angela, and I'll be supporting this proposal.

47  
48 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Me too. Me too.  
49 Okay. Thank you. Very good. Any other comments before  
50 we vote? Okay. Yeah. Oh. Go ahead.

00016

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

MS. CAMINER: Question.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Question.  
Question has been called, so we will take a vote. All  
in favor of this proposal, signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Those opposed  
same sign.

IN UNISON: Aye.

MS. PILCHER: Nissa Pilcher for the  
record. So, it appears to be five yay five -- wait, we  
have Angela. That's 11. So that would be a six yay, five  
nay. So, the motion carries.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Motion  
carries by one. All right, Brian, we're going to move  
down to Wildlife Proposal 26-16.

MR. UBELAKER: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: This is Beaver.

MR. UBELAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Once  
again, Brian Ubelaker. And, yes, as you said, this is  
proposal WP26-16 regarding beaver in Unit 6. This  
analysis starts on page 97 of your meeting books. And  
this proposal, which was submitted by this Council,  
requests two changes -- is that. Sorry? Am I hearing  
things? This proposal requests two changes to federal  
beaver hunting regulations in Unit 6. First, it asks to  
increase the possession limit from one beaver to three.  
Second, it asks to extend the hunting season from the  
current May through October to a year-round season. The  
intent is to better align with traditional subsistence  
practices, which is more opportunistic in nature, which  
would allow hunters to take beaver whenever they are  
encountered and give flexibility to those on multi-day  
trips who may not be able to process their harvest  
immediately.

Currently, federal harvest limit is one  
beaver per day, with only one in possession from May  
through October. Federal trapping regulations allow  
unlimited harvest from December through April. There --  
as there is no state hunting season in Unit 6, but there

1 is no trapping limit during the November through April  
2 season. Beaver are not rigorously surveyed in Unit 6,  
3 and most information comes from incidental observations.  
4 Based on this information, beaver are considered  
5 abundant in Unit 6, especially in Subunit 6A, 6B, and  
6 6C. Harvest is assessed as sustainable, averaging about  
7 60 beaver a year since 2002, with over 90% taken by  
8 trapping. Very few are harvested by firearms and there  
9 are no indications of population decline.

10  
11 If adopted, this proposal would allow  
12 federally qualified subsistence users to hunt beaver  
13 year-round and to keep up to three in possession at a  
14 time. Because trapping already allows unlimited harvest  
15 and very few beaver are taken under hunting regulations,  
16 only a minimal increase to harvest is expected. No  
17 conservation concerns have been identified, as Unit 6  
18 is about 75% federal public lands. These changes would  
19 benefit a wide range of subsistence users. Therefore,  
20 OSM's preliminary conclusion is to support this proposal  
21 as it increases subsistence opportunity, supports  
22 traditional harvest practices and poses no conservation  
23 concern. And I'm open for questions.

24  
25 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay, questions  
26 for Brian? And beaver seem to be doing pretty good there,  
27 huh? Was there any public comments you received?

28  
29 MR. UBELAKER: No, sir.

30  
31 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Tribal,  
32 ANCSA or consultation. Orville.

33  
34 MR. LIND: Good morning. Mr. Chair,  
35 Council members. We did not have any questions or  
36 comments on WP26-16. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

37  
38 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Thank  
39 you. Well let's go to the agencies. Let's go to the  
40 Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

41  
42 MR. POETTER: Yeah, Mr. Chair. Aaron  
43 Poetter again, Alaska Department Fish and Game. We don't  
44 have comments for this one. One point that we will put  
45 out is that harvest information is a bit compromised.  
46 It's only as good as our sealing records. We'll have us  
47 -- we'll be indicating and we have had difficulties in  
48 Unit 6 having federal users know to bring their beaver  
49 pelts in for sealing. Thank you.

00018

1 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Imagine that.  
2 Okay. Is there any federal agencies? Sorry.

3  
4 (No comment)

5  
6 Tribes or ANCSA corps wanted to speak  
7 to this beaver?

8  
9 (No comment)

10  
11 Okay, we'll go to agency groups. Was  
12 there any other RACs that talked about it, Brian?

13  
14 MR. UBELAKER: Yes. Mr. Chair.  
15 Kodiak/Aleutian heard this, but they took no action to  
16 defer to the home region.

17  
18 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Very  
19 good. Is there any Fish and Game Advisory Council report  
20 or talk? Nope. How about fishing Subsistence Resource  
21 Commission? Nope. Any written public comments? Okay. No  
22 written public comments. Okay. We're to public  
23 testimony. Anyone want to testify on this matter?

24  
25 (No response)

26  
27 Okay. Hearing none. We're going to move  
28 to the Council for a motion to put it on the table for  
29 consideration.

30  
31 UNIDENTIFIED: I'll make a motion. And I  
32 am in favor of this proposal. The short reason is, is  
33 most of the Native people in my community would rather  
34 have a beaver than a turkey.

35  
36 UNIDENTIFIED: I'll second.

37  
38 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Yeah, they are  
39 good eating. Moved and second. Thank you. Discussion.  
40 Anyone else? Go ahead, Andy.

41  
42 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.  
43 Chair. It might be worthy to note that the trappers  
44 under the state regulations of trapping can hunt, they  
45 can use a gun in order to get -- to shoot a beaver. And  
46 so, at some level, it seems like we're a little more  
47 restrictive on the federal subsistence users than we are  
48 for that. So, I'm definitely in support of this. And  
49 then no conservation concern.

50

00019

1 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay, great.  
2 Michael.

3  
4 MR. OPHEIM: Yeah. Similar. Seems like  
5 given more opportunity to our federal subsistence users  
6 and no conservation concerns. I'll be supporting.

7  
8 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Thank you.  
9 Anyone else? Go ahead, Dennis.

10  
11 MR. ZADRA: For the record, Dennis Zadra.  
12 And removing beavers isn't a bad thing. Beaver dams are  
13 kind of an impediment to salmon and all of that. So, I  
14 don't think we're going to wipe out the beavers on the  
15 Delta. I will be supporting this.

16  
17 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Faye.

18  
19 MS. EWAN: So -- Faye Ewan, Native  
20 Village of Kluti Kaah. What do they do with the meat and  
21 the skin after they're done with that? Do they preserve  
22 it or do they use it or? Are they trappers to sell the  
23 beaver hide and throw the meat away? Because if they're  
24 going to do that, they should send it to us in Copper  
25 River so we could use it.

26  
27 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Yeah, I think  
28 that a lot of them are trapping.

29  
30 MR. UBELAKER: Through the Chair.  
31 Trapping, they only have to take the fur. I'm not sure  
32 of salvage requirements when they hunt. Give me a minute.  
33 I realize -- understand. But let me dig through here and  
34 see if it says anything about salvage requirements for  
35 beaver. Unless somebody online happens to know more than  
36 I do.

37  
38 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Anyone know  
39 that? While he's taking a look, I'll tell you a beaver  
40 story on the peninsula. Beaver down there are -- used  
41 to be quite prolific in there, and they're kind of --  
42 went downhill. And the actual -- the feds are wanting  
43 to create habitat for beaver restoration. So anyway,  
44 it's interesting. Thank you.

45  
46 UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah. I would have a  
47 question. Is the federal and the state aligned on the  
48 regulations on whether you use the hide or the meat? Is  
49 the state and the feds aligned?

50

00020

1 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Probably not.

2

3 MR. UBELAKER: Through the Chair. I do  
4 not know what the state requires for salvage. But in  
5 answer to Faye's question as well, yes, salvage of edible  
6 meat is required when harvesting a beaver under federal  
7 regs.

8

9 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Is there any  
10 other comments from the Council? Edward.

11

12 MR. GREYBEAR: Question.

13

14 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Questions have  
15 been called. All in favor of the proposal, aye.

16

17 IN UNISON: Aye.

18

19 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Is there any  
20 opposition, opposed?

21

22 (No response)

23

24 Carries unanimously. Thank you. Next one  
25 we're going to go to is Wildlife Proposal 26-17, Unit 7  
26 remainder moose, establish a late fall season.

27

28 MR. UBELAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
29 Brian Ubelaker, for the record. And yes, this is a  
30 summary of Wildlife Proposal WP26-15 regarding moose and  
31 Unit 7. This analysis starts on page 105 of your meeting  
32 books. This proposal from Onie Wilks of Cooper Landing  
33 seeks to create a late fall season for moose in Unit 7  
34 from October 20th to November 10th. The proponent states  
35 that residents of Cooper Landing are allowed to hunt  
36 moose in both Unit 7 and Unit 15B, but that there is  
37 only an additional late fall season in Unit 15B.  
38 Establishing the same late fall season in Unit 7 would  
39 allow Cooper Landing residents the opportunity to  
40 participate in the late fall season hunt closer to home,  
41 where they customarily and traditionally hunt.

42

43 A moose population estimate has never  
44 been performed for Unit 7. Trend counts in Resurrection  
45 Creek and Juneau Creek since the 1990s show a decline.  
46 Taking this into consideration with other historic data,  
47 the moose population indicates a decrease since the  
48 1970s. The results of a 2013 demographic survey showed  
49 a low calf to cow ratio, which also indicates a decline.  
50 Unit 7 is mountainous with mature forests and areas

1 affected by spruce beetle kill. Harsh winters with heavy  
2 snow are common. Forest succession likely limits the  
3 moose population as they gather in low elevation areas  
4 with less snow and more browse during winter. Moose  
5 harvest in Unit 7 remainder occurs under federal  
6 regulations with permit FM4 and state regulations with  
7 a harvest ticket. Since Moose Pass received the C&T  
8 determination, federal harvest ranged from 0 to 7 moose.  
9 In the last five years, 2020 through 2024, the average  
10 combined harvest for state and federal hunts was 22.6  
11 moose, which was up from the -- up from 20 of -- in the  
12 previous five years of 2015 through 2019, but still well  
13 below the historic average of 100 moose per year, which  
14 is an average of 1963 through 1983.

15  
16 The federal season opens 11 days before  
17 the state season, prioritizing subsistence by allowing  
18 the harvest of bulls with forked antlers in addition to  
19 the spike 50-inch or three brow tine restriction. Adding  
20 a late fall season would increase moose harvest  
21 opportunities for federally qualified users during  
22 cooler weather. It would align with Unit 15B dates,  
23 simplifying management, and could boost harvest success  
24 as early winter concentrates moves to lower elevations.  
25 However, the declining moose population in Unit 7,  
26 stressed by limited winter habitat, raises conservation  
27 concerns about increased harvest success and additional  
28 stress on the moose. Therefore, the OSM preliminary  
29 conclusion is to oppose WP26-17. While this proposal  
30 would benefit federally qualified subsistence users,  
31 limited data indicate a potential conservation issue for  
32 Unit 7 moose. The population seems low and may be  
33 declining due to habitat constraints. Hence,  
34 conservative management is advised and increased harvest  
35 is not currently recommended. And with that, I will take  
36 questions. And I see Ed is taking his glasses off  
37 seriously.

38  
39 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Hang on.  
40 Presentation is good. How about public comments you  
41 received? Did you receive any? No. Okay. During the  
42 open...? Okay. You got a question? Is it for Brian? Go  
43 ahead.

44  
45 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.  
46 Chair. Looking here, I just saw Unit 7 -- oh. Where was  
47 it? Right here. Kings Bay is a separate hunt area and  
48 is not addressed in this analysis. Seeing where that  
49 line is going up through. It does seem like Kings Bay  
50 might be part of remainder 7, or is it not?

1

2 MR. UBELAKER: I'm going to phone a  
3 friend. This is once again, is Andrew's analysis. So,  
4 if he is willing and able to answer that, I would  
5 appreciate it.

6

7 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Is Andrew on the  
8 phone by chance?

9

10 MR. SANDERS: Through the Chair. I'm  
11 here. Could the question be repeated for me? Sorry about  
12 that.

13

14 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Yeah, we'll  
15 repeat it. Do you want to repeat it, Andy?

16

17 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes. So, I was reading  
18 on page 111 at the bottom of the paragraph about Chenega  
19 Bay and Tatitlek. It says, however, Kings Bay is a  
20 separate hunt area and is not addressed in this analysis.  
21 But when I look at the border line of Unit 7 it goes up  
22 through the tip of Kings Bay. Is there not a portion of  
23 the Kings Bay drainage that is included in remainder of  
24 7.

25

26 MR. SANDERS: I'll have to take a closer  
27 look at the map to confirm that, but the reason that I  
28 didn't include Kings Bay in this analysis is because we  
29 were talking about the Unit 7 remainder season, not the  
30 Kings Bay hunt.

31

32 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Did that help  
33 Andy or...?

34

35 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Not really, it's still  
36 unclear where that is.

37

38 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Sounds like  
39 it's a little fuzzy. Go ahead, Brian.

40

41 MR. UBELAKER: Andy, can you -- you were  
42 talking page 111, under the heading Chenega Bay and  
43 Tatitlek. That is the cultural and traditional section  
44 which I believe Hannah wrote. So, if Hannah is on the  
45 line, she might be able to answer that a little better  
46 for you.

47

48 DR. VORHEES: Thanks. Through the Chair.  
49 This is Hannah Vorhees.

50

00023

1 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Go ahead,  
2 Hannah.

3  
4 DR. VOORHEES: Yeah. When I dug into  
5 this, my knowledge is that it's a separate hunt area.  
6 Not overlapping with 7 remainder.

7  
8 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Thank  
9 you. Did that help Andy?

10  
11 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah.

12  
13 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay.

14  
15 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: I'm trying to find it  
16 in the map. Yeah. The other -- a different map.

17  
18 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. You're  
19 good to go. Okay, we'll go ahead and move on then. Tribal  
20 or ANCSA Corporation's report, consultation. Orville.

21  
22 MR. LIND: Good morning again, Mr. Chair,  
23 Orville Council members Orville Lind Native Liaison for  
24 OSM. There were no questions or comments on WP26-17.  
25 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

26  
27 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Thank you,  
28 Orville. How about let's move on to the agency and tribal  
29 comments. We'll start with the Alaska Department of Fish  
30 and Game.

31  
32 MR. POETTER: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
33 We do not have any comments about this proposal. Thank  
34 you.

35  
36 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Thank you. How  
37 about some federal agencies? Anyone got a report? Todd,  
38 you're shaking in the seat there. He's shaking his head.  
39 I -- oh, here he comes. Okay. Been too quiet.

40  
41 MR. ESKELIN: Good morning. Todd Eskelin,  
42 Kenai National Wildlife Refuge. Through the Chair and  
43 to the Council members, I -- the only thing I want to  
44 speak on this was when you look at Unit 15 and how --  
45 when the Board and the RAC supported having that late  
46 season hunt, we as a group collectively said we weren't  
47 going to do that in 15A because most populations were  
48 low in 15A, and 15C moose populations were high at the  
49 time, they remained high. And in 15B in 2014 I think,  
50 we had the Funny River Fire. There was anticipation that

1 15B moose numbers were also going to be on the rise. And  
2 so, when we did Unit 15, we put that late hunt in 15B  
3 and C only and excluded A, and I would consider 7 and  
4 15A, you know, kind of similar status. And would support  
5 OSM's thought process on that. I'm available for  
6 questions.

7

8 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Thank  
9 you. Questions for Todd?

10

11 (No response)

12

13 Thank you. Okay. Tribes are ANCSA corps.  
14 Go ahead, Darrel.

15

16 MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, members of  
17 the Board. My name is Darrel Williams. I'm with Ninilchik  
18 Traditional Council. This is right next door, and I  
19 wanted to make a couple comments about the proposal. One  
20 is what I didn't hear was a Swan Lake fire. So right  
21 next door to Unit 7 and into Unit 7, we -- there's a  
22 massive wildfire, and it's just like what Todd was  
23 saying, you know, the opportunity for good environment  
24 to produce growth is there and I think that's something  
25 that needs to be included in these analysis. I think the  
26 other thing that I have real pause on is when we start  
27 talking about going back to the 80s, when we're doing  
28 moose populations and harvest surveys and stuff. We  
29 gotta [sic] remember that the rules have changed. So,  
30 it used to be spike fork 50, fork -- 3 brown tines, 4  
31 brown tine 50. And it's interesting because we worked  
32 the corporations down where I work, and we do -- we  
33 survey the property a lot. And when they introduced the  
34 4 brown tine 50-inch antler restriction the next spring,  
35 when our crew went out in the field to do work, we were  
36 finding winter killed moose and not by -- not from  
37 wolves. They starved to death and you can always tell  
38 because they curl up and they lay down. When wolves get  
39 them, they scatter them. They tear them to pieces and  
40 take them all apart. And we got to be careful when we're  
41 doing analysis based on "harvest", is because those  
42 rules change, and we make bad decisions making those  
43 rules change. That's what happens. You know, there's a  
44 amount of sustainability in any area to be able to the  
45 carrying capacity for different animals. I think you're  
46 going to have a lot of growth because of the Swan Lake  
47 fire, that's going to happen in this area. I don't think  
48 there's as much mature forest there as we think there  
49 is. After that, it was a bigger bet. And what I don't  
50 want to see is -- I don't want to see restrictive

1 decisions that end up having animals starve to death in  
2 the wintertime because it affects the population  
3 geometrically. It's just not one moose that gets sick  
4 and dies. It's all the moose that suffer from it. So, I  
5 just wanted to put that in there because it's right next  
6 door to where we do our stuff, and I think it's very  
7 important. Thank you.

8  
9 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Yeah. Very  
10 good. Thank you, Darell. Any other tribes?

11  
12 (No comment)

13  
14 Okay. How about we're going to go to  
15 other RACs? Brian, did someone...?

16  
17 MR. UBELAKER: No, sir.

18  
19 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Thank you. Fish  
20 and Game Advisory Council. Nissa, no? How about Resource  
21 Commission, no?

22  
23 MS. PILCHER: No.

24  
25 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. You got  
26 any written public comments?

27  
28 MS. PILCHER: I do not.

29  
30 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Thank you.  
31 Okay. Public testimony. We're up for public testimony.  
32 Anyone not want to on the phone or here?

33  
34 (No comment)

35  
36 Okay. And we'll take it to the Council  
37 motion. I'll entertain a motion to put it on the table.

38  
39 MR. OPHEIM: I'll make a motion to  
40 support 26-17. Late fall moose hunt from Unit 7.

41  
42 MR. HOLSTEN: Second.

43  
44 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Thank you,  
45 Michaels. Seconded by Ed. Ed, I don't want to put you  
46 on the spot, but maybe you could. Do you have any  
47 comments on the area?

48  
49  
50

1 UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah, I've got a few. I'm  
2 pretty conflicted on this one now. Moose populations are  
3 low. They have been always low. And Unit 7 lack of  
4 habitats. The main one very mountainous. Yes, we've seen  
5 -- we will see a little impact or an increase in habitat  
6 due to Swan Lake fire, but only on the west, very western  
7 side of Unit 7. Users in Cooper Landing, I believe, can  
8 still hunt in Unit 15. So, there -- they've got an area  
9 to get to along the Road System if they want. They've  
10 already got early season. I understand why they want to  
11 go prolong the hunting season based on changes in  
12 climate, etc. Very warm. So, pardon me, I think what I  
13 would -- propose is I would make an amendment and I  
14 think what they should do or what I would like to see  
15 is have them -- have their season extend to October 20th  
16 but not start till September 25th and basically  
17 eliminate the season as it stands now from August 20th  
18 to 25th. And push it to a 25th to the 20th of October.  
19 That would give them a little more chance of success due  
20 to the very warm falls we've been having. And we'll  
21 still -- I'm sure we'll still continue to fall. So that's  
22 just an idea I have.

23  
24 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Sounds like a  
25 good idea, in my opinion, but I don't know what Todd  
26 thinks about that. He's pulling on his beard, so we  
27 might have -- well, I shouldn't say that. Anyway, is  
28 there any other comments on this? Dennis, go ahead.

29  
30 MR. ZADRA: Yeah. For the record, Dennis  
31 Zadra. I'm just looking at the at the state regulations.  
32 And so, it's a harvest ticket, Unit 7 remainder for  
33 September 1st through September 25th. So, these same  
34 federally qualified users can still hunt this September  
35 1 to 25 under a state permit. Is that correct? So, it's  
36 not -- I think your amendment is a good idea.

37  
38 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Judy.

39  
40 MS. CAMINER: I just wondered Brian or  
41 whoever might have worked this up originally, that the  
42 reason for the gap between the 25th of September and the  
43 20th of October is that rut season. People didn't want  
44 to go then or -- just wondering.

45  
46 MR. UBELAKER: Through the Chair. I would  
47 default to Andrew.

48  
49 MR. SANDERS: Through the Chair. This is  
50 Andrew and I would default to Todd because that is

1 borrowed from the Unit 15 regulation, which they did all  
2 that long before I came around.

3

4 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Yeah, I was  
5 involved in a lot of that too. So, I could probably  
6 speak to it. Come on up, Todd. You know we -- there was  
7 very specific reasons for limiting some of that.

8

9 MR. ESKELIN: Todd Eskelin, Kenai  
10 National Wildlife Refuge. I think Chairman Encewleski  
11 could probably speak to it just as well as I could. We  
12 do have a gap there, and it's often very much the peak  
13 of the rut season. It's the prime time when we would  
14 expect these cows to be getting impregnated. And, you  
15 know, we try to lay off and let that activity happen  
16 without hunting pressure on it. And so, yeah, I think  
17 that would be -- you know, we pushed the September season  
18 five days later, but part of that was there was a belief  
19 that in our warming climate, we were seeing rut happen  
20 just a little bit later, so maybe we wouldn't be  
21 impacting as much. And then we waited till October 20th  
22 so that the bulk of those animals would have already  
23 bred. And there's been, you know, there's always been a  
24 lot of concern from subsistence hunters that even  
25 starting October 20th and going till November 10th, that  
26 they're going to encounter some ratty moose that maybe  
27 aren't as edible as, as during pre-rut. And I haven't  
28 heard that from anybody. But I've also, you know, talked  
29 to a lot of hunters that tend to focus on younger bulls  
30 and not necessarily going after that big 60-incher  
31 because there's a fear they're probably still a little  
32 bit stinky on October 20th.

33

34 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Yeah. Thank  
35 you, Todd. I think you hit the nail on the head there  
36 for as far as my recollection, also the later season,  
37 just so you know, in 15C is -- we do have that late  
38 season and it seems to work pretty well, and we open it  
39 October 20th and it goes to November 10th. And it does  
40 provide an extra opportunity in that area for that time  
41 period. That seems to work for someone that. Maybe didn't  
42 get a Moose and still getting a younger moose or I know  
43 of some take it and they do okay, so. Andy, I was trying  
44 to talk with (indiscernible). You just go ahead.

45

46 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
47 Quick question. Is the bull to cow ratio skewed there  
48 in the zone that this applies to, remainder 7?

49

50

1 MR. ESKELIN: Don't believe we have very  
2 much data from Unit 7 on those numbers. You know, it's  
3 it hasn't been surveyed very much. It's low density.  
4 There's only so much money available for Fish and Game  
5 to do surveys, and they tend to focus on the areas that  
6 have the most moose on the peninsula and that's not Unit  
7 7 typically. I believe that the times when we had higher  
8 Unit 7 most populations also coincided with some of those  
9 fires around Kenai Lake. So, there's maybe some memory  
10 bias of those of us who used to hunt that area after  
11 that fire around Kenai Lake.

12  
13 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay, Andy  
14 good? Ed, what do you think of the discussion so far?  
15 We -- I know that Unit 7 is pretty small and pretty hard  
16 to hunt, and it's kind of overgrown, so I understand all  
17 those challenges there, so. But.

18  
19 MR. HOLSTEN: Through the Chair. Yeah,  
20 it's, it is a hard Unit to hunt. People do go down to  
21 15. Fortunately or unfortunately, we can get roadkill.  
22 Not a lot. Although I was fortunate. I got a big bull.  
23 I'm still in favor personally of having that season from  
24 September 25th to 20th of October. I don't think we're  
25 going to see much of an increase due to the Swan Lake  
26 fire, due to where that fire ended up kind of on the  
27 western edge of Unit 7. So, thank you.

28  
29 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Thank you. Any  
30 other discussion on the proposal?

31  
32 (No response)

33  
34 Okay, I think we're ready to put to a  
35 vote if someone wants to.

36  
37 UNIDENTIFIED: Call for question

38  
39 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Questions been  
40 called. Do we want amendment to that?

41  
42 UNIDENTIFIED: I'd like to see an  
43 amendment.

44  
45 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Is there  
46 a second good with that amendment

47  
48 UNIDENTIFIED: I'll second, yeah.

49  
50

00029

1 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Yeah. That's  
2 good. Good catch. So yeah. okay. That's with the  
3 amendment dates. All in favor, aye.

4  
5 IN UNISON: Aye.

6  
7 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Of the  
8 amendment. Any opposed?

9  
10 (No response)

11  
12 Okay. The amendment passed. Now we'll  
13 vote on it as a -- as the motion with the approved  
14 amendment. All in favor aye.

15  
16 IN UNISON: Aye.

17  
18 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Any opposed?

19  
20 (No response)

21  
22 Okay. We'll give it a shot. There you  
23 go. Good. Yeah. You can say whatever you want.

24  
25 MS. PILCHER: I'm just double checking.  
26 The amendment that member Holsten put on the table was  
27 to extend -- to eliminate the August 20th to September  
28 25th season?

29  
30 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Yes.

31  
32 MS. PILCHER: Because the state federal,  
33 the state season exists. And then instead of October  
34 20th to November 10th September 20th 5th to October 20th.

35  
36 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Correct.

37  
38 MS. PILCHER: Okay. Thank you.

39  
40 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Anyone  
41 want a short break for coffee? Okay. We need it. We'll  
42 take seven minutes. Thank you.

43  
44 (Off record)

45  
46 (On record)

47  
48 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay, folks,  
49 we're going to go ahead and get started. Okay. Brian,  
50 are we on WP26-18/19/20/21/22/23. Okay.

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

MR. UBELAKER: Yes, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Thank you. You want to go ahead?

MR. UBELAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Brian Ubelaker for the record and yes, this is a summary of Wildlife Proposals WP26-18 through WP26-23, all regarding trapping in Unit 7. And this analysis starts on page 119 of your meeting books. And I normally don't do this because I feel it confuses people, but page 120 of your meeting books shows a summary table of each of these proposals. Breaks it down. There's a lot asked for in each proposal, and there are a lot of proposals. So, this does help me keep track of it. At any time if anybody's confused on any of these, please stop me, and I will see if I can straighten it out. And then also page 123, 124, 125, 126 and 127, all have maps illustrating the red area is what they're asking for in the closure. There's some blown up areas with more detail. Once again, if this hopefully will help people keep it straight in their heads. But if there's any confusion, stop me and I will do my best to straighten things out.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay, good. Get going.

MR. UBELAKER: All right, here we go. So, these proposals, all submitted by the Cooper Landing Safe Trails Committee, proposal 26-18, -19, -20, -22 and -23 request trapping setbacks around beaches, campgrounds, roads, pullouts and trails near Cooper Landing. Requested setback distances range from 50 to 100 yards but would not apply to traps that are elevated at least three feet, placed underwater or under ice or enclosed, which matches state regulations adopted for the area in 2023. The intent of these proposals is to protect children, pets and other recreational users from accidental encounters with traps as year-round recreation in the area grows.

Proposal WP26-21 requests that active trapping signs be mandatory at all access points to trap lines. These signs would need to be brightly colored, waterproof, posted at eye level and display a trapper's ID number. The proponent declares these measures would make Cooper Landing safer for families and pets, benefiting the local recreation-based economy. They cite

1 support from community surveys, search and rescue  
2 groups, and examples from other Alaska communities where  
3 similar setbacks have been adopted.

4  
5 While these proposals aim to increase  
6 safety, most of the requested areas are a patchwork of  
7 state, federal and private lands, creating enforcement  
8 challenges and regulatory complexity. In many cases,  
9 adopting these proposals would make federal regulations  
10 more restrictive than state regulations, and trappers  
11 could still operate under the less restrictive state  
12 rules. No conservation concerns are expected, but  
13 subsistence opportunity would be reduced. Therefore, the  
14 OSM preliminary conclusion is to support WP26-19 with  
15 modification, which would require setbacks only at  
16 Quartz Creek, Crescent Creek and Russian River  
17 campgrounds, which will align federal regulations with  
18 recently adopted state regulations. OSM preliminary  
19 recommendation is to oppose WP26-18, -20, -21, -22 and  
20 -23 as these would create unnecessary restrictions,  
21 would be difficult to enforce, and would not effectively  
22 increase public safety since trappers could still follow  
23 state regulations instead. Supporting a modified WP26-  
24 19 balances public safety with subsistence opportunity.  
25 It aligns federal and state regulations, reduces  
26 confusion, and addresses concerns around campgrounds  
27 where conflicts are most likely. The other proposals,  
28 as written, would misalign regulations and burden  
29 federally qualified subsistence users without improving  
30 outcomes. And with that, I will answer questions. And I  
31 will admit this presentation is a super simplified  
32 version of this. So yeah, any confusion, any questions,  
33 please let me know.

34  
35 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Yeah, I  
36 see -19 support and the rest opposed questions from the  
37 Council to Brian.

38  
39 UNIDENTIFIED: Just one comment. Well  
40 done.

41  
42 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Yeah. I think  
43 you summarized it pretty -- very good. Okay, Brian, is  
44 there a public comments received during the open period?  
45 I imagine there was.

46  
47 MR. UBELAKER: Yes, sir. There was. First  
48 off, we received ten in support, with common topics of  
49 the comments being: these proposals protect families,  
50 pets, and recreational users while still allowing

1 responsible trapping; traps in multi-use areas create  
2 real safety risks and current regulations are difficult  
3 to enforce. Most trappers follow ethical guidelines, but  
4 some do not, and setbacks provide clear rules to prevent  
5 conflicts. With overwhelming community support and  
6 successful examples elsewhere in Alaska, these  
7 commonsense measures balance public safety, recreation,  
8 and traditional subsistence practices. So those were the  
9 ten in support. There were also five in opposition, with  
10 common topics being: these proposals are overly  
11 restrictive, unnecessary and would burden subsistence  
12 trappers under ANILCA. Many commenters stating they have  
13 never had an incident with traps, and informal  
14 communication with local trappers has always ensured  
15 safety. Trapping has been part of Alaska's heritage, and  
16 these regulations would remove large areas from  
17 traditional use while creating confusing -- confusion  
18 about land boundaries. Education, responsible dog  
19 handling, and community communication are far better  
20 solutions than restricting trapping. That was the end  
21 of my summary.

22  
23 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay, very good  
24 questions on that from Brian? For Brian.

25  
26 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair.

27  
28 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Go ahead, Judy.

29  
30 MS. CAMINER: Just curious. So, the  
31 difference is removing Tenderfoot Campground and what's  
32 the reasoning behind that? If I heard you right.

33  
34 MR. UBELAKER: Tenderfoot Campground and  
35 the Tenderfoot ski area, it's a -- most of the trails  
36 that were asked for are user created. They are not  
37 sanctioned Forest Service trails, so there is no  
38 delineated boundary. It's a kind of comes and goes from  
39 year to year as conditions change, which would make  
40 enforcement hard, setbacks, where you measure from,  
41 things such as that and Tenderfoot Campground -- I can  
42 dig into that. Okay.

43  
44 Sorry. Through the Chair, Member  
45 Caminer. Because that one was not closed under state  
46 regulations so we did not opt for it in the aligning  
47 with the state.

48  
49 MS. CAMINER: Very good. Thank you.

50

00033

1 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: All right.  
2 Thank you. Any other questions for Brian before I move  
3 on to tribal and ANCSA corporation consultation?

4  
5 (No response)

6  
7 Okay, Orville.

8  
9 MR. LIND: Good morning, Mr. Chair,  
10 Council members. During the consultation, August 19<sup>th</sup>,  
11 we had no questions or comments on those proposals. Thank  
12 you, Mr. Chair.

13  
14 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Thank  
15 you. Agencies and tribal comments. How about the Alaska  
16 Department of Fish and Game?

17  
18 MR. POETTER: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
19 Aaron Peotter again, for the record. So, a couple things.  
20 There is a companion proposal specific to these trapping  
21 setbacks. Proposal 145 that had been submitted to the  
22 Board of Game to be taken up later this year in the --  
23 at the Kodiak meeting. Looks like its companion proposal  
24 to precisely what's being submitted here. As setbacks  
25 for trapping, safer trails, etc. These are more social  
26 constructs than they'd have to do with conservation or  
27 opportunity in that regard. So again, this is we believe  
28 that would be outside of ANILCA intent to address those  
29 social issues. Again, as there is a proposal -- companion  
30 proposal to the Board of Game. The Board of Game will  
31 be weighing in on it here later this year. Thank you.

32  
33 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: It's the first  
34 time I heard that one. Okay. Good. Thank you. How about  
35 federal agencies, anyone? Lisa.

36  
37 MS. GREDIAGIN: Lisa Grediagin. I just  
38 wanted to emphasize. Aaron mentioned this, but just so  
39 the Council is fully aware that OSM's recommendation is  
40 to align with the current state regulations. But there  
41 are a lot of proposals submitted to the Board of Game,  
42 and so they're going to act on those in March. And so,  
43 when this goes to the Board in April, the Board will  
44 know what the Board of Game did with all these similar  
45 proposals. And so, the Council doesn't know that. But  
46 just in my benefit, the Board, if you express whether  
47 your intent is to align with state regulations, you know,  
48 regardless of what they are, you know, or if you just  
49 go with what you know, if you don't care, you understand  
50 what I'm saying? I think Judy's nodding her head.

00034

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

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: I understand, but I don't agree, so it's okay.

MS. GREDIAGIN: Just so you're aware.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: I just can't align with something I don't know. I don't think that would be right. But anyway, just my opinion. Okay. How about tribes and ANCSA corporations? I see some heads shaking. No one wants to touch it. Okay. Okay. I'll go on to advisory groups. Is there other RACs?

MR. UBELAKER: No other Councils heard this.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Thank you. Fish and Game Advisory Councils? No. How about Subsistence Resource Commission? No. How about written public comments?

MS. PILCHER: There were none received after the comment deadline.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Thank you. Okay. We're open for public testimony now. Does anyone want to address this topic regulation?

(No response)

MS. PILCHER: No one online.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: No one online? No one. Okay. Hearing none. We're going to go ahead and go to the Council motion. And you heard Brian recommend a modification they would support. So, we might have to make that motion first if we agree on it.

MR. OPHIEM: Okay. I'll make the motion that we support WP26-19 as been modified.

MR. WILSON: I'll second it.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. That was moved by Michael. Seconded by Kirk is modified by the - what was it? Okay. Everyone clear on that? Question? Okay go ahead, Andy.

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: I'm not quite clear on the modification.

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

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: It's just 19 support. I'll let Brian go ahead.

MR. UBELAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So OSM's preliminary conclusion. So, there's proposal WP26-18 through -23. We are recommending adopting WP26-19 but only to require trapping setbacks in Quartz Creek. Crescent Creek and Russian River campgrounds, which is -- sorry?

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Not Tenderfoot?

MR. UBELAKER: No, not tenderfoot. Those three campgrounds are the only -- they're the only ones under state regulation that match the request to have the trap setback.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Ed, go ahead.

MR. HOLSTEN: Yeah. Just a little background and my perspective. This has been going on for many, many, many years in Cooper Landing. There's been AC proposals of Board of Game and it's all in your packet. One of the problems facing Cooper Landing is that we're unincorporated, so we can't propose our own setbacks. There's large community support. We've had Cooper Landing -- that Safe Trails Committee, I think, just became a nonprofit. Had a number of public surveys for Cooper Landing a couple in the past, and it's overwhelming, like 90% favor setbacks. A lot of people, myself included, are somewhat in favor of setbacks, but not 100 yards. I think that's way out of line. I think the feeling is from Safe Trails. Well, we'll go for 100 yards and negotiate back to 50 yards or whatever. In the past, we have lost dogs through trapping, and we have also dogs that have faced amputations through trapping. And the proposal with modification is okay, but you have to remember, Forest Service campgrounds have leash laws. So, you're not going to -- you never have seen dogs running around in a campground unleashed and it's usually enforced. Right now, you might want to say, well, what about wintertime? Well, a lot of the campgrounds in the winter, through volunteer effort, are groomed for cross-country skiing and snowshoeing. And even though in the winter, apparently the dogs have to be leashed, they're usually not in the wintertime. These people ski, ski draw or just ski with their dogs, etc. Anyway, I agree this -- these proposals, ill will support W26-19

1 with modification. But I do agree, and I think Safe  
2 Trails Committee agrees this needs to go to Board of  
3 Game. And the Board of Game has seen these proposals  
4 numerous times in the past. And unfortunately, I doubt  
5 they will take action on these. Basically, they're come  
6 back to Board of Game. And I might be wrong on this, but  
7 their point is this is not a biological issue. This is  
8 a social type issue. Needs to be figured out, you know,  
9 through the Borough or whatever. I know that Forest  
10 Service at least the Seward Ranger District supports  
11 these proposals on setbacks. So that's it. Thanks.

12

13 CHAIRPERSON ENCELEWSKI: That's good  
14 history, good information. Thank you. Michael.

15

16 MR. OPHEIM: Yeah, I was just trying to  
17 remember when these proposals got passed for the state  
18 the last time. Seems like the Trappers Association and  
19 the Alaska Wildlife Alliance worked together. And I  
20 think we're in agreement with what ended up being passed  
21 for the setbacks previously there. And it would have  
22 been nice to see, you know, the Alaska Wildlife Alliance,  
23 Alaska Trappers here to discuss a little of that, maybe.  
24 But I think, you know -- I think it was 50 yards is what  
25 they settled on for the state and the previous ones  
26 there that were accepted. So, I think I'll be supporting  
27 this.

28

29 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Thank you,  
30 Michael. Andy, you got a get question or comment? Andy  
31 first and then you Faye.

32

33 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
34 Yeah. I would concur with Michael up on there. I was  
35 kind of -- I was definitely -- I'm really impressed with  
36 OSM's work on this, and I was thinking the Tenderfoot  
37 campground -- you could maybe support, but not the Japan  
38 woods or the ski trail, you know, I don't think we should  
39 be hindering the federally qualified subsistence  
40 trappers. And I don't think that in particular, it has  
41 to align with state all the time. But in this case, I  
42 do recall that 50-yard thing. And so anyhow, I'm going  
43 to support 26-19.

44

45 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Thank you,  
46 Andy. Go ahead, Faye.

47

48 MS. EWAN: Faye Ewan, Kluti Kaah. My  
49 question is that the people that wrote this proposal is  
50 it to protect their animals and themselves when they're

00037

1 going on a trail from trapping of snare lines? Is that  
2 why they propose this?

3  
4 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Go ahead,  
5 Brian.

6  
7 MR. UBELAKER: Through the Chair. Yes.  
8 Their proposal stated that they were protecting pets,  
9 children, anything that might be running around close  
10 to them that could stumble into a trap.

11  
12 MS. EWAN: It's the last frontier.  
13 Anyways, if they're going to -- we're going to start. I  
14 mean, they're doing this in the state pretty soon they're  
15 going to do this in all the campgrounds. And I feel I  
16 can tell it's already going to start affecting my area.  
17 We have a lot of campgrounds that belong to the state  
18 and the feds. And you know, we support this, is good for  
19 them. But if you're going to have people trapping and  
20 things, I thought they're supposed to have a sign and  
21 stuff to say, you know, some kind of store to show that  
22 they're supposed to. Because when I went to the Board  
23 of Game meeting about five years ago, they proposed that  
24 they were supposed to put signs up where they have  
25 trapping and snare lines and stuff from the state. You  
26 know, to me, they do that, they should do that for the  
27 federal to have them mandated to put signs up where they  
28 have it for safety. That way, people know you don't go  
29 on that trail or walk with your dog that way, because  
30 pretty soon Alaska's going to be where no trapping and  
31 hunting if we keep on going in this route here and  
32 supporting these organizations that are supporting,  
33 putting these proposals in, you know, I have I kind of  
34 doubt if I'm going to support this because I got to  
35 think about the long range. I live in Copper River. We  
36 have a lot of campgrounds. Thank you.

37  
38 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Thank you,  
39 Faye. Any other discussion? Dennis, go ahead.

40  
41 MR. ZADRA: Yeah. For the record, Dennis  
42 Zadra. I was at the last Board of meeting when this was  
43 listened to, and that same group Tried what they did,  
44 and I think it got negotiated down to what is in state  
45 regulations now. But they said they just keep pushing  
46 for it. The Trappers Association did, you know, I think  
47 a good job, and I -- it seems like there's not a lot of  
48 -- there's conflict, but the number of actual dogs  
49 getting caught and all that is pretty minimal. Granted,  
50 if you lose a dog in a trap, you're going to be pretty

1 emotional about that. But you know, they are trying to  
2 put their use ahead of the trappers use that has been  
3 there. And I think the Board of Game has been pretty  
4 effective in trying to keep that quelled, you know, and  
5 not giving them. But they keep going and it'll depend.  
6 I'll be at this Board of Game meeting here in March 2nd  
7 and see where that goes. But anyway, it's -- you know,  
8 if you're worried about your dog, don't keep him on a  
9 leash. You know, which is hard to do if you're cross-  
10 country skiing or snowshoeing. But that's all I got.

11  
12 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Thank you,  
13 Dennis. Andy was next and then Ed.

14  
15 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, real quickly. Just  
16 kind of a review, I think, for some Council members.  
17 This one is just about the campgrounds only, and not all  
18 the other trails of the other proposals. This is only  
19 about -- so that the pets kind of have a safe place in  
20 the campgrounds only, but not the trails.

21  
22 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Go ahead, Ed.

23  
24 MR. HOLSTEN: Yeah. Just a quick comment.  
25 The Cooper Landing area. I don't think there are a lot  
26 of local trappers. There might be 3 -- 2 or 3. The  
27 problem, I think, is nobody has a handle on it. But we  
28 know there's outside trappers coming down from other  
29 areas putting up trap lines, mainly because let's say  
30 around Anchorage and Girdwood and places like that it's  
31 pretty restrictive for trappers. Around Cooper Landing  
32 we're surrounded basically by federal lands. And so,  
33 anybody can basically come down there and trap. So, this  
34 is -- that's one of the issues. Myself, I've seen traps  
35 left out there during the summer, and I've seen old  
36 rusty traps left out there in the summer. And this would  
37 be hard to control and figure out, but I think this is  
38 one of the concerns from the Cooper Landing residents  
39 is having no idea how many trappers are coming into the  
40 area, even though we know there are more than what we  
41 have in Cooper Landing. So anyway, that's my comment.

42  
43 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay, Judy.

44  
45 MS. CAMINER: Thanks Mr. Chair. So,  
46 Brian, I see under WP 21 that the requirement for a sign  
47 is that going with what we're going with to or was that  
48 specific to -21?

49  
50

1 MR. UBELAKER: Through the Chair, that  
2 was specific to -21, and the state did not enact any  
3 regulations to require signs I believe. My guess would  
4 be because it was very distinct areas that they had  
5 setbacks installed upon where people would know where  
6 the setbacks or the trap free areas would be.

7  
8 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Any other  
9 comments on it?

10  
11 (No comment)

12  
13 Anyone want to make a.....

14  
15 (Simultaneous speech)

16  
17 MS. CAMINER: (Indiscernible) question.

18  
19 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: You've got a  
20 question.

21  
22 MS. CAMINER: Let's call for the  
23 question.

24  
25 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay.

26  
27 UNIDENTIFIED: We moved and seconded  
28 already.

29  
30 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Yeah, yeah. I  
31 mean, you call the question.

32  
33 MS. CAMINER: Yes.

34  
35 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay, I'm  
36 trying to figure out who called what. Okay. All in favor  
37 aye.

38  
39 IN UNISON: Aye.

40  
41 Any opposed?

42  
43 (No response)

44  
45 Okay, that carries. And that was the  
46 modified proposal with -19.

47  
48 (Pause)

49  
50 I got WP26-27 next, Brian.

1

2 MR. UBELAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For  
3 the record, Brian Ubelaker and this will be a summary  
4 of Wildlife Proposal WP26-27 regarding caribou in Unit  
5 13. This analysis starts on page 159 of your meeting  
6 books. And this proposal was submitted by the Bureau of  
7 Land Management Glennallen Field Office, and it requests  
8 that the existing harvest limit of two bulls in Units  
9 13C, D and E be changed to up to two caribou. It also  
10 asks to delegate authority to the federal in-season  
11 manager to determine harvest limits and sex restrictions  
12 within those Units. Currently, that authority exists for  
13 Units 13A and B only. Extending it across the rest of  
14 Unit 13 would make management consistent and provide the  
15 in-season manager with more flexibility to respond  
16 quickly to changing herd conditions.

17

18 Regulations regarding caribou in Unit 13  
19 have shifted many times to balance Nelchina Caribou  
20 harvest opportunity with conservation. For example, from  
21 2020 through 2022, temporary actions allowed hunters to  
22 take up to two caribou, not just bulls, when the herd  
23 estimates were high. But when the population collapsed  
24 in 2023, all hunts on Nelchina Caribou were closed.  
25 Federal regulations changed again in 2025, and now all  
26 federal Nelchina Caribou hunts are may be announced only  
27 seasons. In 2019, the Nelchina Caribou Herd peaked at  
28 over 53,000 animals, but in just four years the herd  
29 dropped to fewer than 7000, the lowest count in the last  
30 20 years. Several factors contributed to this decline,  
31 such as a series of severe winters, late spring green  
32 ups, and high adult mortality, and low calf survival.  
33 There are some early signs of improvement, however.  
34 Surveys conducted in 2024 showed higher cap survival and  
35 increased recruitment. Both summer and fall estimates  
36 place the Nelchina Herd over 12,000 caribou. While this  
37 recovery is encouraging, the herd still remains well  
38 below the management objectives. And there has been no  
39 reported harvest of Nelchina Caribou since 2022, the  
40 last year the harvest was allowed before the closures  
41 were enacted.

42

43 One alternative considered for this  
44 proposal was from comments by NPS -- submitted by NPS  
45 staff during their review, which was to not allow the  
46 up to two caribou in Unit 13C in order to protect the  
47 Mentasta Caribou Herd. OSM has suggested a modification  
48 to the proposal to allow the in-season manager to define  
49 harvest areas which would allow the in-season manager  
50 to limit harvest to bulls only when the Mentasta Herd

1 ranges into Unit 13C, protecting them. If adopted, WP26-  
2 27 would align regulations across all of Unit 13 and  
3 give the in-season manager consistent authority over  
4 harvest limits and sex restrictions, and allow  
5 adjustments in real time based on herd health and  
6 conservation concerns. Any in-season management action  
7 would still be made in coordination with federal and  
8 state partners, AITRC and this Council. Therefore, OSM's  
9 preliminary conclusion is to support WP26-27 with  
10 modification to delegate authority, to define harvest  
11 areas and to clarify and simplify regulatory language.  
12 WP26-27 will provide management flexibility and  
13 consistency and will provide managers with the tools  
14 they need to respond to rapidly changing situations  
15 while protecting the long-term health of the Nelchina  
16 and Mentasta Caribou Herds while ensuring that  
17 subsistence users have sustainable opportunities into  
18 the future. With that, I'm happy to answer any questions.

19

20 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay, I'll open  
21 up for questions for Brian. Yeah. Proposing a  
22 modification to in-season management delegation. Go  
23 ahead, Faye.

24

25 MS. EWAN: Yeah. Being from Unit 13  
26 region, this really surprises me that the BLM proposed  
27 this year, especially with the shortage and we know  
28 there's no caribou. And what is left needs to rebound.  
29 And there shouldn't be no open season for seven years  
30 because the caribou is going to go into moratorium. And  
31 then we're going to have a hard time to get that back  
32 out of moratorium. And to - well I am from the Copper  
33 River. And I know the caribou that I just got on roadkill  
34 didn't have no fat and they're not healthy. And, you  
35 know, they might say they rebound maybe from 1500 numbers  
36 to 2000, but that's combining Mentasta Nelchina Herd and  
37 Delta has over 100 caribou, you know, different areas  
38 in there is no caribou and Copper River. In Paxson,  
39 Mentasta Eureka way, there's no caribou. I seen three  
40 Caribou last month and Eureka area from mile 156 area,  
41 and they were just babies with their mom. There was one  
42 bull with them that was only five caribou, and you got  
43 100,000 people from this area here to go up there and  
44 hunt them out, you're going to have no caribou period.  
45 They're going to be diminished from the world. So, I  
46 think there's a conservation issue here. Thank you.

47

48 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Thank you,  
49 Faye. Kirk.

50

1 MR. WILSON: Yeah. I'm just in total  
2 disagreement with shooting a cow caribou with a calf in  
3 it. And I don't care what rules you make. I mean, a herd  
4 only rebounds in one way. And as far as the numbers as  
5 the state goes, they said 6 to 7. They're saying 12,000  
6 each caribou calf -- or cow only has one calf. There's  
7 never twins. How can you double the population in one  
8 year?

9  
10 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Gotta [sic] be  
11 some twins. Go ahead, Brian.

12  
13 MR. UBELAKER: In response -- thank you,  
14 Mr. Chair. Through the Chair. In response to Member  
15 Wilson, the population estimate was just what Fish and  
16 Game gave me for this. I can't answer how the population  
17 could double.

18  
19 MR. WILSON: I'm just stating a fact.

20  
21 MR. UBELAKER: I don't disagree with that  
22 fact. That's just what was reported to me. And in  
23 response to Member Ewan, if I may. This proposal is not  
24 asking to establish or open any of the hunting seasons.  
25 This is just modifying the authority that Glennallen  
26 Field Office already has. Because two of the Units in  
27 13, they're allowed to set up to two caribou or up to  
28 two bull, but they're allowed to determine at the  
29 beginning of the season if it's going to be bulls only  
30 or if it's any caribou. And they're just asking for that  
31 authority for the other three Units as well. So, the  
32 management is similar across Unit 13 and they can react  
33 when -- if they need to limit harvest, they'll have the  
34 authority to do it. But this is not asking to establish  
35 or open any new hunts.

36  
37 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Thank you for  
38 clarification. That was good. Judy.

39  
40 MS. CAMINER: Is there any information  
41 yet whether there is an expectation to have a hunt this  
42 year?

43  
44 MR. UBELAKER: Through the Chair. Not on  
45 the federal side. I just listened to the Nelchina Herd  
46 update that Fish and Game had online last week or the  
47 week before. They mentioned that, you know, in a couple  
48 of years, they're hoping that'll population will hit the  
49 point where they can open a hunt, a restricted bulls  
50 only hunt. But as far as I know, there is no indication

00043

1 on the state side. Definitely not on the federal side  
2 of opening any season.

3  
4 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: That's good  
5 Andy.

6  
7 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah. So, have you heard  
8 anything about the projected -- I've heard anywhere from  
9 15 to 20 years of perfect, mild winter conditions in  
10 order to get us back to the numbers that we had in the  
11 caribou herd just a couple of years ago. Is that is that  
12 a fact? Have you heard anything like that?

13  
14 MR. UBELAKER: Through the Chair. No, I  
15 have not. I don't know if there's any state biologist  
16 on that can speak to this but I don't have any of that  
17 information.

18  
19 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: And I'll be a  
20 guess at best. Kirk, you got a question?

21  
22 MR. WILSON: No have a comment, though.  
23 It's like from the numbers he gave us from the state  
24 from one year to the next, if the population is going  
25 to double every year, we're going to have a hunting  
26 season pretty soon. But I just doubt that's going to  
27 happen.

28  
29 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Yeah, they come  
30 from somewhere.

31  
32 MS. EWAN: If we change the number from  
33 2 to 1 for emergency hunt, I agree with this, but I know  
34 just to save the caribou. The two caribou is a lot,  
35 especially when there's if shortage. I mean, if you get  
36 two caribou per 100 people, that's 200 caribou right  
37 there. And if you did one bull caribou per household,  
38 that would be fine with me. But if you do two caribou  
39 per household, that's double the amount and especially  
40 the impact with moose season hunters from here -- area,  
41 the urban areas come up to Copper River and wipe out our  
42 caribou. That happened before, when the state of Alaska  
43 opened a caribou for -- five caribou per household.  
44 That's when our caribou declined back in -- I don't know  
45 what -- not -- in 2000. They opened it up like that and  
46 we testified and told them not to do that to the state.  
47 I've been involved with federal, state and Board of Game,  
48 Board of Fish for about -- since I was 18 years old. I  
49 know that you know what's happening in Alaska, and I see  
50 that even in Cantwell there's no caribou. I just came

1 from that area.

2

3

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay.

4

5

6 MS. EWAN: I have pictures to show you,  
7 you know how the health of the caribou is. It doesn't  
8 say anything about the health of -- the well-being of  
9 the caribou. But I would say that the emergency hunt  
10 came on, maybe one caribou per person, per household  
11 would be okay. But 50 households, you know that that's  
12 100 caribou right there. But who's going to be the 50  
13 lucky people you know? That's my concern. Thank you.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay, Faye. I'm  
not going to -- that's -- they're not trying to open it  
up for 2 or 1 trying to delegate authority if a hunt  
ever gets opened and I don't even know it needs to come  
up right now, but that's -- would you want to explain  
that further, Brian?

MR. UBELAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
Yeah, Member Ewan this is not -- A: this is not opening  
any hunts. B: this would not allow any urban users to  
come out. This only applies to federally qualified  
subsistence users. And since the 804 analysis was passed  
through 2024-25, a year or two ago. It's limited to a  
certain subset of federal users and this proposal is  
requesting the authority for up to two caribou. It gives  
the Glennallen Field Office Manager the opportunity to  
say one caribou only, one bull only, whatever would fit  
into the population estimate the best. So, this would -  
- this in my opinion, helps to conserve population when  
it's low, but it also allows greater harvest for  
federally qualified users when the herd can support it.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Thank  
you. Okay. We're good with that? Any more questions for  
Brian? Orville are you still out there? Tribal  
consultation.

(Simultaneous speech)

MR. LIND: I am. There are no questions  
or comments on that proposal. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Thank  
you, Orville. Tribal agencies. How about the Alaska Fish  
and Game Department? Let's hear the stories. Someone's  
wolf's in the background.

1 MR. POETTER: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
2 Aaron Poetter, for the record. We're looking at this as  
3 a administrative process within the federal subsistence  
4 program, so we don't have any comments about it. Thank  
5 you very much.

6  
7 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Thank you.  
8 Federal agencies? Todd's not going to get involved in  
9 that one. Okay.

10  
11 (No comment)

12  
13 No, federal agencies. How about tribes  
14 or ancient corps?

15  
16 (No comment)

17  
18 Okay, we'll move on then. We got other  
19 RACs. Did they make some comments to you?

20  
21 MR. UBELAKER: Mr. Chair, Eastern  
22 Interior did not consider this proposal.

23  
24 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay, Nissa.

25  
26 MS. PILCHER: Kathryn Martin with Ahnta.  
27 Raise your hand, Kathryn Martin.

28  
29 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: We have a  
30 Catherine Martin on the phone. Would you like to speak?

31  
32 MS. MARTIN: Yes. Thank you, Mr.  
33 Chairman, Council members. I just wanted to say that  
34 Ahtna supports this proposal. And I do know I think  
35 there was language in there that, you know, BLM would  
36 coordinate with other agencies and AITRC. And so just  
37 making sure that the field manager, you know, works with  
38 the local entities before making a decision, so. But  
39 thank you. I just wanted to make that comment.

40  
41 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Very  
42 good. Thank you. Any other tribal comments? RACs, we  
43 said no. Fish and Game, Advisory Councils. Any? None.  
44 How about Subsistence Resource? There we go.

45  
46 MS. COHEN: For the record, this is Amber  
47 Cohen from Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and  
48 Preserve. The Wrangell-St. Elias National Park  
49 Subsistence Resource Commission unanimously supported  
50 WP26-27 with the OSM modification. Except that the

1 harvest limit for Unit 13C should be quote up to two  
2 bulls and quote rather than up to two caribou and with  
3 the understanding that this proposal will not lead to a  
4 hunt in the near future. Unit 13C is where the Mentasta  
5 Caribou Herd overlaps with the Nelchina Caribou Herd,  
6 and in order to protect the Mentasta Caribou Herd, the  
7 SRC would like to keep the sex restricted to bulls only.  
8 It is important to have the proper delegated authority  
9 in place, but the SRC is concerned about opening any  
10 hunts before the Nelchina Caribou Herd has recovered  
11 sufficiently. Thank you.

12

13 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: All right. Very  
14 good. Thank you. Nissa, was there some written comments?

15

16 MS. PILCHER: There was no written public  
17 comment after the deadline, but there was -- I'll let  
18 Brian take the one that was okay.

19

20 MR. UBELAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes.  
21 One comment was received during the open period from  
22 AITRC, and they are in support of WP26-27. They state  
23 this proposal would restore flexibility for the federal  
24 manager and ensure consistency across Unit 13. It would  
25 allow management to respond to real time herd  
26 conditions, especially when bull cow ratios are out of  
27 balance. For Ahtna families, it would also reflect  
28 cultural and practical needs, since harvesting two bulls  
29 isn't always feasible. Importantly, safeguards remain,  
30 requiring consultation with AITRC, ADF&G, OSM and the  
31 Council Chairs ensuring both conservation integrity and  
32 indigenous oversight.

33

34 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Very good  
35 thank you. Okay. Public testimony.

36

37 (No response)

38

39 Okay, Council. No public testimony.  
40 Let's go ahead and do Council motion to put it on the  
41 table.

42

43 UNIDENTIFIED: I'll make that motion to  
44 support proposal WP26-27 as modified through OSM.

45

46 MS. ROBERTS: Second.

47

48 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Hope seconded.  
49 Good. Okay. Discussion. Go ahead, Dennis.

50

1 MR. ZADRA: This is just more of a --  
2 Dennis Zadra. Question for Brian. So the manager would  
3 have the ability to manage these units individually,  
4 right? You know, if you wanted to or if you wanted to  
5 keep 13C one bull or keep that unit closed while opening  
6 up others. Is that correct?

7  
8 MR. UBELAKER: Through the Chair, Member  
9 Zadra, yes. The in-season manager would have the ability  
10 to say get pick and choose. You know, 13A would be open  
11 to any caribou, up to two caribou. 13B, one bull, 13C  
12 no harvest. They can pick and choose between what's what  
13 subunits are open or closed and what sex up to a total  
14 of two.

15  
16 MR. ZADRA: Okay. Thank you. With that,  
17 I'll be supporting this.

18  
19 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Thank you,  
20 Dennis. Andy.

21  
22 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, So just to  
23 reiterate, supporting WP26-27 would be able to make  
24 Ahtna families be able to have the option of harvesting  
25 cows someday when or if the season opens?

26  
27 MR. UBELAKER: Through the Chair. Is that  
28 a question on their comment on their comment or...?

29  
30 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, that federally  
31 qualified subsistence users would be allowed to harvest  
32 two cows someday if the season opens.

33  
34 MR. UBELAKER: I mean, that's the.....

35  
36 (Simultaneous speech)

37  
38 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Gist of it.

39  
40 MR. UBELAKER: That's the intent of  
41 the.....

42  
43 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: (Indiscernible)  
44 authority thing for the in-season manager.

45  
46 MR. UBELAKER: Yes. Yeah.

47  
48 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Edward.

49  
50

00048

1 MR. GREYBEAR: For the record, this is  
2 Edward GreyBear. I'll be in support of this proposal as  
3 long as the in-season game manager is in -- meets with  
4 the tribal entities before their decision.

5  
6 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Yes. We got that  
7 Brian. Good. Judy.

8  
9 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair, I do appreciate  
10 the comments by the SRC and Dennis for clarifying that  
11 the SCR's comments could be incorporated by the in-  
12 season manager, depending on what the populations or  
13 situations are at the time, eventually of an opening.

14  
15 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Anything  
16 anyone else got?

17  
18 UNIDENTIFIED: Question.

19  
20 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Questions been  
21 called for. All in favor of the proposal as modified say  
22 aye.

23  
24 IN UNISON: Aye.

25  
26 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Those opposed,  
27 same sign.

28  
29 (No response)

30  
31 It passes. Thank you.

32  
33 (Talking)

34  
35 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Brian how are  
36 you feeling. Do you want to do WP 26-74?

37  
38 MR. UBELAKER: Mr. Chair, I do not  
39 believe that one was for me. I think that is Hannah.

40  
41 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay, let's  
42 look back here and see what else we got for you. We got  
43 26-71.

44  
45 MR. UBELAKER: You got it, Mr. Chair.  
46 Once again, Brian Ubelaker, for the record, and I will  
47 be presenting a summary of Wildlife Proposal WP26-71  
48 regarding brown bear in Unit 12. And this analysis will  
49 be found on page 197 of your meeting books. This  
50 proposal, submitted by the Eastern Interior Alaska

1 Subsistence Regional Advisory Council, requests  
2 increasing the harvest limit for brown bear in Unit 12  
3 to 2 bears. The proponent suggests raising the brown  
4 bear harvest limit in Unit 12 to give federally qualified  
5 subsistence users more opportunities. Currently, state  
6 hunting regulations in Unit 12 permit resident hunters  
7 to take two bears. There are no conservation concerns  
8 for brown bears in this Unit.

9  
10 Federal regulations for Brown Bear in  
11 Unit 12 have remained relatively unchanged since their  
12 inception. In March of 2024 the Alaska Board of Game  
13 increased the annual brown bear harvest limit for  
14 residents in Unit 12 from one bear to two bears, stating  
15 that there were no biological concerns. While biological  
16 information is very limited and no population surveys  
17 for brown bears have been conducted in Unit 12, the last  
18 estimate from fall of 2,000 suggests 350 to 425 bears,  
19 based on extrapolations from similar habitats. The  
20 annual harvest of brown bears in Unit 12 from 2002 to  
21 2023 averaged 21 bears per year, ranging anywhere from  
22 8 to 39 bears annually. On average, residents harvested  
23 12 bears per year, while non-residents harvested 9 bears  
24 per year. The average harvest has remained relatively  
25 stable since 1983.

26  
27 If adopted, this proposal would increase  
28 the brown bear harvest limit in Unit 12 to 2 bears,  
29 offering more opportunities for federally qualified  
30 subsistence users. No significant changes in harvest or  
31 impacts on the brown bear population are expected, as  
32 users can already harvest two bears under state  
33 regulations with low harvest pressure. The remote  
34 Wrangell-St. Elias National Park lands in Unit 12 are  
35 unlikely to see increased brown bear harvests. Limited  
36 data show no conservation concerns due to low pressure  
37 and no substantial increases in other units with similar  
38 limits. Adopting this proposal would also reduce  
39 regulatory complexity by aligning state and federal  
40 regulations. Therefore, it is OSM's preliminary  
41 conclusion to support this proposal as it enhances  
42 harvest opportunities for federally qualified  
43 subsistence users. There are no conservation issues due  
44 to low harvest levels, and because Alaska residents can  
45 already harvest two bears in Unit 12 under state  
46 regulations. That is the end of that, and I'll answer  
47 any questions I can.

48  
49 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. That's  
50 good. The only question I have is how come OSM is always

00050

1 have is always preliminary. But anyway, I'll drop that.  
2 Yeah, I do.

3  
4 MR. UBELAKER: That is our preliminary  
5 conclusion right now, as we present to you folks who  
6 give us all the information which may change our opinion  
7 in the end before we present it to the Board.

8  
9 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: That's a good  
10 answer. Thank you. Okay. Thank you. Good. All right.  
11 Presentation of analysis. We are open for questions to  
12 Brian.

13  
14 UNIDENTIFIED: Basically, we're just  
15 aligning with the state on this one?

16  
17 MR. UBELAKER: Through the Chair, yes.

18  
19 (Pause)

20  
21 Yes, Mr. Chair. Ahtna Intertribal  
22 Resource Commission. Submitted a letter in support of  
23 WP2671. Their key points include regulatory consistency  
24 as this aligns federal and state regulations, reducing  
25 confusion and improving harvest reporting. No  
26 conservation concerns. It states there are no known  
27 issues with brown bear populations in Unit 12, with  
28 sustainable monitoring and sealing requirements, and a  
29 low risk of overharvest as remote terrain limits harvest  
30 pressure. AITRC supports monitoring and consultation if  
31 future concerns arise but endorses this beneficial  
32 update for subsistence use.

33  
34 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Very good.  
35 Thank you. No others? Okay. Consultation, ANCSA  
36 corporations. Orville.

37  
38 MR. LIND: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Council  
39 members. Orville Lind Native liaison. We did not have  
40 any questions or comments on that proposal. Thank you,  
41 Mr. Chair.

42  
43 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Very well.  
44 Thank you, Orville. Agency, Tribal comments. Alaska  
45 Department of Fish and Game.

46  
47 MS. PILCHER: This is Nissa, for the  
48 record. Aaron did message us that he did have to sign  
49 off for the day, so I don't believe there'll be any  
50 Fish and Game comments, but I will defer to him if he is

00051

1 still on.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay, I can answer for him if he wants. Alaska Department of Fish and Game is off, so we'll go to the federal agency. Any comments, anyone?

(No comment)

Tribal or ANCSA corporations, anyone?

(No comment)

Okay. Was there any other RACs?

MR. UBELAKER: Yes. The Eastern Interior heard this one, and they support it.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: That's correct. Okay. Fish and Game Advisory Councils? No. Subsistence resource commission. Here she comes. Amber.

MS. COHEN: For the record, this is Amber Cohen Cultural Anthropologist at Wrangell-St. Elias. I did read this yesterday into the record, but for you guys, I'll reread it again. Again, the SRC did take up 26-24, -25, -26 and -71 all as one comment. They do unanimously support this group of proposals, including -71 that would increase the harvest limit of brown bears in Units 11, 12 and 13. And with the modification requesting that monitoring continues for these brown bear populations. They said many observations have shown that brown bears are doing well in these Units, including Unit 12. But it's important to prevent overharvest. Increasing harvest limits would allow for more harvest opportunities for local subsistence users.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Very good. Thank you. Was there any other written public comments that you received?

MS. PILCHER: There was no comments received after the comment deadline. Okay, so we're good there.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay, good. Public testimony. Who wants to testify? Anyone online anywhere? Call Lisa. She'll tell me. Okay.

(No comment)

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

Okay. I'm ready for a Council motion to put it on the table.

UNIDENTIFIED: I'll move that. We support WP26-71, increasing the harvest limit of brown bear in Unit 12 to 2 bears.

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Seconded by Andy. Discussion. We're open for discussion.

MR. OPHIEM: Yeah. It just no conservation concerns. It increases harvest opportunity for the federally qualified users. It kind of brings us up to date with what, with a more liberal bag limit that the state is already following. So, it's kind of a no brainer.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Andy says it's a no brainer. So, let's -- go ahead, Kirk.

MR. WILSON: Yeah, it's a no brainer for me too. I'm going to support this.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Judy? No comment. Thank you. Edward.

MR. GREYBEAR: Call the question.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Questions been called for all in favor, aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Any opposed, same sign.

(No response)

It passed unanimously. Brian, can we dig up anything else for you? Just let me take a look.

(Talking)

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Yeah okay. Let's go ahead and do 26-01.

1 MR. UBELAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Once  
2 again, for the record, Brian Ubelaker. And as Mr. Chair  
3 said, this is a summary of Wildlife Proposal WP26-01  
4 regarding delegation of authority letters statewide.  
5 This analysis can be found on page 23 of your meeting  
6 book with the addendum that I will speak to afterwards  
7 and in part starting on page 34.

8  
9 This proposal, submitted by the Office  
10 of Subsistence Management, seeks to move authority for  
11 managing federal hunts out of delegation of authority  
12 letters, or DALs, and into unit specific regulations.  
13 If adopted, the 61 DALs currently in use across Alaska  
14 would be rescinded. DALs were originally meant to  
15 provide management flexibility, but over time they've  
16 created inefficiencies. Any action taken under a DAL  
17 counts as a special action which triggers requirements  
18 for public hearings, tribal consultations and Regional  
19 Advisory Council recommendations. These processes are  
20 important for unusual or emergency situations, but they  
21 add unnecessary burden when applied to routine in-season  
22 management actions like closing a hunt when a quota is  
23 met. As a result -- excuse me, federal in-season managers  
24 and OSM staff spend significant time on procedural  
25 requirements for decisions that are already expected  
26 every year. High staff turnover also makes consistency  
27 difficult. On top of that, OSM must maintain 61 DALs,  
28 some of which overlap, conflict or contain outdated  
29 guidance.

30  
31 By moving these authorities into  
32 regulation, in-season management actions would no longer  
33 trigger the special action process. Approximately four  
34 pages of boilerplate DAL requirements would be replaced  
35 with one clear paragraph in regulation. Public  
36 transparency improves since changes to delegated  
37 authority would go through the standard regulatory  
38 proposal process. Oversight also becomes simpler, with  
39 clearer responsibilities and reduced administrative  
40 workload. Importantly, the Board retains authority over  
41 emergency closures and broader decisions, but in-season,  
42 managers would still be able to act quickly within the  
43 parameters set by the Board.

44  
45 This proposal is not expected to affect  
46 wildlife populations or subsistence opportunity. It's  
47 primarily administrative, streamlining how decisions are  
48 made. It increases efficiency, strengthens coordination  
49 with the state and local users, and makes the process  
50 more transparent for the public. One alternative to

1 consider for the master analysis for 2601 is replacing  
2 the phrase "coordination with" in regulation to "seeking  
3 input" and "considering feedback from". This clarifies  
4 the expectation for in-season managers to communicate  
5 their actions and consider feedback, without adding the  
6 confusion that has developed around the word  
7 "coordinate".

8  
9 Alternatives specific to the  
10 Southcentral Region addendum, or 26-01b include  
11 delegating in-season authority to close and reopen  
12 federal public lands for non-subsistence moose hunting  
13 in Unit 6. The federal lands closure for this hunt was  
14 recently rescinded by WCR24-41 and was done -- excuse  
15 me, and was done because delegated authority allowed the  
16 in-season manager to close to non-subsistence uses. But  
17 delegated authority for federal lands closure were not  
18 transferred to unit specific regulations, as it was  
19 boilerplate language included in all DALs, and is more  
20 appropriately retained by the Federal Subsistence Board.  
21 OSM did not consider this alternative further, because  
22 100% of antlerless harvest is taken by federal users.

23  
24 Another alternative for 26-01b is to  
25 retain broad delegated authority for deer in Unit 6 in  
26 the current DAL, rather than transferring it into  
27 regulation. The Council may wish to consider whether  
28 this authority is still necessary, and if so, whether  
29 it is better kept as a DAL or codified in regulation.  
30 Because deer in Unit 6 do not require routine in-season  
31 management, and any action taken would likely be in  
32 response to an emergency, the special action process is  
33 more appropriate to handle this kind of situation. This  
34 would, however, require a new DAL to be drafted, as the  
35 current letter is for both moose and deer in Unit 6.  
36 Therefore, the OSM preliminary conclusion is to adopt  
37 WP26-01 with modification to replace the term  
38 "coordination with" to "seeking input" and "considering  
39 feedback from" and to modify WP26-01a, which references  
40 Southeast region and 26-01b Southcentral region with  
41 region specific regulations. WP26-01b suggests to retain  
42 the broad authority to manage deer in Unit 6 as a dal.  
43 Adopting these changes would reduce administrative  
44 burden, resolve inconsistencies, and improve efficiency  
45 while maintaining transparency and accountability in  
46 federal subsistence management. And that's the end of  
47 that. And I'll answer any questions.

48  
49 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: That was good.  
50 Thank you, Brian. And even with the two amendments, it's

1 pretty clear. So, I appreciate that. Okay, open it up.  
2 Let's give Brian some questions, comments. Okay. They  
3 liked your presentation.

4  
5 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair.

6  
7 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Oh, no they  
8 didn't. Okay, Judy.

9  
10 MS. CAMINER: No, it was a great  
11 presentation, but just that maybe a very specific  
12 question. There's an order listed of who this -- the in-  
13 season manager needs to contact. Does that have any  
14 hierarchy or it's just how that fell out?

15  
16 MR. UBELAKER: Through the Chair, Member  
17 Caminer. That's the order that it is presented to us in  
18 our technical writing guide. It's, you know, federal  
19 agencies, state agencies, other tribes, blah, blah. And  
20 that's just the order that our brains function in. So,  
21 there's no rhyme or reason, there's no hierarchy. Nobody  
22 gets consulted before anybody else. Unless somebody  
23 doesn't answer a phone, they move on to the next.

24  
25 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. That's  
26 good. Good question. Anyone else? Faye.

27  
28 MS. EWAN: This means that the state does  
29 the regulations and then the federal will follow behind  
30 it? It's like a caribou shortage, moose shortage,  
31 whatever. Is that what this to change the power so that  
32 the federal Board will have the authority to change it  
33 on their own or...?

34  
35 MR. UBELAKER: Through the Chair. No,  
36 this is -- delegated authority exists -- the Federal  
37 Subsistence Board says there's a decision that needs to  
38 be made every year on a certain species, in a certain  
39 unit. And let's take caribou in Unit 13. So rather than  
40 the Federal Subsistence Board getting a proposal  
41 requesting a special action to close down a hunt once a  
42 quota has been met, the Federal Subsistence Board gives  
43 their authority to the Glennallen Field Office Manager  
44 to say, oh, once the harvest quota has been met and Fish  
45 and Game says we're going to close the hunt because  
46 we've taken enough caribou, then the Glennallen Field  
47 Manager can just go, oh, okay, I have this authority.  
48 I'm going to close this hunt because the Federal  
49 Subsistence Board told me I could do this without taking  
50 it to the Board.

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

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Any other questions for Brian?

(No response)

Okay. Did you receive other comments during the open period?

MR. UBELAKER: I most certainly did. AITRC submitted comments in support of WP26-01, but only with conditions. They stated that delegating authority to local managers makes sense for timely decisions, but it must include mandatory tribal consultation. Local knowledge is critical when actions affect subsistence species, timing or access. They also urge transparency, consistency across units, and limits on delegated scope. Most importantly, regulations for Units 11 and 12 must explicitly require consultation with AITRC, as was recognized in WP25-01. With these conditions, WP26-01 will improve both responsiveness and cultural appropriateness in wildlife management.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Any other received? That was it.

MR. UBELAKER: That's all.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Tribal ANCSA corporations' consultation report. Orville.

MR. LIND: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Council members. Orville Lind Native Liaison. At the -- during the consultation session, we did not have any questions or comments on WP26-01. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Thank you. Agency and tribal comments? ADF&G is out for the day. And they are not prepared on most of them anyway, so we'll move on to federal agencies. Oh, wait a minute. There he comes. Todd, come on. Okay.

MR. ESLEKIN: Todd Eskelin, Kenai National Wildlife Refuge. I would one applaud OSM for this proposal and looking through it, I think almost everything is exactly how we manage in Unit 15 and I think our consultations, I would hope you would agree, it's been pretty open lately. The one other species that I thought there could be room for improvement was on the Dall sheep one. And it may not be -- it may be something

1 that the legal department says is not okay to put in  
2 this proposal. But I imagine this scenario, if you look  
3 at the other species, we have the ability to say close  
4 a portion, like the one year I think we had to close  
5 fork hunting and maintain the rest of the antler  
6 restrictions open to hunting. So, we have that with  
7 moose. But with sheep, my one concern is, as we continue  
8 to see sheep numbers dwindle on the Kenai, I can imagine  
9 a scenario where sport hunting possibly gets restricted.  
10 Be that a drawing hunt or registration hunt, a closure,  
11 and in some cases, you know, we're all going to be in  
12 agreement that that is the next step for the Federal  
13 Subsistence hunt as well. But there could be a scenario  
14 where we're like, maybe we can keep this hunt open by  
15 going from three quarters to full curl for that one  
16 drawing hunt and keep that open. And the -- in the sheep  
17 portion of this, it doesn't give the manager that  
18 flexibility to change bag limits. It only -- it's open  
19 or closed and area restrictions. So, I throw that out  
20 there as a -- don't know if that is even possible to  
21 work in this, nor do I know that we're ever going to  
22 face that situation where we can't go through the regular  
23 proposal cycle. But I can see limited opportunities  
24 where we could maintain an open season, possibly in a  
25 few situations. So, entertain any questions or thoughts  
26 on that.

27  
28 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Questions  
29 for Todd. I guess the question would be, Darell, do you  
30 feel you get sufficient consultation at the tribal  
31 level? I do, I get it for as a Chair here. I don't know  
32 what you're receiving there.

33  
34 MR. WILLIAMS: Yes.

35  
36 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Good. Thank  
37 you. So, yeah, it works good, Todd. We have a long  
38 history of delegation of authority, and we must be  
39 getting old and soft, because now we're putting in a  
40 regulation. But we used to fight these and stand on the  
41 table. So, yeah. Okay. Pretty quiet huh, Andy? Yeah.  
42 Yeah. Okay.

43  
44 MR. ESKELIN: I think I would also add  
45 that over the years that process has, you know, put us  
46 in a better place. There's times when I'm like, I want  
47 the entire quart of ice cream and my wife says, no. And  
48 the happy medium ends up being the right place where we  
49 need to be. So, I think we've done a good job. All of  
50 our hunts, all of our fisheries are, you know, actively

00058

1 supporting subsistence. So, I would say that process  
2 worked.

3

4 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Yeah. Thank  
5 you. I'd say it works too. And also, the wife hides my  
6 ice cream. So anyway, I think we're on the same page,  
7 so. Okay. All right.

8

9 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair.

10

11 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Any other  
12 questions? Judy.

13

14 MS. CAMINER: A couple times, Brian, in  
15 the write up, it says you know that OSM did not transfer  
16 this authority into unit specific regs as it's not been  
17 used for several years and not necessary. So just not  
18 quite following that reasoning.

19

20 MR. UBELAKER: Through the Chair, can you  
21 point to a specific?

22

23 MS. CAMINER: Page 37, second whole page  
24 37, second full paragraph, Unit 7 moose. And then that  
25 last section, the sentence.

26

27 MR. UBELAKER: The closing federal public  
28 lands to all user statement is -- it's a boiler -- it's  
29 boiler plate language for DALs. Way -- there were certain  
30 instances when they were first becoming issued that it  
31 made sense to give a land manager the authority to close  
32 it. And then as they started promulgating, we just took  
33 the language and changed unit, land manager, whatnot.  
34 So, it was all delegation of authority letters covered  
35 all authorities that they could possibly have use them  
36 or not. Even if it was just a give this guy the ability  
37 to close the season when harvest quota has been reached.  
38 They got A through F as options they could do under the  
39 delegated authority letter.

40

41 MS. CAMINER: I'm still not getting it.

42

43 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Lisa,  
44 would you want to.....

45

46 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah. Lisa Grediagin.  
47 Just to clarify a little bit what Brian said. The  
48 boilerplate language in every single delegation of  
49 authority letter was to close to non-subsistence uses.  
50 And so that'd be non-federally qualified users and

1 income -- when we're OSM was putting together this  
2 proposal we had a meeting with our Solicitor and the  
3 solicitor advised us not to transfer that boilerplate  
4 language of transfer -- of closing to non-subsistence  
5 users into every single unit specific regulation,  
6 because closures are more of a kind of emergency, like  
7 true special action situation, not just a routine annual  
8 thing. And so, when we are going through all 60 of these  
9 delegation of authority letters, there were a few that  
10 contained this closure to all users language. And again,  
11 these incident management actions are supposed to be  
12 kind of routine things that happen every single year.  
13 And so, closing to all users is not a routine thing that  
14 you know, you're going to do every single year. That's  
15 more appropriate to be a true special action that goes  
16 through the process emergency versus in regulation, you  
17 know, the manager can just do it because, you know, if  
18 you're going to be closing to users every single year,  
19 why do you even have a hunt? So, I think that -- yeah.  
20 Does that help?

21

22 MS. CAMINER: Yeah, I think I understand  
23 it better now. Thank you.

24

25 MS. GREDIAGIN: Okay. Yeah. And just --  
26 I was also going to come up and say that another  
27 modification that is not in the Council version that OSM  
28 is planning on incorporating based on AITRC's comments,  
29 is to add a track to the list of entities required for  
30 coordination to Unit 11 moose. So, if the Council wants  
31 to consider that modification you know, that'd be  
32 helpful as well. And, you know, this is the first we're  
33 hearing from Todd on the sheep, that Unit 7 or 15 sheep  
34 are delegation of authority. But that's something that  
35 the Council could consider adding in and modifying to  
36 allow them to set the harvest limit. And with all of  
37 these delegations, you can't really go outside the  
38 bounds of regulations. You know, if you say you can  
39 announce a season, but the regulations say August 20th  
40 to September 25th, you can't announce a season in March.  
41 You know, you can only announce the season within those  
42 bounds of regulation. And so, the same with harvest  
43 limit. You know, if it's a three -- if it's a three  
44 quarter -- if it's a full curl ram, you could go down  
45 to -- well yeah that'd be hard. Because yeah, if it's a  
46 three-quarter curl ram, I think you could go up to full  
47 -- yeah. I'll have to think about this. The curls are  
48 like in the numbers are, you know, if it says up to two  
49 caribou like Unit 13, you could say one caribou, but you  
50 couldn't say three caribou sort of thing. And so, the

00060

1 sheep one, if we -- we'll have to think about that. We  
2 haven't had that specific situation before. But I think  
3 you understand what I'm saying. Where you can't go  
4 outside the bounds of regulation. You can become kind  
5 of more conservative or restrictive but not increase it.  
6 So, thank you.

7

8 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: No comment.  
9 Okay. Any other questions for him?

10

11 (No response)

12

13 Okay Brian, was there public comments  
14 received on this that you just went through?

15

16 MR. UBELAKER: I read the only one that  
17 I had, yes.

18

19 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. I'm not  
20 blaming you. I was asked, so I had to ask. Okay. And we  
21 went through that. We got the tribal, corporate  
22 consultation. Orville.

23

24 MR. LIND: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Orville  
25 Lind Native liaison, during the consultation session  
26 AITRC was in support of WP26-01.

27

28 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Thank  
29 you. Fish and Game, we mentioned they're not here.  
30 Federal agencies, and that's when Todd jumped up. So,  
31 we went back a little bit. But anyway, tribes and AMCSA  
32 corporations.

33

34 (No comment)

35

36 None. Advisory group comments. Was there  
37 other RAC?

38

39 MR. UBELAKER: Yes. Mr. Chair. Southeast  
40 Council heard this and they are in support of WP26-01  
41 as modified by OSM and also in support of WP26-01a with  
42 modifications shown in the RAC book. Which if I can step  
43 to the side for a second, mentioning that you guys will  
44 also have to take action on both 26-01 and 26-01b whether  
45 you do that combined, separately, however. Excuse me,  
46 there will need to be two actions. Okay.  
47 Kodiak/Aleutians supported as modified by OSM. They only  
48 -- and I'll -- sorry, I will back up again. 26-01a and  
49 b are the only two modifications. So, the other Councils  
50 had no modifications to consider. So basically

1 considered 26-01 with changes per standard from letter  
2 to regulation. Western Interior supported 2601 as  
3 modified by OSM. Northwest Arctic Council supported as  
4 modified by OSM. Eastern Interior supported WP260-01 as  
5 modified by OSM and supported WP26-01i as modified by  
6 the Eastern Interior Council. North Slope supported as  
7 modified by OSM. And that's all the Councils that have  
8 heard this proposal.

9  
10 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay, that's a  
11 lot. Pretty good. Fish and Game Advisory Council. No.  
12 How about Subsistence Resource? Amber, go ahead.

13  
14 MS. COHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Again,  
15 for the record this is Amber Cohen from Wrangell-St.  
16 Elias. So, the Subsistence Resource Commission took up  
17 WP26-01, WP26-01b, the Southcentral Addendum and WP26-  
18 01i, Eastern Interior. And they supported with  
19 modification moving delegated authorities in the South-  
20 Central and Eastern Interior regions into unit specific  
21 regulations. The modification would add Ahtna Inter-  
22 Tribal Resource Commission or AITRC as a consulting body  
23 for Unit 11 winter moose hunt and Unit 12 Chisana caribou  
24 hunt. AITRC has been conducting research that would  
25 benefit federal agencies and managers with their  
26 decision making for these species. It's a way to increase  
27 working together and supports more effective management  
28 decisions. The SRC believes that moving delegated  
29 authorities into unit specific regulations would be a  
30 better and more efficient system.

31  
32 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay, Amber.  
33 Thank you. Okay, Nissa, was there other written public  
34 comments?

35  
36 MS. PILCHER: There was none received,  
37 no.

38  
39 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Thank  
40 you. Is there anyone that -- from the public want to  
41 testify on this? Anyone online that want to testify?

42  
43 (No response)

44  
45 Nope. Okay, we're down to the Council's  
46 motion to put it on the table. Michael, you got to do  
47 your job. You're getting tired. Getting weak.

48  
49 MR. OPHEIM: Yeah. So, I move that we  
50 support Wildlife Proposal WP26-01 as modified by OSM

00062

1 with 26-01a, 26-01b and yeah.

2

3 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: I think that  
4 covers it.

5

6 MR. WILSON: I'll second it.

7

8 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: We got a motion  
9 on the floor. We need a second to keep moving.

10

11 MR. WILSON: I'll second it.

12

13 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Seconded  
14 by Kirk. We got consultation going on the side here. Did  
15 you guys -- we got a motion on the floor.

16

17 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, sorry. I just  
18 wanted to clarify that most other Councils and what I  
19 would recommend for this Council is to do two separate  
20 motions, one for 26-01, just the statewide concept and  
21 then a separate one for 26-01b that Southcentral  
22 specific.

23

24 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay, we got a  
25 motion on the floor. We got a second for the way we want  
26 it. Unless you guys want to modify and retract it to  
27 change it to individual motions. I'll accept that. But  
28 otherwise, we'll have to press on and go take it up  
29 again with the second motion.

30

31 MR. OPHIEM: I'd be happy to go back to  
32 what Lisa mentioned there.

33

34 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Second.....

35

36 (Simultaneous speech)

37

38 MR. OPHEIM: Second wants to?

39

40 MR. WILSON: I'll second it.

41

42 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Second is good  
43 with that. Okay. Is it clear what we got? You want to  
44 read us back a motion?

45

46 MS. PILCHER: Well, if I'm understanding  
47 correctly what the Council will be discussing right now  
48 is WP26-01 as a statewide concept right now.

49

50

1 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: That's correct.  
2 Okay. And we -- a second is good with that. Okay.  
3 Discussion on that. We're open to discussion. Judy.  
4 Anyone? Andy, go ahead.

5  
6 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah. Thank you. Through  
7 the Chair. So, I'd like to thank OSM for finding a way  
8 for us to address and perhaps modify some DAL things  
9 that have been historically significant to the RAC  
10 members. Not sure if the new RAC members know the history  
11 of that, but I would caution RAC members and tribal  
12 members to not take it loosely when just giving a blanket  
13 DAL to an in-season manager. Historically, we were told  
14 that when we did that, we could then rescind that later  
15 with another vote as easy as the motion was made the  
16 first time. But that proved to not be true when we have  
17 done that and tried to remove that from an in-season  
18 manager, it was not allowed. So, it kind of becomes a  
19 permanent fixture. And it seems to me that the OSM has  
20 found a way as putting this into regulation gives us a  
21 place in the book where we can go make a proposal and  
22 then modify that in time, rather than be stuck with this  
23 permanent thing where the sunset clause that we have put  
24 in historically just got omitted. I would not be in  
25 support of the modification part here where "in  
26 coordination with" seems to give us some power. But in  
27 the changing that words and you can see where OSM  
28 preliminary conclusion and the support in quotes  
29 "seeking input" and "considering feedback" from I don't  
30 -- that's a big no for me because it disempowers the RAC  
31 input. Seeking input and consideration is -- it doesn't  
32 give us as much weight into the decision making process  
33 from my view on that specific wording.

34  
35 In page 29, in the early 2000s paragraph  
36 it points out this DAL type system goes through a process  
37 second line down without going through the full  
38 regulatory process. Okay. That to me, seems quite  
39 significant. I would think that it'd be prudent for the  
40 RAC members support to be garnered from -- by the in-  
41 season manager for, like a higher level or degree of RAC  
42 input, because we are the ones with our boots on the  
43 ground that have our finger on the pulse of these  
44 populations and kind of know what's going on. And I can  
45 speak from the past of different situations where  
46 consultations have happened before, like during the  
47 snowpocalypse of the deer in Prince William Sound. I  
48 would like to bring to the attention of 31, page 31 on  
49 the second paragraph down. It starts with previous  
50 Councils, but the last sentence the OSM expects any

1 future DALs issued by the Board to be temporary. Okay,  
2 that hasn't been proven in the past. They have not been  
3 temporary. They've become permanent. Okay, so a DAL is  
4 nothing to take lightly, in my view.

5  
6 So, anyhow I just feel that not thrilled  
7 about the modification coordination with and seeking  
8 input is slightly -- is different. I think they should  
9 garner support from the RAC members. And when you look  
10 at that list that Ms. Caminer had mentioned earlier it  
11 says a consultation with the Chair. Yeah. Granted, the  
12 Chair. I totally respect the Chair, but sometimes the  
13 Chair doesn't know what's going on in my home region or  
14 your home region, and there should be some type of  
15 process that like, somebody mentioned the tribal or the  
16 Resource Commission said that they wanted, you know,  
17 hey, we support this, but there should be some input  
18 here from the local people. You know, I think that's as  
19 vital constituent to this situation. And I'm a little  
20 apprehensive about the wording and how this current  
21 motion is.

22  
23 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: That opens up a  
24 whole slew of discussion and changes you know, so we'll  
25 have to discuss that. We do have a motion on the floor.  
26 We do have a second on it. We're having discussion just  
27 on the motion one. The first one on -- so let me clarify  
28 that. Just so, Brian, we know where we're at. We're just  
29 on 26-01. We're not doing the B part yet, so I don't  
30 know if that could be taken out for the more thorough  
31 consultation with AITRC and etc. Anyway, I'll just throw  
32 that out.

33  
34 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair.

35  
36 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Go ahead.

37  
38 MS. CAMINER: Well, I guess I'm wondering  
39 OSM or to agencies what direction may or may not even  
40 occur to an in-season manager as to what consultation  
41 means? Or are they just you know, looking at the wording  
42 and it's their own interpretation?

43  
44 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Well, in my  
45 consultation as the Chair, they get pretty involved and  
46 -- but -- and Andy brings a very good point, and you  
47 know in his region 6. Do I know what's going on, no I  
48 don't. So, we have to call them and contact them. That  
49 might. That's a good point. That's a very good point.  
50 That's why, you know, the letters of authority were

1 specific to those regions. But when they do consult with  
2 me, we talk about the either decline of the herd or the  
3 emergency, the reason or why we could give another one  
4 moose. And Todd gets all shook up. He says they're  
5 doggone, we're hitting the top level. We can't go any  
6 further. I says, hang on we take one over the limit  
7 we're good. Okay. So, I get a good consultation in my  
8 area. But I agree with you on other areas. We need to  
9 consult them. And I think that's why AITRC wants to put  
10 in B to consult with them. So, we're going to -- we  
11 could debate this all day. So, we need to come to some  
12 conclusion on number one first and then we can move on,  
13 I think. Go ahead, Nissa.

14  
15 MS. PILCHER: And I just wanted to  
16 clarify; I might have gotten the original motion when I  
17 read it back to you incorrect. Because I do believe  
18 actually Michael, when he put it on the floor, was with  
19 OSM's modification, correct? So, what we're now  
20 considering is to change -- in the statewide, not in the  
21 Southcentral, but in the statewide to change the  
22 language from "coordination with" to "seeking input" and  
23 "considering feedback from". So, if you didn't want that  
24 change then you would not want to take -- you wouldn't  
25 want to support as OSM modified. But Lisa might have  
26 more.

27  
28 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah. Lisa Grediagin. I  
29 just wanted to address the words, you know,  
30 consultation, coordination, seek input and consider  
31 feedback from. OSM had like a lot of internal discussions  
32 about what consultation means, what coordination means,  
33 and that there's kind of confusion over what those terms  
34 could mean. And so that's why we decided to recommend  
35 changing it to seek input and consider feedback from.  
36 So, it's more explicit and clear what is actually  
37 required and the expectation of the in-season manager.

38  
39 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: I have to agree  
40 with you. It weakens it. But anyway, thank you for your  
41 input there. Yeah. We -- go ahead, Andy.

42  
43 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah. So, I myself will  
44 I support this -- the first part, but the without the  
45 modification, I didn't like the change in that wording.  
46 I think coordination includes us as a RAC and  
47 consultation is like yeah, I listen to them, but I'm  
48 still going to and we don't -- these in-season managers  
49 change over time. And you never know, there could be a  
50 person who doesn't like liberal bag limits for federal

00066

1 qualified subsistence users, and it takes a more  
2 conservative approach about a population that you know  
3 more about than they do. So anyhow, I will support this,  
4 but not with the modification. I could see -- I will  
5 vote against it, hoping it doesn't pass, and then  
6 entertain making another motion to just accept the --  
7 support the WP26-01 without the modification.

8  
9 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay, this  
10 motion is with modification. So, if you don't like it,  
11 vote it down. Read motion. But anyway, any other  
12 discussion? Go ahead. Ed.

13  
14 MR. HOLSTEN: Call the question.

15  
16 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Question has  
17 been called for all in favor of the motion to support  
18 with the modification by OSM, signify by -- that's 21a.  
19 Signify by saying aye.

20  
21 IN UNISON: Aye.

22  
23 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Yeah, just one.  
24 Yeah. Just one. Yeah. Okay. Just one. Any opposed?

25  
26 IN UNISON: Aye.

27  
28 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: One, two,  
29 three, four, five. It fails. Right?

30  
31 MS. PILCHER: To double check my numbers.  
32 But it looks like the motion -- it's 5 to 6 nays, so it  
33 would fail. That is correct.

34  
35 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: That was my  
36 count. But I'm fast.

37  
38 MS. PILCHER: I am not so fast.

39  
40 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Andy.

41  
42 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Is this the point where  
43 I can make a motion to.....

44  
45 (Simultaneous speech)

46  
47 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Yeah, that  
48 motion failed. So, we're.....

49  
50

00067

1 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: If that failed, I would  
2 make a converse motion to support proposal WP26-01, but  
3 without that modification of that change in the wording.

4  
5 MS. CAMINER: Second.

6  
7 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. It's  
8 moved and seconded. You just heard the motion. Is there  
9 more discussion on the motion? It's moved and seconded.  
10 I hope. Judy.

11  
12 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair, I think what  
13 Andy's proposing more clearly reflects the level of  
14 whatever we want to call the word but involvement in  
15 communication with not only the RAC, but other needed  
16 necessary organizations to help the in-season manager  
17 make the best decision possible for the resources and  
18 subsistence users.

19  
20 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay, that's  
21 the clarification or justification. Any other comments  
22 on it?

23  
24 MS. TOTEMOFF: Yeah. I just want to thank  
25 you for the clarification on the wording and stuff like  
26 that. That was really helpful. Thank you.

27  
28 UNIDENTIFIED: Questions.

29  
30 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: All in favor,  
31 say aye.

32  
33 IN UNISON: Aye.

34  
35 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: All those  
36 opposed, same sign.

37  
38 (No response)

39  
40 Okay, we gotta go. We have the motion  
41 for the second portion. Someone wants to make that  
42 motion.

43  
44 UNIDENTIFIED: I'll move that. We support  
45 the proposal 260-1b for the South-Central region.

46  
47 UNIDENTIFIED: Second it.

48  
49 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Yeah. Was that  
50 added with AITRC?

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

UNIDENTIFIED: We can do it with the AITRC.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: You got -- you agree to that? Okay. Okay. Does that clear boundary. They're supporting it with the added with the comments from AITRC to be consulted.

MR. UBELAKER: Mr. Chair, so if I'm understanding correctly, the motion would be -- excuse me, to support with the OSM modification, but with the addition of AITRC.

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.

MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair. Obviously, we're appropriate for that region. Not for everything in Southcentral.

MR. UBELAKER: So, through the Chair, so limited to Southcentral region or -- no, no I'm sorry. You're not saying to amend it to all of Southcentral region. Just Units 11 and 12 -- or 12.

MS. GREDIAIGN: Yeah. It's only Unit 11 moose. There are -- AITRC's already included for Unit 13 caribou. And so, the only other delegation of authority that applies to AITRC would be Unit 11 moose. And then just to clarify, the other OSM modification for 26-01b was to retain that Unit 6 deer delegation of authority as a letter, instead of putting it into unit specific regulations. Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: We got questions on that, so.

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah. Can you clarify what she just said again?

MR. UBELAKER: Okay. Through the Chair Member McLaughlin, the original.....

(Simultaneous speech)

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Getting off course. So, if you can clarify our motion and we got a second and we're voting on it. So, let's get clear where we're at. Thank you.

1 MR. UBELAKER: Correct. So, the OSM  
2 modification is -- on the wrong. Hold on. Geeze. Proposal  
3 WP26-01 with modification to retain the broad authority  
4 to manage deer in Unit 6 as a delegation of authority  
5 letter. And then in addition to that, having AITRC listed  
6 as consultation for moose in Unit 11 is the motion on  
7 the floor. This could also go the same way as the  
8 previous one you voted down and then resubmit a proposal  
9 without that modification.

10  
11 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Okay, I'm a little  
12 confused. I'm looking at 26-01b, correct?

13  
14 MR. UBELAKER: Yep.

15  
16 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: I see deer and you're  
17 talking about moose.

18  
19 MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah. And just -- Lisa  
20 Grediagin. You might want to look at the alternatives  
21 considered on page 40 of your meeting book where it kind  
22 of outlines like this -- Unit 6 deer is a very broad  
23 like everything in the kitchen sink delegation of  
24 authority. So, it's not -- these are not routine  
25 management actions that happen every year. They're you  
26 know, it seems more appropriate to be true special  
27 actions to OSM. And so, in these alternatives we  
28 considered retaining it as a delegation of authority  
29 letter, or just completely rescinding this delegated  
30 authority.

31  
32 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Yeah, I think  
33 unfortunately we got too much information, and we got a  
34 little bit overloaded. So, it's really hard to make a  
35 decision on that for the Board. So, we have a motion on  
36 the table. It is seconded. And it was to include the  
37 modification with AITRC. The only other thing that I  
38 hear, I am going to complicate myself is Todd wanted  
39 something on his sheep or so that could be in there too,  
40 I guess. Or Todd would take you up separately, but if  
41 someone wanted it in that motion, we would have to add  
42 that.

43  
44 (Pause)

45  
46 No, we're not rescinding nothing. We're  
47 going to take a vote on this motion as it is. So, we got  
48 the motion made. We got it seconded. We got it with the  
49 AITRC in it. That's the motion on the floor. We're  
50 discussing that. We'll take a vote on that.

00070

1

2

UNIDENTIFIED: Can you repeat the motion  
please?

4

5

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Brian's real  
good at it. Go ahead.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

MR. UBELAKER: I hope I'm not just  
confusing people more. Motion on the floor is to support  
proposal WP26-01b with the OSM modification to retain  
the broad authority to manage deer in Unit 6 as a  
delegation of authority letter. And to add AITRC to the  
list of consulted agencies for Unit 11 moose.

15

16

17

18

19

20

MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair, perhaps to  
hopefully streamline for us, since Todd's comments just  
came up and you haven't had a chance to really analyze  
them. Can we request that you do that so that the Federal  
Board will have that in front of them?

21

22

23

24

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. We're on  
the floor to modify it. If they need to take up sheep,  
we'll do it separate with them, so. Question.

25

26

27

28

29

30

UNIDENTIFIED: Call the question.

31

32

33

34

35

CHAIRPERSON ENCELEWSKI: Those opposed,  
same sign.

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

(No response)

Motion carries. So, your.....

UNIDENTIFIED: Abstain.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Oh, you  
abstain. This is what happens when you get too many  
cooks in the kitchen. And we cannot be modifying and  
modifying motions in the middle of a motion. And it's  
really confusing. And I want to get -- that's why we  
have the public comment period. We have the comment  
period from all the members so we're clear on it. And  
then we get clear, and then we get to the point where  
someone wants to modify it again. And it's, you know,

00071

1 it's -- there's -- it's not going to work that way, so.  
2 Let's take a five-minute break and come back.

3

4 (Off record)

5

6 (On record)

7

8 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay, folks, if  
9 you take your chair, we're going to take a stab at  
10 finishing up these proposals. So, we're going to work a  
11 little late through lunch. And some of us -- we got some  
12 people having to leave by one. And so, we're going to  
13 try and do as much as we can before that. Just for  
14 clarification, the last motion we did pass and there's  
15 reconsideration of how that was passed or what we really  
16 wanted. So, there's several things we could do. The first  
17 thing we could do is rescind the last motion, take it,  
18 and present a new motion, or you could keep it and  
19 present a new motion on top of that. So that's -- and  
20 it has to if you're going to rescind, it has to be by  
21 the winning side that makes that motion, which there was  
22 only two that were opposed, I think. So, they can't make  
23 that motion, so. (Indiscernible) but that's where I'm  
24 at.

25

26 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair, I'll ask that  
27 we -- I move that we rescind the last motion so we can  
28 review our real intent and perhaps be more clear on what  
29 we'd like to accomplish here.

30

31 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Is there a  
32 second to that motion?

33

34 MS. EWAN: Second.

35

36 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Second by Fay.  
37 Is there any discussion on that motion?

38

39 (No response)

40

41 Hearing none. All in favor of the  
42 rescinding them passed motion on B -- 26, whatever it  
43 was.

44

45 IN UNISON: Aye.

46

47 CHAIRPERSON ENCELEWSKI: Any opposed?

48

49 (No response)

50

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

Okay. Now, I would ask Brian, we had some consultation and we have a proposed motion that we would like to put forth. And if you would want to read that, and, Andy, if you would make sure it's copacetic with what you would like. Thank you.

MR. UBELAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So, the new motion to be considered will be to support WP26-01b with modification to rescind the Unit 6 deer delegated authority, and to add AITRC to the list of entities required for coordination for Unit 11 moose.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Very good. You like that? That rescind the deer.

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: And that rescinds the dear DAL?

MR. UBELAKER: Through the Chair. Yes.

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: That's -- that sounds exactly like what we were trying to get. I was trying to get, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED: I'll make a motion to adopt what he just put up there.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Very good. I just want to make sure we're clear on it.

MS. EWAN: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: We got seconded by Faye. We do now have the motion. It's on the floor. It's been seconded. We've had discussion. Is there any further discussion on the motion? I see head shaking. No. All those in favor aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Those opposed?

(No response)

It now carries. And I hope that motion is what we wanted. Okay. Thank you, thank you, thank you. Okay. Yes, it was kind of confusing and it's

1 confusing for the Chair. I mean, Robert's Rules say you  
2 rescind a motion if you're not just going to go in and  
3 pull up one motion and make it. Yeah. Okay. Is there any  
4 other -- before we go, is there any other motions we  
5 need to make? Go ahead, Angela.

6  
7 MS. TOTEMOFF: I would also like to make  
8 a motion to rescind our vote on proposal WP26031, in  
9 lieu of new information that was presented yesterday at  
10 close of day.

11  
12 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Thank  
13 you. Is there a second to that?

14  
15 UNIDENTIFIED: I'll second.

16  
17 UNIDENTIFIED: I'll second it.

18  
19 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Seconded by  
20 several people. The motion is to rescind. Do you want  
21 to read the 31 or...?

22  
23 MS. TOTEMOFF: Absolutely. Proposal 26-  
24 31 requests that the BLM lands in Unit 13 be closed to  
25 moose hunting by non-federally qualified users.  
26 Submitted by Kirk Wilson.

27  
28 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay, Okay.  
29 That's a motion has been seconded.

30  
31 MS. EWAN: Second.

32  
33 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Got a second,  
34 but we'll second it again. Discussion.

35  
36 UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah. I don't know.  
37 Yesterday we had a testimony at the very end of the  
38 meeting there yesterday, and it was here. And in there  
39 it talks about 229 days consecutive hunting with no  
40 success whatsoever for the people. The other thing that  
41 comes to mind that maybe people didn't understand is I  
42 put this proposal in before and it was adopted -- or it  
43 was amended and they -- and 13B is already in where it's  
44 closed to everybody else. So, if you're not a qualified  
45 subsistence hunter and you've been hunting in 13B,  
46 you've probably been not doing the right thing. The only  
47 thing that we're asking for in this proposal, if you  
48 look at this thing, is down at the very bottom of the  
49 map, there's a little yellow line that goes down and  
50 it's down around Tonsina down there. Basically, you can

00074

1 see some other little orange spots in Unit 13D and 13A,  
2 and then a spot up here in 13E that is way off the Road  
3 System. I mean, that's all we're asking for because 13B  
4 we've already had that in. And when our proposal failed  
5 the, we lose 13B too, we won't have 13B anymore after  
6 this year.

7

8 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Is there  
9 any more comments before. Angela, go ahead.

10

11 MS. TOTEMOFF: Thank you. So just for  
12 reference this is in your supplemental material, page  
13 33. And so, due to the report presented yesterday by Ms.  
14 Deanna from AITRC, as well as a clarification on the  
15 boundaries, which is a lot less than what we initially  
16 had discussed. This is why I'm supporting this.

17

18 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Is there  
19 any discussion?

20

21 (No response)

22

23 Okay. Hearing none. All in favor of the  
24 motion to rescind -31, signify by saying aye.

25

26 IN UNISON: Aye.

27

28 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: All those  
29 opposed.

30

31 (No response)

32

33 Okay. That motion is rescinded. Do we  
34 want to make a motion?

35

36 MS. TOTEMOFF: Yes. Mr. Chair. I would  
37 like to make a motion to support WP26-31.

38

39 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Is there a  
40 second to that?

41

42 MR. GREYBEAR: Second.

43

44 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Seconded by  
45 Edward. Okay. Any discussion?

46

47 (No response)

48

49 Hearing none. All in favor of that now  
50 signify by saying aye.

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

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Any opposed?

MS. CAMINER: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: One, Judy. Okay. Motion carries. My schedule here and see if I've missed something on another proposal. We do have the next proposal WP26-74. It's in Unit 12. And I think Hannah is going to give that. Are you on the phone?

DR. VOORHEES: Yes, Mr. Chair. Good afternoon, Mr. Chair Members of the Council. This is Hannah Voorhees. I'm an anthropologist at OSM, and I'll be presenting Wildlife Proposal WP26-74, which begins on page 203 of your meeting materials. This proposal submitted by Bruce Gordon of Chitina requests that the Board recognize the customary and traditional uses of sheep in Unit 12 by residents of Chitina and Kenny Lake. The proponent states that he and other residents of the Unit 13 communities of Kenny Lake and Chitina, have a history of harvesting sheep in Unit 12. He explained that residents of both communities have historically adapted their hunting locations based on the changing availability of wildlife, competition on the Road System, and the availability of permits. He would like to be able to participate in the federal subsistence elder sheep hunt in Unit 12, because it is one of the few areas where he can do a sheep hunt on his own, on foot.

In regulatory history residents of Unit 12: Chistochina, Dot Lake, Healey Lake, Mentasta Lake and Slana currently have C&T for sheep in Unit 12. Traditionally, sheep were an important and valued part of the Ahtna diet. At the beginning of the 20th century, Ahtna living in areas overlapping with present day Chitina and Kenny Lake, were often unable to obtain moose and caribou, and depended heavily on sheep, which were plentiful in the region. The Ahtna hunted and hunt sheep in areas relatively close to their camps and settlements. However, in the ethnographic literature, hunting by Ahtna residents of the Chitina and Kenny Lake areas within Unit 12 was not documented. Chitina has been surveyed three times by Division of Subsistence. Surveyed Chitina households did not harvest sheep in any of their survey years. An average of about 8% of surveyed households attempted to harvest sheep across the survey

1 years, and an average of 11% used sheep. All documented  
2 search and use areas occurred exclusively in Unit 13.  
3 Like Chitina, surveyed households in Kenny Lake did not  
4 harvest sheep in any of their three survey years. In  
5 2012, 5% of surveyed households attempted to hunt sheep.  
6 That year, about 6% of surveyed households used sheep.  
7 The surveys again did not document sheep search areas  
8 in Unit 12.

9  
10 State harvest information was not  
11 available when this analysis was published, but I have  
12 it for you now. Between 2000 and 2024, state records  
13 show that residents of Chitina and Kenny Lake  
14 participated in 197 sheep hunts in the state, but of  
15 these, only two occurred in Unit 12. The preliminary  
16 conclusion is to oppose proposal WP26-74. Traditionally,  
17 sheep were an important and valued part of the Ahtna  
18 diet, particularly during times when other ungulates  
19 were unavailable. The Ahtna harvested sheep within their  
20 traditional territory in areas relatively close to their  
21 camps and settlements. Over three surveys between 1982  
22 and 2012, participating Chitina and Kenny Lake  
23 households were not found to have harvested any sheep  
24 although some hunting effort and use was documented. No  
25 search and use areas for sheep were specifically  
26 documented in Unit 12 for Chitina or Kenny Lake in the  
27 subsistence studies. While these communities have a  
28 demonstrated pattern of customary and traditional  
29 hunting for sheep, this pattern has not been  
30 demonstrated for Unit 12. Thank you, Mr. Chair. That  
31 concludes my presentation, and I'm available for any  
32 questions you may have.

33  
34 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Hannah,  
35 thank you. We'll open up for questions here. Questions  
36 for Hannah from the Council? Dennis, you go ahead.

37  
38 MR. ZADRA: Yeah. Dennis Zadra. I'm  
39 looking at the regulations and I -- to me, it seems like  
40 the federal regulations and the state regulations are  
41 the exact same for residents in Unit 12. So, I don't  
42 know -- it seems like the proposal -- the proponent can  
43 do this -- put this under state regulations. And I just  
44 want to make sure if I'm correct on that.

45  
46 DR. VOORHEES: That's a great question.  
47 They're essentially the same except for the elder hunt  
48 which does have a longer season and which the proponent  
49 was hoping to take advantage of in this area. And that  
50 is not mirrored on the state side.

00077

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

MR. ZADRA: Okay. Thank you for the clarification.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Other questions?

(No response)

Okay. Was there any public comments received, Hannah, during the open period?

DR. VOORHEES: This is Hannah Voorhees, for the record, and yes, there was one written public comment in opposition to this proposal. Ahtna Intertribal Resource Commission stated that the proposal does not meet the established criteria for C&T use as defined under Federal Subsistence Management Regulations. They stated that these determinations should be made on community wide patterns rather than individual preference. Communities with C&T for sheep in Unit 12 demonstrate intergenerational knowledge transfer, geographic proximity, and cultural significance of sheep.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Thank you for that. Any tribal, ANCSA corporations on our consultation report? Orville.

(No response)

Nissa, do you know?

MS. PILCHER: I don't believe there was, but I will double check.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. He might have went to lunch. We didn't get the memo to him. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game not available. How about federal agencies? Looked like Todd. We talked about sheep, and he left, so. Okay. I'm sure. I'm sure we'll find him again.

MS. CAMINER: He's in the corner.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: He's in the corner. Oh. Oh, I see he went to the corner. Okay. If there's no federal agencies, how about tribes and ANCSA corporations? Anyone?

1 (No response)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

Any advisory group comments? Other RACs?  
Hannah, do you know of other RACs that submitted  
comments?

DR. VOORHEES: Mr. Chair, this is Hannah  
Voorhees. The Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council  
recommended opposing this proposal, the Council stated  
that there is no evidence that residents of Chitina and  
Kenny Lake have a long-term pattern of traditional use  
of sheep in Unit 12, as reflected by the data in the OSM  
analysis. Both communities formed more recently because  
of industry, and there is no evidence of successful sheep  
harvest in Unit 12 by either community. The Council noted  
that the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park Subsistence  
Resource Commission also opposed this proposal.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Thank  
you. Was there any Fish and Game Advisory Councils? How  
about Subsistence Resource Commission? Here comes Amber.

MS. COHEN: For the record, this is Amber  
Cohen from Wrangell-St. Elias. So, the Subsistence  
Resource Commission opposed modifying the customary  
traditional use determination for sheep in Unit 12. As  
neither Kenny Lake nor Chitina demonstrated the eight  
factors used to determine customary traditional use.  
They did suggest that the individual who submitted this  
proposal could go through the individual process to  
recognize their personal history of hunting sheep in  
Unit 12.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Very  
good. Thank you. Was there any other written public  
comments, Nissa?

MS. PILCHER: There were no written  
public comments received after the comment deadline. And  
looking at Orville's notes there was no comments given  
at the consultation.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay.

MS. PILCHER: Tribal consultation.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Very good. That  
clears that both up. Thank you. Public testimony. Anyone  
want to testify? Public? Anyone on the phone?

1 MR. SCHIMMEL: If I may.

2

3 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Who's there? Go  
4 ahead. State your name and go ahead and talk.

5

6 MR. SCHIMMEL: Hello, this is Sam  
7 Schimmel. I'm a Kenaitze tribal member speaking on my  
8 own. Approving a customary traditional use determination  
9 that's based on a single individual's usage of a resource  
10 goes against the purpose of the C&T determinations,  
11 which are inherently community based. For that reason,  
12 I'd urge you guys to oppose this finding.

13

14 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Very good, Sam.  
15 Good to hear your voice and congratulations on your law  
16 degree. And you find out now that the federal system is  
17 not all what you thought it was, is it? Thank you.

18

19 MR. SCHIMMEL: Not quite, Greg.

20

21 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Anyway.

22

23 MR. SCHIMMERL: It's much more.

24

25 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Yes, it is.  
26 Thank you. Sam, just for your information, I went  
27 sideways there, but Sam is just -- he's with the Kenaitze  
28 Indian group, and he also just became an attorney. And  
29 he's for support, subsistence. He's very proud to make  
30 that accomplishment. Okay. Any other public testimony  
31 on the phone or otherwise?

32

33 (No response)

34

35 Okay, Council motion to put it on the  
36 table and we'll debate it.

37

38 MR. WILSON: I'll make a motion to put  
39 it on the table.

40

41 MR. OPHIEM: I'll second.

42

43 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Thank you.  
44 Curt. Seconded by Michael to open for discussion. Go  
45 ahead, Kirk.

46

47 MR. WILSON: Yeah. For the same reasons  
48 that they mentioned on this count, I'm totally against  
49 bringing in any new user groups that's going to let a  
50 whole bunch of people come in here without C&T. Anyone

00080

1 that wants to qualify to hunt, that has C&T, she said  
2 it, all you have to do is go in and sign up and qualify.  
3 So, I'm totally opposed to this.

4

5 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Other  
6 comments? Judy.

7

8 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair, thank you. Just  
9 wondering, Hannah, I probably should have asked before.  
10 Any contact or feedback with the proponents since this  
11 analysis came out or before it came out?

12

13 DR. VOORHEES: Thank you, member  
14 (indiscernible). So, I'm sorry, Caminer. I did speak  
15 with the proponent pretty extensively about his proposal  
16 to clarify his intent. And that's all in the proponent  
17 statement. I have not made contact with him or heard  
18 from him since that time.

19

20 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Go ahead,  
21 Faye.

22

23 MS. EWAN: Faye Ewan, Kluti Kaah.  
24 Traditionally and customary, that was our main staple  
25 food for the Ahtna region until the territorial  
26 government came in and closed it down to our people. If  
27 we could have -- if we could sheep hunt right now like  
28 we used to we would be eating sheep instead of caribou  
29 and moose because that was our main staple. Due to the  
30 government level -- law, they changed that to among our  
31 people. So now you have to have a drawing hunt to go out  
32 there and hunt sheep. And I don't think our people have  
33 eaten sheep in the last 50 years. And it's really sad  
34 because that is our main staple. We make spoons out of  
35 the horns, we make -- we use it for different ways to -  
36 - for tools. The horns, and the sheep skin was very part  
37 of our traditional regalia. And Kenny Lake was a  
38 traditional village. So, Chitina is still a traditional  
39 village, and I would recognize those traditional and  
40 traditional village people who are federally recognized  
41 people to hunt or if they have permits and everything  
42 like the state does. But as far as opening it up for  
43 hunt like moose and stuff, I don't know. I don't know  
44 about the -- I didn't see no data on here. But the  
45 populations are the sustainable, you know, what will  
46 happen to them? Who's going to take them out to the  
47 mountains? The guides? You know, to me, it looks like  
48 it's hard to get up to the mountains unless you have a  
49 guide or plane and stuff. And it's for us Native people.  
50 That's why we're not up there hunting. If we had an open

00081

1 season, you bet we'll be sending our hunters up there  
2 now. Thank you.

3

4 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Thank you.  
5 We'll come down the mountain. But go ahead, Judy.

6

7 MS. CAMINER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So,  
8 for this customary and traditional use determination  
9 appears there's not adequate evidence to show that  
10 Chitina and Kenny Lake use the sheep in Unit 12. So, I  
11 would be voting against the motion.

12

13 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Thank you,  
14 Judy. Any other comments before we vote?

15

16 UNIDENTIFIED: Question.

17

18 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Question has  
19 been called. All in favor of the proposal signify by  
20 saying aye.

21

22 UNIDENTIFIED: Aye.

23

24 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair, so just to  
25 clarify the proposals actually to give the C&T and we've  
26 not seen -- I'm not seeing the evidence for that. So  
27 I'll be voting no.

28

29 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. I'll take  
30 that vote again. And all those in favor signify by saying  
31 aye. That would be giving them the C&T. Any ayes?

32

33 (No response)

34

35 All in favor of no C&T signify by saying  
36 aye, same sign. Same sign.

37

38 IN UNSION: Aye.

39

40 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. It fails  
41 for customary and traditional use. Okay. I gotta [sic]  
42 check with the Coordinator here. We got a couple things  
43 I need to make sure we cover.

44

45 (Pause)

46

47 Okay. Before we take a break or  
48 something for lunch, we're going to have -- we're going  
49 to lose some people. I think we're going to have a  
50 quorum. Unfortunately, I have to go too in about an hour

1 or so, but Judy's very capable of finishing. We got all  
2 the reports and stuff. We do have to approve our calendar  
3 for next year, so if we could do that now while we got  
4 everyone before people -- you -- and Nissa will take  
5 over the calendar.

6  
7 MS. PILCHER: Okay. If everyone -- the  
8 calendars. Of course. I should have been ready. Thank  
9 you. So, the Winter 2026 meeting dates is found on page  
10 255 of your meeting book. That's the black comb bound  
11 one. Currently you're scheduled for March 17th and 18th  
12 in Anchorage. So far that calendar is current, other  
13 than Bristol Bay did move their meeting. I'm not sure  
14 when it was, but it will now be on March 9th through  
15 10th, which we'll deal with if you guys do need to move  
16 those dates, just be aware that that's. Two months away  
17 at this point so can every -- does the 17th and 18th  
18 work for those and meeting in Anchorage? Dennis.

19  
20 MR. ZADRA: Yeah, I just wanted to  
21 comment that the statewide Board of Fish, also starts  
22 on March 17th, and then the statewide Board of Game for  
23 our area starts on March 20th, and I need to participate  
24 in both of those. So, I don't know if I can do all three.

25  
26 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: How about the  
27 rest of you? You got conflicts? Or can you make that  
28 17th-18th? We got a pretty tight window, Dennis on that  
29 calendar, so I don't know. We could do much, but yeah.  
30 Okay, well, appreciate it. Yeah. We'll make it work.  
31 We'll send you there for a little bit and bring you back  
32 here for the important stuff. Yeah. Okay. Okay. From  
33 what I see now, I think we'll stick with the 17th-18th  
34 since I mean, if it wouldn't probably help to move it a  
35 day up, but it looks like there's a little leeway there.  
36 Yeah, they don't want to do that. Okay, 17th-18th. What's  
37 the next date?

38  
39 MS. PILCHER: So, on the next page -- oh.

40  
41 MS. TOTEMOFF: I mean, would it hurt to  
42 consider the 16th and the 17th? Sundays are good for  
43 traveling.

44  
45 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: It means you got  
46 to come up Sunday, a day early.

47  
48 UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah, I can get out of  
49 Seldovia, but I've already got a bunch of other things  
50 on my calendar that for March is going to be super busy,

00083

1 and I've been working around that 17 to 18 calendar, so.

2

3 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Angela's  
4 going to give you some grace, stick here. Anyway, okay.  
5 17th-18th, looks like we're going to stick with that.  
6 Okay. That's by unanimous consent, correct? Okay. Thank  
7 you.

8

9 MS. PILCHER: All right. And then the  
10 Fall 2026 meeting date is currently scheduled for  
11 October 14th and 15th. And that is also in Anchorage.

12

13 MS. ROBERTS: I'm committed to something  
14 else. Two other things, actually.

15

16 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes, so am I. The  
17 earlier the better for me in October.

18

19 (Pause)

20

21 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Rather than --  
22 for the 14th-15th. So, what do we want to try and move  
23 to we got a little bit. I see we got Columbus Day or  
24 Indigenous People Day, October 12th. You got the 16th.  
25 You got the 13th. So, Hope your calendar is plugged up  
26 there?

27

28 MS. ROBERTS: From the 12th to the 15th,  
29 probably all the way through AFN. I think I have to go  
30 to that too.

31

32 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Yeah.

33

34 MR. OPHIEM: Yeah. Any chance of  
35 September 29th and 30th?

36

37 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: 8th and 9th of  
38 October?

39

40 MS. PILCHER: I would not be able to do  
41 that because I -- Western Interior RAC my other Council.  
42 And they've selected their October 6th and 7th.

43

44 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: How come all  
45 these guys selected before we did?

46

47 MS. PILCHER: That's one benefit of going  
48 early.

49

50

00084

1                   CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: I guess I  
2 shouldn't ask that. Some people hunt through the 30th, but  
3 I don't know. I'm going to shoot mine before the 25th, so.

4  
5                   MR. ZADRA: Yeah, I couldn't make it in  
6 September. No.

7  
8                   CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Yeah. September  
9 is pretty booked up for hunters, you know, but. Yes.

10  
11                   MS. TOTEMOFF: What about the 6th and the  
12 7th of October?

13  
14                   MS. CAMINER: That's a conflict for  
15 Nissa.

16  
17                   CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Yeah, she's got  
18 the -- it's on page 256, but she's got -- she's going  
19 to be in Aniak.

20  
21                   MS. PILCHER: And guys one -- through the  
22 Chair. Just as one double check. Just also keep in mind  
23 that our transcriptions or our recording service really  
24 can only do two a week. So, if there's already two  
25 Council meetings there, it'd be best if you don't choose  
26 that week. There's a possibility that they can, but I  
27 would suggest if you do have a selection for a week that  
28 already has two meetings scheduled, that you also choose  
29 a backup set of dates in case they are unable to  
30 accommodate that.

31  
32                   (Pause)

33  
34                   CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Yeah. We have  
35 the current week 14th-15th. We can move it up or down  
36 to the 13th and 16th. Which one way day or if we can.  
37 So, Angela can't make that. But we're kind of stuck. We  
38 have the week before, but it has two, the week before  
39 that has two. And then you're all the way up to September  
40 22nd. People in the -- really chasing moose then.

41  
42                   MS. PILCHER: And if one -- thing that  
43 could be done is especially if it's -- so on the week  
44 of September 21st and the week of September 28th at  
45 least the week of September 28th, those meetings are at  
46 the end of the week. So, if you did -- like if that was  
47 the best week, you could ask for the 28th and 29th,  
48 especially if you guys are in Anchorage. I don't know  
49 if we can accommodate that, but that can certainly be  
50 seen. And then we can go with your second date, but.

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

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: What's going on  
29th and 30th?

MS. PILCHER: Yeah. Well, it wouldn't  
we'd, we'd have to do it Monday and Tuesday to allow a  
day between the next set of meetings because they have  
equipment they've got to get from point A to point B.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: September 28th,  
29th? Now we're talking okay, 28-29th September before  
it changes. Thank you.

MS. PILCHER: Okay, but.....

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: No buts.

MS. PILCHER: Nope. That was with the  
caveat of I don't know if we can accommodate that or  
not. So, if you did choose something where there was  
already two meetings, you were going to need to choose  
a secondary set of dates in case that can't be  
accommodated. So, we could go with 28th and 29th as your  
first choice. And then either stick with the old meeting  
dates and just be aware that we may have not as much  
representation as we'd like.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay.

MS. PILCHER: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay, that  
sounds good.

MS. CAMINER: We can confirm.

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Some of this may  
not be here anyway, so. This thing have appointments?

MS. CAMINER: Yes.

(Pause)

CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Just to feel you  
guys out for the annual report. Nissa is going to give  
a summary on how long you think that would take, and you  
want to try and do that now?

MS. PILCHER: I can do that now. The  
summaries for last. It's for the annual report reply.

1 So, it's not an action item. The action item is you, the  
2 Council generating the 2025 Annual Report, which tends  
3 to be a longer conversation. But I can certainly do the  
4 summary of last year's.

5  
6 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Well, I'm fine  
7 with whatever you guys come up with, and I'll probably  
8 be leaving around an hour or so. But Judy will still be  
9 here. I guess there's a lot of reports that got to go  
10 on yet, and so on and so forth, but. And who else is  
11 leaving? Angela, you're leaving. Does anyone else got  
12 to go? Someone told me on the RAC they got to go. That's  
13 it?

14  
15 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair.

16  
17 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Yeah.

18  
19 MS. CAMINER: Perhaps. Nissa, could you  
20 just point us in the book where the reply is for our  
21 annual report and.....

22  
23 MS. PILCHER: Absolutely. So, it is in  
24 the supplemental materials book. So that is what most  
25 people have, that red folder if you got it in advance,  
26 and that's on page 51. Some people have the ring bound  
27 one. And so just to let you guys know last year, we  
28 asked that you separate -- which you guys already did  
29 anyway, ask that you separate it into specific requests  
30 for information or action by the Board and then also  
31 informational. From last year, you had two topics which  
32 you requested action or some form of action by the Board.  
33 And that was reevaluation of the criteria for the  
34 Fisheries Resource Monitoring program to better reflect  
35 the Council's concerns. As member McLaughlin pointed out  
36 there's a lot of subsistence activities that happens in  
37 Prince William Sound and other marine bodies as well as  
38 the current program FRMP does not -- is not able to deal  
39 with contaminants. And number two, review of the effects  
40 of the Chitina Subdistrict Personal Use Fishery on  
41 subsistence fishing opportunities and chinook and  
42 sockeye salmon returns.

43  
44 And then there were four topics that  
45 were just informational to the Board. Concern over  
46 difficulty in navigating the process to acquire  
47 ceremonial harvest permits for shrimp used at potlatches  
48 in Prince William Sound. That's -- the potlatch, that's  
49 a Alaska Department of Fish and Game process. Concern  
50 over chinook salmon and need for information on the

1 listing process under the Endangered Species Act.  
2 Concern over the effects of changing environmental  
3 conditions such as PSP and ocean acidification. That is  
4 generally a topic that you guys put on most annual  
5 reports going forward. And then to rounded out the  
6 alarming depletion of Southcentral region's subsistence  
7 resource. So, as you've got it in front of you, that's  
8 just a quick summation. If anybody has any questions.  
9 But that's -- that of course, that's last year's report.  
10 And that was the reply to it that is in your book. So,  
11 what we'll do moving forward is drafting a new annual  
12 report. Thank you.

13  
14 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Anybody got any  
15 items for the new annual report? You guys could think  
16 about it. Come up at the day goes on. Scotts got one. I  
17 got one myself too. But I don't know if it's an annual  
18 report thing, but it's a request of meetings. Scott,  
19 I'll let you go. Go ahead.

20  
21 MR. AYERS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just  
22 wanted to get up real quick before you started in on  
23 your new annual report topics and let you know that we  
24 at OSM have been diligently working to improve the  
25 process. We've heard from the Councils, we've heard from  
26 the Board that there's some challenges to this, and  
27 sometimes the Councils aren't getting information that  
28 they want and or don't know fully what's happening with  
29 the data. That's the comments and the concerns that are  
30 being sent to the Board. So we are to the extent that  
31 we can trying to streamline that process and clarify  
32 things we're looking to ensure that the information that  
33 the Councils are providing does end up in the analyses,  
34 along with other information, because you all are the  
35 source of so much of the data that we have to use for  
36 things. So, I just wanted to let you know that we're  
37 still trying to tighten things up and hopefully continue  
38 to make this process better. Thank you.

39  
40 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: One thing on the  
41 topic, Scott as we go through here, you know, I think  
42 all of us, you know, it just kind of gets you cold for  
43 what we're going to bring up. So, I guess we should have  
44 known it was coming up. It's on the agenda. But we  
45 obviously -- we've discussed a lot of things and, and  
46 we've you know, even we've had tribal Council talk about  
47 the concerns. So, in my book, there are some of those  
48 could be drafted for annual report things. The one thing  
49 that I want to say, I don't know, Krystal took off, but  
50 I was going to say, you know, with the these meetings,

1 like, especially today quite frankly, I mean, I figured  
2 we'd be done by noon today, but kind of missed the boat  
3 on that one. But that's because we had all this public  
4 testimony of the other concerns that possibly could be  
5 vetted. So, it took up about a half a day or 3 or 4  
6 hours. But something like that, it seems to me, could  
7 be done in a work session for the for the Council or  
8 something that, you know, prior to the meeting. But  
9 anyway, maybe because it'd be on the zoom or something.  
10 I don't know that may -- I've Chaired meetings on zoom,  
11 so that could be a goat rope too. So, let's clarify  
12 that. One thing is the consideration of the length. In  
13 the past, I know if we've had a lot of things on the  
14 agenda, we scheduled three days or whatever, and that's  
15 we can't just do that at the drop of the hat because of  
16 your funding and coordination and all that stuff. But  
17 just something to consider. Times for the Councils to  
18 adequately evaluate their process.

19  
20 MR. AYERS: Duly noted, sir. Thank you  
21 very much. I will say there's been a lot of things thrown  
22 at all of us recently related to these meetings and  
23 particularly for this fall cycle, which we're now doing  
24 in January of '26. But this has been a very heavy load  
25 on the agenda for this Council, for this meeting. And  
26 clearly, we're trying to get through things, as you are  
27 as quickly as possible. But an extra day would have been  
28 nice.

29  
30 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Well.  
31 Thank you. Yeah, I understand that. And, you know, the  
32 shutdown didn't help anyone, so it put us all behind.  
33 But anyway, thank you much. And so, Judy, go ahead.

34  
35 MS. CAMINER: Two things, I guess I  
36 brought them up before with regard to the Secretarial  
37 Review, but it could go on our annual report, I believe,  
38 and that would be to look at. I know money is probably  
39 non-existent but at least put forward the idea of a  
40 Wildlife Monitoring Program. Many of our proposals said  
41 we need more monitoring done. And secondly bringing up  
42 the concept of, you know, no more staff cuts to any of  
43 the agencies working on subsistence issues and  
44 especially OSM as well.

45  
46 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: And staff cuts  
47 needs to be addressed in the annual report. Also, this  
48 public scoping process needs to be addressed, probably,  
49 but I'm not sure how we address it.

50

1 MS. PILCHER: Well, you do have -- the  
2 Council will be submitting comments to the Office of the  
3 Secretary on the comments. Yeah. So, all of that will  
4 be forwarded. I mean, I'm not saying that you can't put  
5 it in your annual report, but hopefully the Board is  
6 very well aware of that process.

7  
8 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Good  
9 enough. We're not going to sit here dreaming up  
10 something, so we'll just keep moving on. But we'll as  
11 you get it later this day if you're going to be here for  
12 a while, I think Judy's going to -- I don't know if you  
13 want to take a break for lunch or you want to come back.  
14 Probably, and so. Lose everybody. Wait a minute. Nissa  
15 got something.

16  
17 MS. PILCHER: I was just going to  
18 mention, if you guys want to think about this potential  
19 topics that could be added to the report at lunch. That  
20 would be great. You certainly don't need to make a 15-  
21 page annual report. It could be two. It's up to you. But  
22 if anybody wants anything, think about it during the  
23 break. Thanks.

24  
25 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Well if I'm  
26 going to be gone after lunch, if you don't see me, I'm  
27 going to make my comments now to the Board, because we  
28 go through and we make them all and you know, it's a  
29 very good meeting on a lot of topics, and we're kind of  
30 jammed up, but I think it's good. It's always a learning  
31 curve. It's good to see everyone here and the support,  
32 especially a lot of the younger people getting involved.  
33 And it's really cool we're able to really diversify and  
34 understand what we're trying to support. And I think the  
35 process is one of the best processes to get subsistence  
36 rights. We know it from Ninilchik for sure, and I see  
37 it working. And so, we just need to continue the fight.  
38 I'm getting a little long in the tooth, but that don't  
39 matter. I guess I can't get out of here for a while. But  
40 anyway. So, I appreciate everything. And go ahead.  
41 Angela.

42  
43 MS. TOTEMOFF: Just in the spirit of  
44 submitting my closing comments as well. I've been  
45 staring at these pictures, and it's really putting me  
46 in the correct mind space and the head space to talk  
47 about these issues. So, if you guys are feeling a little  
48 overwhelmed by the paperwork definitely just take a look  
49 at these photos. And then also, I just want to say thank  
50 you to Nissa and the whole team for preparing this. And

00090

1 thank you, Greg, for your leadership and working through  
2 this process. It's -- I really appreciate the tight ship  
3 that you're running.

4  
5 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Well, I  
6 appreciate that. Thank you. Some people get agitated,  
7 but that's okay. Anyway, anyone got a question for me?  
8 I do want Todd to really quick just say if you want  
9 something while I'm here on the Kenai Peninsula, we --  
10 yeah. If you could just real quick. I know I'm holding  
11 people up, but that would be -- that'd be good. That's  
12 okay.

13  
14 MR. ESKELIN: Okay. Todd Eskelin, Kenai  
15 National Wildlife Refuge. And I was going to be  
16 disappointed that you're going to miss hearing about  
17 Kenai subsistence moose. So, I'm glad we can run through  
18 this real quick. I think -- Oh, there. It's coming  
19 around. I'll wait for half a minute and.

20  
21 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Nissa, you skip  
22 both of us.

23  
24 MR. ESKELIN: I'm proud of you for  
25 getting your moose. It's a -- you know, moose on the  
26 Kenai is an every other year thing. Yeah.

27  
28 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Yeah. And that  
29 was -- if anyone wants to see a picture. It was four  
30 brow tines, 54 inches or something. That's kind of a  
31 little bit unusual, but.

32  
33 MR. ESKELIN: Happy for you.

34  
35 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: But I eat the  
36 meat. I eat the meat, I eat everything. Innards, outers.

37  
38 MR. ESKELIN: Okay. 2025. As Greg knows  
39 we have a cow harvest on the Kenai refuge Unit 15C. We  
40 typically, based on where we're at now and the population  
41 cycle of moose on the Kenai we set, you know, at least  
42 internally, a harvest cap of 8 cows. Beyond that, we  
43 feel like we're going to start impinging on that  
44 population. And so, we've never even come close to that.  
45 I think one year we hit three. And so, we stopped doing  
46 the special action before season setting it, we said,  
47 wow, we're never getting close to that. And then this  
48 year I think we had 5 in the first week and I was like,  
49 oh no, here we go. So that was Greg's comments on  
50 reaching out to him early and preparing for a potential

1 closure of the cow season. And we had everything in  
2 place and ready, and we hit 8 with two days left in the  
3 season. So there wasn't any point in closing it at that  
4 point. I have no idea whether that is going to be a  
5 regular mainstay. I've looked through, you know, what  
6 precipitated that increased cow harvest. And it was a  
7 handful of new people that went straight out and shot a  
8 cow, and it was a handful of old people that every five  
9 years get a cow. And everybody, all lined up and got at  
10 the same time. It could also be an indication from --  
11 most of the hunters have always told me in the past in  
12 15C that they would have got a -- they would have taken  
13 a calf, they saw one, and they never saw a cow out on  
14 the refuge without calves. So, this could be an  
15 indication that we're seeing the crest of that 15C moose  
16 numbers being so high and they could be starting to go  
17 down a little bit and health is going down. But that's  
18 all complete speculation. Yeah. No, don't know. But we  
19 did have 8 cows. And you can see that kind of bumped our  
20 total up to 26. That was, you know, higher than we've  
21 had in recent years. And you can read those numbers.

22  
23                   The other thing that Greg always wants  
24 me to point out is how many of those moose would not be  
25 legal under state hunting regs. And this year we had 22  
26 out of 26. We're only legal under the subsistence hunting  
27 regs. Be that by the increased dates or the increase of  
28 forks. I think it's -- that's 85%. For the early season,  
29 that was two forks and then of course, the early portion  
30 of that season set from the state. The late season, all  
31 ten out of ten are obviously by date. And then three out  
32 of the ten were only subsistence qualifying antler  
33 restriction opportunities. So, yeah, 8 out of 10 or --  
34 no, 22 out of 26. Definitely supports the idea that  
35 these harvest regulations and seasons are supporting  
36 subsistence beyond what the state seasons provide them.  
37 And with that, I won't read this to you. You can all  
38 read, and you can ask me any questions you got.

39  
40                   CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Well, just a  
41 comment. That's definitely a good indicator of  
42 subsistence priority. So, I think it's worth working.  
43 So that's great. Questions for Todd while he's given his  
44 report. And you guys are getting hungry. And I saw Donald  
45 Mike coming in maybe he came to buy me lunch? Yeah.  
46 Hello, Donald. Anyway Krystal, I was talking about  
47 Krystal, too, but anyway, I'll go ahead.

48  
49                   MS. CAMINER: I just want to thank Todd  
50 for, you know, being here for putting together these

1 great statistics, and for working well and coordinating  
2 with everybody you're supposed to. It's really  
3 gratifying. And it should be for everybody here that the  
4 Council and the Board has provided a meaningful  
5 subsistence priority. That was the deal with the courts.

6

7 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay. Very  
8 good. And we'll work with you on the sheep curls later  
9 on.

10

11 MR. ESKELIN: Yeah. There was no need to  
12 complicate that. It may not ever come to fruition. And  
13 it just means we go through the regular special action  
14 process.

15

16 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Okay.

17

18 MR. ESKELIN: Not a big deal.

19

20 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Hanna, it's  
21 good to see you, too. You're leaving, that looks like.  
22 So, I gotta [sic] catch you. Thank you. Hannah Gordon  
23 wrote a published document for Ninilchik that I would  
24 encourage you to read if you get it. And it's really  
25 quite well. Thank you. I said enough, does anyone got  
26 any questions for me before I leave? I appreciate being  
27 excused a little early. I think the reports are  
28 critically important. So, if you could take some time,  
29 another hour or so, this afternoon, Judy should be able  
30 to wrap it up in 45 minutes. I would think so. I'll  
31 check back on her, but don't let her keep you at any  
32 later than 3:30. Anyway.

33

34 MS. CAMINER: What time to come back  
35 here?

36

37 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: Your call. It's  
38 one 1:00 now. You got to give them an hour. So, you got  
39 two back, that good? Can everyone make it back by two?  
40 Sounds good. Yeah, it's not long enough.

41

42 MS. CAMINER: 2:15.

43

44 CHAIRPERSON ENCEWLESKI: 2:15. Yep.  
45 2:15. And good to see you. I'll see you next time, I  
46 guess. 2:15, all right.

47

48 (Off record)

49

50 (On record)

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

MS. PILCHER: Hello, everyone. This is Nissa Pilcher, Council Coordinator for the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council. It is 2:17. We are now two minutes late getting back from lunch, but we are getting ready to get going, so just letting everybody know that's online. Thanks.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Good afternoon. Southcentral Regional Advisory Council is back in session. And we still have quite a few topics to cover. Nissa is going to remind us where we're starting because we did jump around in the agenda quite a bit, but we'll catch up.

MS. PILCHER: All right. So, the plan was when we start, we do have one more one more official action item, and it's to draft your FY2025 Annual Report. Scott, were you done giving what you needed to give for the annual report? Okay, so he is good to go. So, you guys well, not you, the Council specifically. Greg did lay out a couple topics. So, one was being cognizant of Council time and additional topics that could potentially take up a lot of the Council's time maybe do in a work session or another form, creation of the wildlife resource management program with the justification that as Judy noted, there are many data gaps in the analysis that you guys are given. No more staff cuts to any agencies that deal with subsistence and as well as OSM. And then those were the topics that were outlined before we went to lunch. One topic that you guys' generally do have on there is the ocean acidification topic. We can continue that if the Council so desires.

UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah, the ocean acidification, PSP, harmful algal blooms. That would be great. Invasive species like elodea in streams and things like that. Yeah, that's just things that are going to affect our harvests, potentially.

MS. PILCHER: And I should note that I believe it was last year or the year before we started doing it, where the annual report that is drafted at the fall meeting is then -- it's approved at the winter meeting. Years past you were allowed to add additional topics at the winter meeting. And last year, the year before we changed that. So, you can certainly edit what is written, but no new topics can be added. So I just wanted to remind everybody of that as well. Not to

00094

1 mention you guys are meeting not that long away from  
2 right now, and I still have to write.

3

4 ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: I guess one  
5 perennial topic which usually gets denied has to do with  
6 compensation. But we may want to bring that up again.  
7 Andy, you got a comment?

8

9 MR. MCLAUGHLING: Yeah, I agree with you  
10 on that. But I was thinking concern about the open seas  
11 trawl fishery and its effects on the subsistence  
12 resources of, like, uncountable species that are tied  
13 into the food web and the food chain of the ocean floor.

14

15 MS. PILCHER: And that is t, r, a, w, l.

16

17 ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Any other  
18 ideas on the annual report? We will be able to review  
19 it next time, but as Nissa said, not add to it.

20

21 (No response)

22

23 Can we have a motion to approve the list  
24 as Nissa just recently read it and we added to it?

25

26 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah. Sorry, not a  
27 motion, but have we -- did we address climate change  
28 issues in this report? This -- like extending the  
29 importance of being open to extending seasons and being  
30 able to adapt to things that are going on in multiple  
31 region -- in our region, but many places for many  
32 different things.

33

34 MS. PILCHER: Through the Chair. A  
35 Council that I coordinate has certainly done that. I'm  
36 not positive it's yours, but I certainly understand  
37 where you're going with that.

38

39 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, I would like that  
40 included, I think.

41

42 ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Good point.  
43 Any other thoughts or topics or someone ready to make a  
44 motion to put forward the list that we've compiled?

45

46 MR. WILSON: Yeah. I might have one more  
47 topic. I don't know if we can address it even, but our  
48 country is being tore up by these people. The land, I  
49 mean, they're out there with these vehicles tearing  
50 up the country. I mean, I don't know if our Board can

1 address that or not, but it's certainly a concern.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: I guess some areas there -- some federal areas, yeah, ORV's are allowed. But not all areas, and so I think that have to be a we could list it as a concern, I guess, but it would be a case by case basis or proposal if you really want to change it in an existing proposal.

MR. WILSON: Well, one of the problems, not only with this, but other issues that we have going on when we do change things in a certain area, particularly 13B up there where there's no signage, there's no monitoring by anybody. So how would we know if they're tearing up the country? Because there's no one there to monitor it. And they definitely are.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Thank you, Kirk. Any other comments thoughts?

MR. OPHEIM: I'll make the motion that we move forward with the list that we've created for Nesa to start our draft letter for the winter meeting.

MR. HOLSTEN: Second.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Okay. Motion by Michael and seconded by Ed. Any other discussion on it?

(No response)

All those in favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Any opposed, same sign.

(No response)

Sounds like we're unanimous on that one, but thanks for making a collaborative list, everybody. I think we always -- we come up with better ideas when we all participate in that. So, thank you.

MS. PILCHER: And this is if I could add one thing, Chair. I just did want to double -- or verify with everyone that there are still nine Council members in the room. So, we certainly have quorum, even though

1 we did lose a member Totemoff and Greg, Chair Encelewski.  
2 Thank you.

3  
4 So, the next two things on the agenda  
5 item, they are listed under action items, but they are  
6 certainly not necessarily action items. So, the first  
7 one is review relevant Alaska Board of Fisheries and  
8 Board of Game proposals. That's not something -- if  
9 someone has a proposal they'd like to bring to the floor  
10 to have the Council discuss, that is totally fine. What  
11 I normally tell this Council when we get here is many  
12 of you are on your local advisory committees. And that's  
13 generally how comments get to the Board. This Council  
14 doesn't normally take much action on those. You're more  
15 than welcome. If you'd like to, we can go ahead and do  
16 that.

17  
18 ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Anyone have  
19 any comments on the relevant Alaska Board of Fisheries  
20 or Game proposals?

21  
22 (No response)

23  
24 If not, we can just move on and thinking  
25 about any of us putting in for Alaska Board of Fisheries  
26 or Board of Game proposals, and we're probably best off  
27 discussing that in March to be timely. But just a heads  
28 up on that. With that, we have Kevin here. We've been  
29 waiting to hear from you. Fisheries Resource Monitoring  
30 Program, and Partners. So if you'll fill us in on the  
31 general overview, that would be very helpful.

32  
33 MR. FOLEY: Thank you, Chair Caminer.  
34 Good afternoon, members of the Council. My name is Kevin  
35 Foley. I'm a fisheries biologist with OSM. And I'd like  
36 to share a brief overview of our Fisheries Resource  
37 Monitoring Program with you, and a little bit about the  
38 funding process. And after describing the funding  
39 process, we will request your comments on the projects  
40 submitted for the Southcentral region. So once again,  
41 this is not an action item, but your comments are an  
42 important part of this process. Monitoring Program  
43 materials start on page 259 of your Council books.

44  
45 The goal of the monitoring program is  
46 to fund research on federal subsistence fisheries, to  
47 enhance management, and to work with rural Alaskans to  
48 sustain these fisheries. The Monitoring Program funding  
49 process starts with Councils identifying information  
50 gaps and developing priority information needs for each

1 of the regions listed on page 259. Volunteers from this  
2 Council met during the fall of 2024 and created a list  
3 of priority information needs for the Southcentral  
4 region, and you may find that list on page 268. We then  
5 took this list and requested projects that addressed  
6 these priorities. Investigators then submitted project  
7 proposals to the Office of Subsistence Management. And  
8 for the Southcentral region, three proposals were  
9 submitted for funding, and these proposals are listed  
10 in the table on the bottom of page 268. Those proposals  
11 are currently going through the review process now.  
12

13           The first step in the review process is  
14 for the Technical Review Committee to assess the  
15 projects. And the Technical Review Committee is a panel  
16 of expert scientists that review the proposals based on  
17 the following five criteria: strategic priority;  
18 technical, scientific merit; investigator ability and  
19 resources; partnership and capacity building; and cost  
20 benefit. The Technical Review Committee writes  
21 justifications that summarize what they thought of the  
22 projects, and these justifications can be found in your  
23 Council books at the end of each of the project's  
24 executive summary. After the Technical Review Committee  
25 review, OSM collects the Council comments on the  
26 projects. And that's what we're here to do today. Your  
27 comments and the Technical Review Committee's  
28 justifications are combined and presented to the  
29 Interagency Staff Committee or the ISC. And the ISC, who  
30 are Federal Subsistence Board staff, also provide  
31 comments on the projects.  
32

33           The Federal Subsistence Board will meet  
34 early next month during their February 5th work session  
35 meeting. The Board will be presented with all of the  
36 information from the Technical Review committee,  
37 Councils, and the ISC, and at their recommendation on  
38 what projects to fund. The final selection of projects  
39 will be determined by the Director of OSM. Based on all  
40 of the feedback we've received and how much money is  
41 available as allocated by Congress, OSM funds as many  
42 projects as possible based on our budget. Funded  
43 projects will start in the spring of 2026. And this  
44 whole process happens every two years, and projects may  
45 be funded for a period of up to four years. Again, this  
46 is not an action item, but your comments are an important  
47 part of the funding process. We are requesting the  
48 Council's thoughts and comments about the proposed  
49 projects in the Southcentral region that are listed on  
50 page 268. OSM would appreciate hearing if the Council

1 has any specific concerns or comments about the proposed  
2 projects. To that end, if the Council wishes, we can go  
3 through each project and provide a brief summary or the  
4 Council can work through and comment on the projects  
5 listed on page 268. Madam Chair, how would the Council  
6 like to proceed?

7

8 ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Council.  
9 Any comments on that? Faye.

10

11 MS. EWAN: Faye Ewan, Kluti Kaah. I  
12 support this project because it's really important to  
13 me, because the state of Alaska does not have accurate  
14 numbers and their data and the way I live off the land  
15 up there in Copper River. We really do need to start  
16 monitoring what -- where the fish is going. From Chitina  
17 to Copper Center, they say there's 180,000 fish there  
18 when they get to Copper Center maybe we're lucky we get  
19 10 or 15 fish. And as it further goes up to Chistochina,  
20 did going to get nothing. So, I would recommend -- I  
21 would say this would be the best thing to help our --  
22 help the fishing industry, to know where our data is  
23 going and what's going on. This is very important to me.  
24 Thank you.

25

26 ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Thank you,  
27 Faye. Kirk.

28

29 MR. WILSON: Yeah. This Klutina River  
30 monitoring. Klutina River is one of the most important  
31 rivers in our system. It has more red salmon than any  
32 other river in the Copper system. And to -- it's -- it  
33 comes off a Klutina Lake, which is a glacier lake. It's  
34 a glacier river where you can't see in very well. I  
35 mean, it's kind of clear, and sometimes you can when the  
36 water's just right, you can see in it, but it holds the  
37 majority of our red salmon going up the Copper River.  
38 And no one knows the numbers there yet. I mean, it's  
39 very important, I think this study particularly. I don't  
40 know about the other two so much, but this one, I know  
41 a lot. I've spent a lot of my time on the Klutina River,  
42 and it is a very valuable resource to our valley.

43

44 ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Thank you,  
45 Kirk. Just to clarify, Kevin. These are all continuing  
46 studies, aren't they? I mean, we've been studying these  
47 areas, some of them for very long and the Klutina maybe  
48 for a year or two?

49

50

1 MR. FOLEY: That's a good question. I  
2 don't have that information in front of me to suggest  
3 how long these or how many of these projects are up for  
4 funding after the previous cycle that would have been  
5 funded. I do know that in -- yeah, I'll full stop there.

6  
7 ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Sorry, this  
8 is Judy. From my memory, which is probably getting worse,  
9 but Tanada Creek has been studied pretty much since the  
10 beginning of the program, which forms a terrific basis  
11 for knowing what's going on. And I think the Copper  
12 River and Klutina -- Klutina is newer, but I thought  
13 we've been doing it before, so I'd certainly support  
14 continuing all of them. Kirk.

15  
16 MR. WILSON: Yeah. On the Klutina Lake,  
17 I've been involved with a lot of the people that have  
18 done the studies up there and stuff. And I'm telling  
19 you, I don't believe that we have accurate enough  
20 material to really give it a good scientific guess.

21  
22 ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Thanks. And  
23 so, you would support continuing the Klutina River  
24 study?

25  
26 MR. WILSON: I certainly would.

27  
28 ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Okay. Thank  
29 you.

30  
31 MR. WILSON: And if there's others that  
32 are trying to study on the Klutina, and I don't know if  
33 everybody can work together on this thing, but it is.  
34 It's important.

35  
36 ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Thank you.  
37 Did AITRC have a comment?

38  
39 MR. GORZE: For the record, my name is  
40 Dan Gorze. I'm the Fisheries Biologist with AITRC. I'm  
41 the PI on both Klutina and Tanada Creek salmon weir. If  
42 you have any questions, I can answer them.

43  
44 ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: So, Dan, is  
45 this the second, at least the second year of the study?

46  
47 MR. GORZE: Yeah, we started scouting for  
48 a site location in 2021 with FRMP funds, and then  
49 established the sonar on the North Bank on 2022 and  
50 2023. And we haven't had funding since.

000100

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Okay.  
Thanks very much.

MS. EWAN: Hey, Dan.

MR. GORZE: Hey, Faye.

MS. EWAN: During this high water and you know, in that counter, you guys did your sonar counter, it worked. And it still counted the fish on this other side of the state sonar, did the numbers match?

MR. GORZE: I don't.....

(Simultaneous speech)

MS. EWAN: Did the state sonar on the other side counted, and what your monitor, did they match the numbers that went by, or is it different?

MR. GORZE: So we had AITRC, and NVE were partnered and we had a single ARIS sonar unit, adaptive resolution sonar imaging unit on the North Bank. That was it. So we had pretty solid estimates. We have really, really good data on the North Bank. We just -- we don't have a second sonar unit for the South Bank.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Andy.

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah. Thank you, Chair. Was this operating in the summer of -- the sonar operating in the summer of 2025?

MR. GORZE: No, 2022 and 2023.

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Only two years?

MR. GORZE: Yes.

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Okay. And so I see this proposal I'm trying to understand is a four year duration of years on a 268 says it's a four year project.

MR. GORZE: Yes. So we started funding - through the Chair, in 2021. We ran for 2022 and 2023. We ran longer than intended in 2023, and we caught a second like a B run in August. And we kind of depleted our funds. We've been putting back in for FRMP for the following couple of years, and it was -- I don't remember

000101

1 the specifics, but I think maybe Kevin can help me out,  
2 but there was issues with funding. Otherwise, I think  
3 we would have been running continuously.

4

5 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: To your knowledge of --  
6 are your local there? I assume, so was the run in  
7 particular in the Klutina, I saw in the Gulkana a month  
8 late where I could hardly believe there were no fish.  
9 Did that happen in the Klutina as well this past summer?

10

11 MR. GORZE: I couldn't tell you for this  
12 past summer because we didn't have the sonar in there.  
13 I wish we did.

14

15 ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Kirk

16

17 MR. WILSON: Yeah. You're monitoring big  
18 fish, right?

19

20 MR. GORZE: Yeah. We measure every fish  
21 that's over -- I can't remember the threshold 7 and  
22 30mm.

23

24 MR. WILSON: I think this says that  
25 they're going to estimate the spawning escapement on the  
26 major salmon production drainage. So that's not the same  
27 thing, is it?

28

29 MR. GORZE: Through the Chair. That's a  
30 creative title to say that about 45% of sockeye in the  
31 Copper River system go up to Klutina River. And so,  
32 we're calling it the major spawning river of the basin  
33 in the title. And we're also measuring large kings.

34

35 ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: I would  
36 suggest if people want more details about each of the  
37 proposals, it's in here. And we're not being asked to  
38 do an action item, but I think we -- so we don't need a  
39 motion. But I think we could voice our general support  
40 for hopefully continuing these studies. Nissa.

41

42 MS. PILCHER: I did -- Amber gave me  
43 something before she left from the Wrangell-St. Elias  
44 National Park Subsistence Resource Commission to read  
45 into the record. I won't read the full letter, but I'll  
46 read the paragraph that is the most important. So, the  
47 SRC supports proposal 26-501: the Klutina River Sonar  
48 Pilot Project; Proposal 26-502: Abundance and run timing  
49 of Salmon in Tanada Creek; and Proposal 26-504: In river  
50 abundance of Copper River Chinook Salmon. There is

1 concern about fish reaching the upper reaches of the  
2 Copper River. It is important to measure the abundance  
3 of adult salmon, to understand the age of fish coming  
4 back into the river. These projects will provide  
5 important information for copper River management. The  
6 SRC supports all three investigation plans for providing  
7 more data about salmon runs on the Copper River. Thank  
8 you.

9  
10 ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Okay. Any  
11 other discussion on this?

12  
13 MR. WILSON: I'd be in support of this.

14  
15 ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Thank you.  
16 And thank you to those organizations who produced those  
17 proposals for studies, and we'll hope all of them do go  
18 through. I'm sure as always, funding is a consideration.  
19 But out of our hands. Faye.

20  
21 MS. EWAN: Thank you, Ms. Chair. This is  
22 Faye Ewan, to me is conservation. And with the salmon  
23 that comes up there -- that's where the king salmon used  
24 to go. I mean, plenty of king salmon, now it's very low  
25 of salmon coming in there. And it was one of the --  
26 there's a lot of sports fishermen that come into Klutina  
27 now, and they fish out a lot of those kings out of there.  
28 And if we didn't have a monitor system there, the AITRC,  
29 we would have never known how much fish was going there  
30 and what's going on, because the state don't share that  
31 information with us people in Copper River unless we ask  
32 for it. And I never got my data information yet from  
33 last year and I asked for it. I support this 100%.

34  
35 ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Thank you,  
36 Faye. Thanks, Kevin, for your presentation. And go  
37 ahead.

38  
39 MR. FOLEY: Thank you, Madam Chair. So  
40 thank you for your comments. They'll certainly move  
41 forward with these projects as they go through to the  
42 final stage. Next, we have an update for the Partners  
43 for Fisheries Monitoring program and the Office of  
44 Subsistence Management post a notice of funding  
45 opportunity for the Partners Program last spring. And  
46 the Partners Program is a competitive grant for Alaska  
47 Native and rural nonprofit organizations. The intent of  
48 the program is to strengthen Alaska Native and rural  
49 involvement in federal subsistence management by  
50 providing salary funds to organizations so they can hire

1 a professional biologist, social scientist, or an  
2 educator. The grant also provides funds for science and  
3 culture camps and paid student interns. There were a  
4 total of eight applicants for the new funding beginning  
5 in 2026, and this funding lasts for up to four years in  
6 total. The Partners Program Review Panel, made up of  
7 subject matter experts across various interior agencies,  
8 have reviewed the proposals, and the Office of  
9 Subsistence Management Regional Director has approved  
10 funding for three new partners. And the new partners are  
11 the Bristol Bay Native Association, the Native Village  
12 of Eyak and Ahtna Intertribal Resource Commission.  
13 Congratulations to our new partners, several of whom are  
14 in the room and with us here today.

15  
16 The next notice of funding opportunity  
17 will be sometime in the spring of 2027, for funding to  
18 beginning '28. If you would like to learn more about  
19 this program, you may contact Jarred Stone or Liz  
20 Williams by way of email or phone, and their contact  
21 information can be found on the partners web page at  
22 [www.gov/forward/partners](http://www.gov/forward/partners), or if anyone here is  
23 interested, please come see me at any time during this  
24 meeting and I'll make sure you have all the information  
25 needed about the program or its main points of contact.  
26 Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Council, that  
27 concludes my update and presentation to you on the  
28 Partners for Fisheries Monitoring program. Are there any  
29 questions?

30  
31 ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Any  
32 questions for Kevin? I'll just comment that I'm glad to  
33 see that culture camps now are included in the Fisheries  
34 Resource Monitoring Program was not always that way, and  
35 this Council has always been a strong supporter of youth  
36 and culture camps going forward, so it's a nice  
37 enhancement. Okay, with that, we can move on to various  
38 tribal and agency reports. And, and we actually got quite  
39 a few of them done already. So, I'll just say 12A Ahtna,  
40 we already heard from or -- excuse me AITRC. Native  
41 Village of Eyak unfortunately couldn't attend. And  
42 Michael and I were saying we always enjoy hearing from  
43 Matt and others because they do tremendous amount of  
44 work. Okay. But next we have Chugach Regional Resources  
45 Commission Tribal Fish and Wildlife Department update.  
46 Can you shorten your title a little bit, maybe?

47  
48 MR. CARL: Oh, that's right, I'm sorry.  
49 Good afternoon. Members of the Southcentral Regional  
50 Council committee. So I'm Dustin, I'm the -- I'm Dustin

1 Carl. I'm the Tribal Fish and Wildlife Director for the  
2 Chugach Regional Resources Commission. As most of you  
3 are aware, CRRC is a nonprofit, intertribal consortium  
4 in the Chugach Region. We serve seven communities in  
5 Chugach Region; Valdez, Tatitlek, Cordova, Chenega,  
6 Seward, Nanwalek, and Port Graham. And I will just --  
7 want to share with you some -- I just want to show you  
8 the projects we're working on this next year. So, we are  
9 developing a curriculum for subsistence in the Chugach  
10 (indiscernible) for the Chugach School districts and to  
11 be available online for any homeschool from our website.  
12 It'll be approximately 5 to 7 draft lesson plans which  
13 include subsistence practices, regulatory process, and  
14 more information regarding harvest of wild foods. We  
15 have a -- we partnered with the Prince William Sound  
16 Chugach National Forest, with the Forest Service to  
17 conduct subsistence surveys in Cordova, along with the  
18 Native Village of Eyak. And we'll be heading down there  
19 next month to do those household surveys with the Alaska  
20 Department of Fish and Game and Native Village of Eyak.  
21 The last one was conducted in 2014. So it is -- it's  
22 been plenty of time for an update.

23  
24 We also got funded for a project to  
25 develop and manufacture signs that we're going to be  
26 putting up in Cordova, Whittier and Valdez at the harbors  
27 to show three aspects of the Chugach culture to any  
28 visitors in those hubs. One sign will be of subsistence,  
29 the uses of subsistence and what's available that the  
30 Chugach people have historically used. One of the land  
31 ownership map, just to help people from stop -- to help  
32 try to prevent people from stop --- from trespassing on  
33 basically Native land and Native corporation and private  
34 lands. And then another to show some culturally relevant  
35 sites on the map too, that have been used by the Chugach  
36 people and Eyak people.

37  
38 Another project we have, we partnered  
39 with the Forest Service again to we are will be  
40 conducting an aerial survey for the moose in the Kings  
41 Bay. That is supposed to be open for the Chenega and  
42 Tatitlek and other rural residents for the moose hunt  
43 there, but that's been closed. So we're trying to, you  
44 know, put some effort in to open it back up. We have a  
45 -- the Forest Service out of Washington, the Research  
46 Center on Washington is doing a wildlife monitoring  
47 project in the Kenai Peninsula. And we're partnering  
48 them. We will be doing the traditional ecological  
49 knowledge surveys in the Kenai Peninsula for that  
50 project. And so -- and they'll be working with other

000105

1 landowners to set up game cameras along the -- up and  
2 down the Kenai Peninsula for that.

3  
4 We've been also -- we've also been  
5 funded for a tribal youth training program to work with  
6 the seven tribes and train them on fisheries, wildlife  
7 -- fisheries and wildlife data collection and ocean  
8 monitoring data collection, and then some basic  
9 wilderness survival. So that'll be happening over the  
10 next two summers. And then our marine mammal project  
11 focuses on -- we're doing training courses to work with  
12 marine mammal harvesters to do some co-stewardship of  
13 the marine mammals in their regions -- in their  
14 communities, and for our region. So that is my summary  
15 and I'll take any questions you guys have.

16  
17 ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Thanks. Any  
18 questions, comments?

19  
20 (No response)

21  
22 Congratulations on getting that much  
23 funding. That's pretty hard to do.

24  
25 MR. CARL: Thanks.

26  
27 ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Faye.

28  
29 MR. ROBERTS: Thanks, Dustin.

30  
31 MS. EWAN: Thank you for your  
32 presentation, and I wanted to say, you better take care  
33 of that fish down there, because that's what I depend  
34 on. And good job. Thank you.

35  
36 MR. CARL: Thanks.

37  
38 MS. ROBERTS: Yeah. Nice to see you here.  
39 Thanks.

40  
41 MR. CARL: Thanks.

42  
43 ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Very good.  
44 Maybe next time you can bring you know, an illustration  
45 of those signs. Love to see how that comes out.

46  
47 MR. CARL: Yeah. We hired three Native  
48 artists out of Cordova, and they -- yeah, we got most  
49 of the signs done, and we're going to be printing them  
50 soon, so.

1

2 ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Okay. And  
3 you can send me a copy. She can send them to all of us,  
4 too.

5

6

MR. CARL: Okay.

7

8

ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Yeah. Look  
9 forward to it.

10

11

MR. CARL: Thanks.

12

13

ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Thank you.  
14 Okay. We have heard already from Fish and Game yesterday  
15 and we heard from Todd earlier from Fish and Wildlife  
16 Service. National Park Service. I know the written  
17 reports are in our supplemental materials, so I don't  
18 know if anybody else had any other things to add. I did  
19 just want to say with both the retirements or leaving  
20 of Dave Sarafin longtime Fisheries Biologist and Barbara  
21 Cellarius long, long time Anthropologist, a heartfelt  
22 thanks to both of them, because they really serve  
23 subsistence users very well. Made, you know, coming in  
24 for permits as easy as possible and collected some  
25 excellent information. And they'll certainly miss them  
26 but wish them well on their further pursuits now. BLM,  
27 you're patiently waiting. I always feel bad that BLM is  
28 pretty much the last one on the list. Has to sit through  
29 the whole meeting.

30

31

MS. KETRON: Thank you. And for the  
32 record, I'm Caroline Ketron. I'm the Anthropologist and  
33 Subsistence Coordinator for the Bureau of Land  
34 Management in Glennallen. And I don't have too much extra  
35 to share with you all today. Your report is in your  
36 book, I believe, starting on page 279. So, I'm just  
37 going to hit some highlights and fill in some gaps.

38

39

Let's see first of all, as you all know,  
40 the federal caribou hunt in unit 13 will remain closed.  
41 It's now a may be announced hunt by regulation. So, it's  
42 closed until the population becomes high enough that we  
43 can start talking about a possible hunt. But that is  
44 it's -- we don't have to do any actions or anything for  
45 it to remain closed for now, which is good. Let's see.  
46 I'm still finalizing our moose reports. They were coming  
47 in during the federal government shutdown. So we've got  
48 most of our hunt reports back from our federal users,  
49 which is good. The BLM issued 783 permits for the federal  
50 Unit 13 Moose hunt. And also, side note, thank you to

1 OSM staff who helped us issue permits in Delta this  
2 year. It was nice to have some extra help. We have 36  
3 bull moose harvested, which is if you can see in your  
4 report that's pretty low. It tracks with everything you  
5 all have been saying. Hunter's success is not great in  
6 Unit 13. I broke out that harvest by subunit for your  
7 interest. Of the 36, there were 0 harvested on this  
8 permit in 13A, 25 in 13B, 1 in 13C, 5 in 13D, and 3 in  
9 13E. And then there's two that are listed as general  
10 Unit 13 so we can call those folks and try to pin down  
11 what subunit they harvested in. So that -- it's low, but  
12 it does track in general with the use of those subunits  
13 over time. Those the 13B is by far the most used by  
14 hunters. And then with 13D is a close second there. The  
15 good road accessible areas for moose habitat for  
16 hunters.

17  
18 Oh, I wanted to highlight even with the  
19 Nelchina Caribou hunt closed the BLM Glennallen field  
20 office still issues the most permits -- most federal  
21 permits in the whole state of Alaska. Were at about 25%.  
22 With the caribou hunt, it's about it was about 65% of  
23 total federal permits, but we're still barely beating  
24 the wild -- the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park Service  
25 as far as permit issuance, but we work closely with them  
26 just with the volume of permits that we issue. So, it's  
27 still a big job, and I just really appreciate the field  
28 office staff, and we're doing the best we can. So that  
29 breaking that down we still serve about a thousand  
30 subsistence users and families. So I think that's all I  
31 have for you all.

32  
33 ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Anyone have  
34 questions for Caroline about the charts or the numbers?  
35 Faye.

36  
37 MS. EWAN: Faye Ewan for the recordm  
38 Kluti Kaah. Do -- what was the numbers of permits that  
39 turned in that they harvest moose out of all those 700  
40 permits?

41  
42 MS. KRETON: Yeah, through the Chair. Our  
43 total moose harvest this year was only 36.

44  
45 MS. EWAN: 36. Oh, thank you.

46  
47 MS. KRETON: The average is about 50 or  
48 so. 50 or 60, so it's low. Last year it was only 46. So  
49 it's been going down.

50

1                   ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Any other  
2 questions?

3  
4                   (No response)

5  
6                   Okay. Thank you so much. I guess we'll  
7 hear from Chugach National Forest in March. But is  
8 someone doing a general OSM update? Thank you. Scott.

9  
10                  MR. AYERS: Thank you, Madam Chair, and  
11 members of the Council. This is the time of the meeting  
12 where we gush about how awesome you all are, and we  
13 appreciate all the hard work that you do. And then we  
14 share a little bit information about what we've had going  
15 on since the last time we met. So again, thank you for  
16 the excellent work this meeting. We threw a lot at you  
17 all, and you came through mostly unscathed. I appreciate  
18 that. Getting into it here.

19  
20                  All right, so OSM continues to work to  
21 ensure that rural -- federally qualified subsistence  
22 users have an opportunity to meaningfully engage in  
23 implementing the federal subsistence priority that's  
24 mandated by ANILCA Title VIII. We've also been busy  
25 bringing the leadership at the Office of Policy,  
26 Management and Budget in the Office of the Secretary of  
27 Interior, up to speed about this program and any of the  
28 current issues that require their attention. During the  
29 current wildlife regulatory cycle, the Board received  
30 78 wildlife proposals, which you all worked through a  
31 number of today, but that's quite a haul for us. OSM  
32 staff developed in-depth analyses of the proposed  
33 changes, and we also had an additional 17 closures that  
34 we were looking at across the state this cycle so it's  
35 a busy cycle for wildlife.

36  
37                  A few regulatory items. The federal  
38 subsistence regulations were moved this past year. They  
39 were previously at 50 CFR 100, which is associated with  
40 the Fish and Wildlife Service. And they've moved to a  
41 new location at 43 CFR part 51, which is Department of  
42 Interior. So this move corresponds generally to OSM move  
43 out of the Fish and Wildlife Service. There's no change  
44 in the regulations. They just effectively moved them  
45 from one spot to the next. The federal regulations for  
46 the take of fish and shellfish for the 2025 to 2027  
47 regulatory period, the Federal Register notice on that  
48 the Final Rule also published this last year. In addition  
49 to all the changes that were made related to the Board's  
50 action and the Council's recommendation on fisheries.

1 It also removed Ketchikan area from the list of non-  
2 rural areas. And it updated the regulations for  
3 subsistence taking of caribou and Units 11, 12 and 13  
4 and corrected an error from recent Final Rule regarding  
5 the take of Wolf and Wolverines in Unit 17. So there's  
6 a lot packed into that one.

7  
8 The Federal Subsistence Board held a  
9 summer work session this past July. They reviewed and  
10 approved replies to the Fiscal Year 2024 Annual Reports,  
11 which you all have seen from your region and your book.  
12 They also adopted Deferred Wildlife Proposal WP24-01 as  
13 modified by OSM to allow the sale of brown bear hides  
14 harvested by federally qualified subsistence users,  
15 which nine of the different Subsistence Regional  
16 Advisory Councils supported. Implementation of that  
17 particular proposal will proceed once the regulations  
18 are published in the CFR as part of the Final Rule  
19 associated with this set of regulations. We're hoping  
20 in the summer of 2026, everyone keep their fingers  
21 crossed.

22  
23 Related to Council appointments. The  
24 Board received 50 applications from incumbents and new  
25 applicants to fill 48 seats that were vacant or terms  
26 were expiring. The Board also received 8 letters of  
27 interest from young leaders that are interested in non-  
28 voting positions on the Positions on the Council and  
29 your region, and specific received 5 membership  
30 applications and 3 non-voting leader letters of  
31 interest. We're still waiting on those in the process  
32 that it takes to get from A to B. I feel like they kind  
33 of go off into some magic place and then eventually come  
34 back to us. But the new application period for cycle  
35 [sic] for the next round will open sometime soon. We  
36 can't open up the next cycle until we get the previous  
37 one wrapped up. So we are gently pushing and prodding  
38 to the extent that we're able to get that to move  
39 through. But we're hoping it's very soon. And unless  
40 there's a major delay that will close March 26th.

41  
42 Related to our subsistence permit  
43 application. In 2024, OSM initiated the modernization  
44 of the federal subsistence permitting application. Part  
45 of this process was to make permits more readily  
46 available to users through an option to obtain permits  
47 online. This is proven a bit of a challenging task, and  
48 the new system is still in development and we're working  
49 through some technical issues. Users should continue to  
50 be able to obtain permits by contacting local issuing

000110

1 office until the portal is ready. When the online option  
2 is available, we will make sure to broadcast that news  
3 all over the place and let everyone know that that's  
4 going to be an option. We're hoping it's sooner than  
5 later, but as I said, it's been a challenging road.

6  
7 For some staffing updates. We are at  
8 currently at about 25% vacancy rate. And so lots of  
9 folks are filling many roles right now. We are patiently  
10 awaiting word of when a hiring freeze will be lifted,  
11 but we do not know when that will happen. Several OSM  
12 employees opted to retire earlier this year through the  
13 deferred retirement program that was offered. This  
14 included OSM Fisheries Biologist Karen Hyer, OSM Council  
15 Coordinator Lisa Hutchinson, OSM Cultural Anthropologist  
16 Pippa Kenner, and OSM Permit Specialist Derek Hildreth.  
17 We're excited for them, but we also miss them at the  
18 same time. Happily, we were able to lateral two folks  
19 from other DOI agencies into OSM. Karen McKee came back  
20 to OSM as the subsistence outreach specialist, and Anna  
21 Senechal, who's sitting in the back room here, has joined  
22 OSM Fisheries Division to fill one of the three vacant  
23 positions that we had. We're very excited to have both  
24 of them on. New people are always wonderful.  
25 Additionally, Kerry Crowe is acting as OSM's deputy  
26 director for operations for the next 120 days or so.

27  
28 Strengthening collaboration with the  
29 state of Alaska. Krystal and I have been conducting  
30 monthly in-person meetings with the Alaska Department  
31 of Fish and Game Deputy Commissioner and Federal  
32 Subsistence Board Liaison. These meetings are helping  
33 to ensure strong communication and collaboration,  
34 especially data sharing and analysis reviews, and  
35 working through all the finer points of things that are  
36 in those communications back and forth. Additionally,  
37 OSM and the Interagency Staff Committee held a workshop  
38 early last year to identify opportunities for  
39 strengthening the agency's relationship with the state,  
40 which has produced several action oriented results. And  
41 we're really excited to kind of continue to dig into  
42 that.

43  
44 As for upcoming meeting dates. We still  
45 have two more Councils to meet as part of this fall  
46 cycle. Next week I believe Seward Peninsula and Yukon-  
47 Kuskokwim Delta will both be meeting in Nome and in  
48 Bethel. Other meetings happening. There's going to be a  
49 public meeting held to solicit feedback on the  
50 Subsistence Program Review. This time and date are just

000111

1 kind of hot off the press. The meeting will be held from  
2 3-7pm on February 3rd at the Anchorage Fish and Wildlife  
3 Regional Office. This is where OSM resides and there'll  
4 be more news releases on that in the near future. The  
5 Federal Subsistence Board will be meeting on February  
6 4th and 5th for a Board Member Training and for work  
7 session to discuss the proposals submitted to the 2026  
8 FRMP cycle. Additionally, Tribal and ANCSA Corporation  
9 consultations on the wildlife regulatory proposals and  
10 closure reviews took place. The first set took place on  
11 August 19th and 20<sup>th</sup> -- sorry, 21st of this past year  
12 and there will be two more opportunities for tribes and  
13 ANCSA Corporations to consult with the Board on these  
14 proposals and close reviews. The first one is February  
15 17th and 18th, and then just before the April 2026 Board  
16 Regulatory meeting. Council Chairs are welcome and  
17 encouraged to attend these consultations, and we'd like  
18 to remind tribes and ANCSA Corporations that if the  
19 scheduled dates for consultations don't work, you can  
20 always request a separate date and time for consultation  
21 by emailing OSM's Tribal Liaison Orville Lind at  
22 subsistence@ios.doi.gov. And in that same line, the  
23 Board's Wildlife Regulatory meeting will be taking place  
24 April 20th to 24th of this year to consider all of those  
25 proposals that you all took up and many more. And to  
26 accept public testimony on these closure reviews and  
27 proposals and to engage in regulatory rulemaking. And  
28 undoubtedly, there will be even more stuff on their  
29 agendas to take care of. And all of that information is  
30 always available on our website.

31  
32 And lastly, I have a couple of brief  
33 updates on litigation. So as we heard at the very  
34 beginning of this meeting there was some litigation that  
35 the U.S. brought against the state of Alaska to resolve  
36 a dispute over regulation of subsistence fishing on the  
37 Kuskokwim River within the Yukon Delta National Wildlife  
38 Refuge. There was in March of 2024, the court granted  
39 summary judgment to the U.S. and issued a permanent  
40 injunction against the state. The state appealed. On  
41 August 20th of 2025, the Ninth Circuit panel ruled in  
42 favor of the United States, and the court upheld its  
43 previous holdings that ANILCA defines public lands to  
44 include navigable waters in which the United States  
45 holds reserved water rights based on three previous  
46 Ninth Circuit decisions, commonly referred to as the  
47 Katie John cases. The court rejected the state's  
48 arguments that the Katie John cases were clearly  
49 irreconcilable with Sturgeon versus Frost -- excuse me,  
50 and Sackett v. Environmental Protection Agency. The

1 state petitioned the Supreme Court to consider the case.  
2 And as we just heard the Supreme Court has declined to  
3 hear the case, which effectively closes this out.  
4 Additionally, there's a second case, the State of Alaska  
5 Department of Fish and Game versus the Federal  
6 Subsistence Board et All. On June 2nd of 2025, the Ninth  
7 Circuit panel ruled in favor of the United States in  
8 this lawsuit filed by the State of Alaska. After the  
9 Board authorized an emergency subsistence hunt in 2020  
10 for moose and deer on federal public lands in the  
11 vicinity of Kake, Alaska. The court's basis for  
12 upholding the Board's decision was twofold. First, the  
13 Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act provided  
14 the Board with the authority to provide access to  
15 subsistence resources on federal lands. And second, the  
16 Board has the authority to authorize an emergency  
17 subsistence hunt to ensure that rural residents of  
18 Alaska have a reasonable opportunity to reach and use  
19 subsistence resources found on federal lands in Alaska.  
20 The panel also concluded the state's claims that the  
21 Board improperly delegated the administration of the  
22 Kake hunt to tribe were not properly before the court,  
23 and that was not appealed any further up, so that is now  
24 settled as well. With that, thank you for letting me sit  
25 up here and talk at you for a while, and let me know if  
26 you have any questions.

27  
28 ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Thank you,  
29 Scott. Michael got a question?

30  
31 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: I was just curious, is  
32 Brian still the new George for the Board of Game/Board  
33 of Fish meetings?

34  
35 MR. AYERS: I don't know if Brian likes  
36 to be referred to as the new George, but the state --  
37 the federal liaison to the state program. I'm trying to  
38 remember what the title is, appropriately, is still a  
39 vacant position in our office. And effectively, we have  
40 been cobbling together folks to attend the Board of Game  
41 meetings which Brian and Kendra have both been doing,  
42 mostly. And then also the Board of Fish meetings, which  
43 I and several members of the fisheries program have been  
44 doing. But it's just another hat to wear. So we're,  
45 again hoping at some point in time we can refill some  
46 positions and, go back to wearing one hat at a time.

47  
48 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Thanks.

49  
50

1                   ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Thanks.  
2 Anyone else have comments? I just wanted to highlight.  
3 I mean, you gave us lots of great information, and we  
4 certainly do appreciate all the work that went into this  
5 and this and this and I -- and the shutdown, I'm sure  
6 didn't help your situation. But four of our members,  
7 your term expires in 2026, so I would encourage people,  
8 if they haven't already, to reapply. And that's Kirk,  
9 Angela, Faye and Andy. So please get your names in there.  
10 We want some continuity. I think we're really doing well  
11 as a group. And be great to have people who have  
12 experience and people who are gaining experience.  
13 Thanks, Scott.

14  
15                   MS. PILCHER: Hello everyone. This is  
16 Nissa Pilcher for the -- I'm the Council Coordinator for  
17 the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council. The next  
18 item on the agenda is under number 15: Other Business.  
19 It's the 805(c) Report. So just to give a brief update  
20 on what that is, is the 805(c) Report is a report that  
21 explains to the Council how the Board action differed  
22 from the Council's recommendations the previous years.  
23 Based on the three criteria in which it does not -- it  
24 does not defer, basically. Sorry, it's been a long day.  
25 It was late out here, anyhow. In regards to last cycle,  
26 the Board took action in line with your counsel's  
27 recommendation for all proposals and closure reviews  
28 that affected your region, so there is no 805(c) Report.  
29 There is a cover letter and there is a table in your  
30 meeting book starting on page 289 that details the  
31 proposals that your Council did take up, if you did want  
32 to take a look at them. But the Board agreed with your  
33 recommendations, so no 805(c) was required.

34  
35                   The next topic is Correspondence Update.  
36 Start on page 293 of your meeting book. There is one  
37 piece of correspondence that was drafted and sent --  
38 after your last meeting. This is just to have it in hard  
39 copy. You all should have been emailed a copy when it  
40 was finalized. But it's just to put it in the meeting  
41 book. So, it is there as well, of course. Also, not an  
42 action item. And just to follow up, what Scott and Judy  
43 have just been talking about those members whose terms  
44 are expiring. I trust me, I will be reaching out and  
45 making sure that you have the correct paperwork that you  
46 need in order to turn it in, so you don't need to -- you  
47 can gladly contact me, but I will also be contacting  
48 you. Thank you.

49  
50

1                   ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Thank you,  
2 Nissa. And in terms of the Board basically agreeing with  
3 us on proposals, the best way to have that happen is and  
4 we've been doing that provide a good justification for  
5 how we're voting and the reasons and Nissa will have  
6 this for us next time. But you know reasons to support  
7 how we're voting. Not a conservation concern or it is a  
8 conservation concern, you know, beneficial to  
9 subsistence users and so on. So if we use the right  
10 language it makes our case really solid. So, okay. And  
11 are we at closing comments? Can we believe it. We made  
12 it to Closing Comments. So. Hope, would you like  
13 (distortion).  
14

15                   MS. ROBERTS: I suppose. It has been a  
16 long couple of days. It's my first meeting back in a  
17 couple of meetings. First meeting back in my second term.  
18 I really appreciate all the hard work that everybody has  
19 done and sticking through us, with us, because these are  
20 some long days sitting here with all these agenda items  
21 on here. And I really appreciate all of the tribal  
22 updates and the tribal people that are here. And I  
23 especially appreciate seeing so much of Ahtna  
24 Intertribal being included, commenting and the clarity  
25 that other Council members have given, like Andrew, that  
26 was so good earlier. I just can't even tell you. It was  
27 a great couple of days. Thanks again for everybody being  
28 here and sticking it out with us. Thanks. See you in  
29 March, right?  
30

31                   ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: March is  
32 just around the corner, so now we're on a roll. We'll  
33 be good in March. Kirk.  
34

35                   MR. WILSON: Yeah, I'd just like to thank  
36 everybody, too, for being here and participating in  
37 giving up your time to this place. And it's an honor for  
38 me to serve with you guys here. And I'm in a learning  
39 phase she says. Yeah, I'm one of them. I hope I can do  
40 better. And it's really good to serve here with you  
41 guys, and I'm just thankful to be here. And I'm thankful  
42 for the Ahtna the people to have the will to let me do  
43 this. It's just an honor to be here, and I appreciate  
44 it. Thank you so much for you and, Niecy [sic]. When I  
45 show up first thing in the morning, here she is, first  
46 one here. Last night when I come by, everybody's gone,  
47 here she is. She's here. I mean, we really appreciate  
48 you. Thank you.  
49

1                   ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Good point,  
2 Kirk. Thank you. Michael.

3  
4                   MR. OPHEIM: Yeah. Just thanks to the  
5 crew for putting together such a great meeting and short  
6 notice. You know, the shutdown definitely didn't help  
7 things but great information that was shared, great  
8 discussions on proposals, that was that was really nice.  
9 You know, we always seem to be pretty cordial in our  
10 discussions. It's always good to see everybody being  
11 able to speak and share their input. And yeah, it was a  
12 good meeting overall. And, look forward to seeing  
13 everybody in March.

14  
15                   ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Faye.

16  
17                   MS. EWAN: I learned a lot. First time I  
18 ever served on a federal -- state board in my whole  
19 life. And I'm usually sitting on the other side and  
20 supporting, you know, our proposals and stuff. And I  
21 wanted to share some information about Federal  
22 Subsistence Board. When they first started, I wrote the  
23 first C&T proposal that was passed by Pete Ewan, Walter  
24 Charlie, Harry John. That's how that Federal Subsistence  
25 Board got the C&T on their application. And I've been -  
26 - in another thing too, is that now down in Kenai, I  
27 went down there and I testified, that's how you guys got  
28 your hunting rights on federal land. You ask Mary Ann  
29 Mils and a Kenai Council. I've been involved with  
30 subsistence way of life since I was a kid. My parents  
31 and my family are leaders, and that's where I -- Katie  
32 John is my grandma. And we don't let them down by what  
33 they fought for us, for where we are today.

34  
35                   I learned how to do Robert's Rules of  
36 Orders. I've never ever had this kind of training before.  
37 But, you know, I really see how all these organizations  
38 are run. And I'm really happy that this agency recognizes  
39 and honor us indigenous people on this world that we're  
40 here because the state of Alaska do not recognize us for  
41 the things we ask them to stop and they keep on doing.  
42 And it's to me, it's a shame because the state of Alaska  
43 should be supporting us Indigenous People, because we're  
44 First Nation here. And as a sovereign nation. I sit  
45 here, I represent my people, and I listen to them what  
46 they tell me to say at these meetings. I don't come here  
47 with my own agenda. I talk to my Council. I sit on my  
48 Tribal Council, I sit on Karen's Council, I sit on a lot  
49 of different Native Councils here in Alaska. Also, I sit  
50 on, you know, United Nations and different agencies from

000116

1 international. And I see, you know, where this is at.  
2 And I remember as I was young, there was an indigenous  
3 person, there was a lot of tears when we left the  
4 meetings before because they wouldn't even hear us. They  
5 didn't even take what we took in, especially the state  
6 of Alaska meetings, Fish and Game meetings. They never  
7 heard what we stood up in Copper River when we come down  
8 there, testify. But the federal government, when they  
9 came in, they started listening to what we were talking  
10 about and start supporting us. And I'm very thankful.  
11 If I don't get back on the Board, I will still be here.  
12 Thank you.

13  
14 ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Thank you  
15 Faye. And I think that is something we all take pride  
16 in, is that we do listen, so. Would you like to say  
17 something?

18  
19 UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah, sure. So this is my  
20 second meeting. The first one I was -- wasn't able to  
21 attend in person so it's really nice to put everyone's  
22 face to, like, your voice. And it's really nice to meet  
23 everyone. And just want to say thank you for having me  
24 be on this Council. And thank you to all the everyone  
25 in the representing their organizations. You know, all  
26 the clarifications really help explain all the proposals  
27 a lot better for us and really help us understand more  
28 about them. So, thank you.

29  
30 ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Thanks.  
31 Andy.

32  
33 MR. MCLAUGHLING: Yeah. Thank you. Just  
34 a huge thank to the wealth of knowledge that all the RAC  
35 members bring into this arena and share about our  
36 resources that we all care for and as equal of a huge  
37 thanks to the OSM for impressively coordinating and  
38 organizing this -- so many multitude of factors involved  
39 in this. It's unfathomable to me to how it still comes  
40 together in the system works really well. So thank you  
41 to all that, everything required for this meeting in  
42 both arenas of that. A couple things I was wanting to  
43 mention a few times, I was like, I wanted to call for a  
44 point of order because we're trying to speed through  
45 this stuff with a lot of information in two days, which  
46 was, you know, and if we could just follow through on  
47 some of this stuff and watch and realize that the  
48 discussion level is where a lot of this deliberation and  
49 facts and things can be brought forward. And that's where  
50 the corn gets cut after the motion is made. So that's

1 one thing you know, point of order. You know, I wanted  
2 to call it a few times, but I don't want to interrupt  
3 people. But things that would streamline our processes,  
4 maybe also in the book, it's kind of like Congress  
5 putting a bunch of riders in on a bill, and we get these  
6 ones that have a bunch of WP this, this, this and this  
7 all in one line that that complicates things. I couldn't  
8 wrap my head around some of that. It's better for me  
9 when they're kind of individual bullet points. And each  
10 time we address one of those at a time. But lumping them  
11 was a little rough. But overall, I'm amazed we got  
12 through this in two days. So, thank you.

13  
14 ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Thank you,  
15 and Ed.

16  
17 MR. HOLSTEN: I just echo most of the  
18 comments I've heard here. Especially I appreciate the  
19 Board for their knowledge. I've learned a lot. I do  
20 every meeting. I appreciate Greg's efforts. I always  
21 have. Runs a good show. And thank you, Judy, for getting  
22 us through the rest of it. And as usual, OSM staff is  
23 absolutely phenomenal, on not only getting the meeting,  
24 set up all the materials, but all the information they  
25 provide us. Without that, we'd be in a world of hurt.  
26 And also, the agencies and tribal reports are always  
27 something I look forward to. So, thank you all.  
28 Appreciate it.

29  
30 ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Good  
31 comments. And Dennis.

32  
33 MR. ZADRA: I just want to express my  
34 gratitude to be able to be part of this process and all  
35 that. And I'm just the sake of brevity, I'll just say  
36 thank you, everybody, and let's get on.

37  
38 ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: Nissa, did  
39 you want to add something? Okay. I guess just a few  
40 thoughts. We had a lot of proposals, and that certainly  
41 was a lot of work for everyone. But on the flip side of  
42 it, the good part is people, you and others are thinking  
43 about how the federal subsistence regulations could be  
44 from your and oftentimes our perspective, how they could  
45 be improved. And that's a great thing. So I always do  
46 appreciate, in a way, having a lot of proposals. People  
47 worked hard to think about the changes that were  
48 necessary. And I certainly want to thank Greg, who does  
49 run a really good meeting, and hope he had a safe trip  
50 home, too. So, with that, I guess if we have a motion

000118

1 to adjourn. Okay.

2

3

UNIDENTIFIED: Second.

4

5

6

ACTING CHAIRPERSON CAMINER: I think it's  
done. So ,we've adjourned the meeting. Thank you very  
much for all your participation.

7

8

9

(Off record)

10

11

END OF PROCEEDINGS

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Rafael Morel, for Lighthouse Integrated Services Corp, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 1 through 118 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the SOUTHCENTRAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME II recorded on the 14th day of January;

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

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

DATED at Isabela, Puerto Rico this 12th day of February 2026.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Rafael Morel  
Chief Project Manager