

1 SOUTHEAST ALASKA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE  
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

3  
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5  
6 VOLUME II

7  
8  
9 Sitka Tribal House  
10 Sitka, Alaska  
11 March 18, 2015  
12 9:00 a.m.

13  
14  
15 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

16  
17 Michael Bangs, Chair  
18 Arthur Bloom  
19 Michael Douville  
20 Donald Hernandez  
21 Kenneth Jackson  
22 Cathy Needham  
23 Robert Schroeder  
24 Frank Wright  
25 John Yeager  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31 Regional Council Coordinator, Robert Larson

32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42 Recorded and transcribed by:  
43  
44 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC  
45 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2  
46 Anchorage, AK 99501  
47 907-227-5312/sahile@gci.net

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Sitka, Alaska - 3/18/2015)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Could everybody take their seats we'd like to get going here, it's 9:00 o'clock.

(Pause)

CHAIRMAN BANGS: I'd like to start the meeting off this morning with any public comments on non-agenda items.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay, hearing none, we'll get a little quick presentation from Robert about climate change.

MR. LARSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yesterday there was some discussion from the Council about remaining informed regarding climate change, climate change activities and I resurrected a document that the Forest Service put together about a year ago, it's called Climate Change in the Alaska region. It's still valid and I thought that that would be a reminder. I think that the Council has seen this before during our joint meeting with the Southcentral Council. But anyway it's still valid and I think the take home message there is that the agencies are very concerned about monitoring climate change activities. And if it's the will of the Council we can, you know, produce some information, you know, on an annual basis or a general nature or if there's some specific questions we can answer those too.

But, in fact, the agencies take climate change monitoring and looking towards the effects of climate change fairly seriously because it is happening and this document that's in front of you is just a reminder that we are capable of providing briefs on this topic if the Council needs it.

Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Larson.

1                   Okay, Ms. Kenner, did you have some  
2 rural determination presentation.

3  
4                   MS. KENNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair and  
5 members of the Council. For the record my name is  
6 Pippa Kenner and I work for the Office of Subsistence  
7 Management in Anchorage. I am going to be presenting  
8 the proposed rule on rural/nonrural determination  
9 process, and it is an action item. The Council was  
10 present last night at the public meeting and has seen  
11 the materials but I am going to go over it again very  
12 quickly for your review.

13  
14                   In 2009 Secretary of the Interior  
15 Salazar announced the initiation of a departmental  
16 review of the Federal Subsistence Management Program in  
17 Alaska and Secretary of Agriculture Vilsack later  
18 concurred with this course of action. The review  
19 focused on how the program is meeting the purposes and  
20 subsistence provisions of Title VIII of the Alaska  
21 National Interest Lands Conservation Act, or ANILCA and  
22 how the program is serving rural subsistence users as  
23 envisioned when it began in the early 1990s.

24  
25                   On 2010, the Secretaries announced the  
26 findings of the review, which included several proposed  
27 administrative and regulatory reviews and revisions to  
28 strengthen the program and make it more responsive to  
29 those who rely on it for their subsistence uses. One  
30 proposal called for a review with Council input of the  
31 rural determination process. And, if needed,  
32 recommendations for regulatory changes.

33  
34                   The Subsistence Regional Advisory  
35 Councils were briefed on the Federal Register notice  
36 during their winter 2013 meetings, at their fall 2013  
37 meetings the Councils provided a public forum to hear  
38 from residents of their regions to deliberate on the  
39 rural determination process and provide recommendations  
40 for changes to the Board. Testimonies from members of  
41 the public were also recorded during separate public  
42 meetings held to solicit comments on the rural  
43 determination process. Government to government  
44 consultations on the rural determination process were  
45 held between members of the Board and tribes. And  
46 additional consultations were held between the Board  
47 and Alaska Native Corporations.

48  
49                   The Board received 475 substantive  
50 comments from various sources, including individuals

1 citizens, members of Regional Advisory Councils and  
2 other entities such as borough and city governments.

3  
4                   Based on those comments, the Federal  
5 Subsistence Board developed a recommendation for the  
6 Secretaries that would, if adopted, simplify the  
7 regulation that guides the process of making  
8 rural/nonrural determinations.

9  
10                   After the Board meets in June or July  
11 2015 and makes its recommendations to the Secretaries a  
12 final rule will be published which may or may not  
13 differ from the proposed rule we're discussing today.

14  
15                   Under current regulations the Board  
16 aggregates communities or areas that are economically,  
17 socially and communally integrated, evaluates a  
18 community's rural or nonrural status using guidelines  
19 defined by the Secretaries such as population  
20 thresholds and economic development. Under the  
21 proposed regulations the Board would evaluate a  
22 community's nonrural status using a broad array of  
23 relevant information and rely heavily on the  
24 recommendations of the Regional Advisory Councils.

25  
26                   The proposed regulatory change would  
27 increase flexibility in the decisionmaking process and  
28 recognize the unique nature of Alaskan communities.

29  
30                   So the new regulation says:

31  
32                   The Board determines which areas or  
33 communities in Alaska are nonrural.  
34 All other communities and areas are  
35 therefore rural.

36  
37                   So do you agree with the changes, do  
38 you disagree with the changes and, again, this is an  
39 action item for you to work on.

40  
41                   Thank you, Mr. Chair.

42  
43                   CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Pippa. Any  
44 questions. Discussion.

45  
46                   Don.

47  
48                   MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, thank you, Mr.  
49 Chairman. Pippa, how does this new rule deal  
50 specifically with aggregating communities together. I

1 don't hear it mentioned specifically in the new rule.

2

3 MS. KENNER: It does not. It's not a  
4 requirement in the new rule.

5

6 MR. HERNANDEZ: So when it refers to  
7 communities, I guess, you know, we might run into other  
8 situations -- I'm assuming for our purposes that, you  
9 know, under the new rule, Saxman, with its own self-  
10 governing body would be considered a separate community  
11 now. I'm just wondering how it might relate to some  
12 other communities in Southeast like I'm thinking  
13 possibly Douglas, in the Juneau/Douglas area, can you  
14 give me some ideas on how that might be viewed and also  
15 say, specifically, about Saxman.

16

17 (Pause)

18

19 MR. HERNANDEZ: Is Saxman going to be  
20 considered a community unto itself now under the new  
21 rule.

22

23 (Pause)

24

25 MS. KENNER: Under this rule nothing --  
26 nothing changes. This rule is about the process, it's  
27 not about talking about specific communities. This  
28 just redefines the process that the Board will use to  
29 determine nonrural.

30

31 MR. HERNANDEZ: Right, I understand  
32 that. So there are no more aggregate communities under  
33 the new rule, is that correct.

34

35 (Pause)

36

37 MS. KENNER: There is no more  
38 aggregating communities under the rule unless there is  
39 a proposal that comes in that requests that and it's  
40 analyzed in terms of whether or not an area or  
41 community should be aggregated.

42

43 MR. HERNANDEZ: I guess I'm just  
44 wondering what the criteria will be for determining  
45 that, I guess it'll be kind of this broad range of  
46 factors still.

47

48 MS. KENNER: Thank you for the  
49 question. Through the Chair.

50

1 I don't want to get too far ahead of  
2 what the proposed rule is but, you know, there was this  
3 extensive review with the public and others and you'd  
4 think that if we had this criteria in regulation there  
5 would be a general consensus that these were criteria  
6 that defined rural and nonrural but, in fact, what we  
7 found is that this consensus didn't exist and that  
8 regionally -- I don't want to get too far ahead -- but  
9 regionally there seemed to be differences in how people  
10 in different regions looked at this question.

11  
12 For instance some communities have  
13 military bases, some have -- are on road systems, some  
14 are not, some have some industrial development, some  
15 don't, and it appears that the Board, when it looked at  
16 this testimony in developing the rule recognized that  
17 there were these regional differences and that these  
18 criteria weren't always appropriate for the cases that  
19 they were looking at and they actually wanted to  
20 broaden what they could look at and not be -- not  
21 necessarily have to look at some of the crit -- at  
22 certain criteria in regulation and that the Advisory  
23 Councils are probably well-suited in most cases to  
24 advise the Board on what these determinations are in  
25 their regions. The Councils are made up of  
26 representation from a wide range of communities and  
27 interests in a region.

28  
29 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Cathy.

30  
31 MS. NEEDHAM: So in public testimony  
32 last night we heard a number of people say that they  
33 supported having the Board give deference Regional  
34 Advisory Councils when making the nonrural decisions  
35 and the language of the new rule doesn't necessarily  
36 include that piece of it so would that be some  
37 subsequent implementation guidelines of how -- or a  
38 policy that would come subsequently to the regulation  
39 or does -- should we consider that as added language.

40  
41 MS. KENNER: Thank you for that  
42 question. Through the Chair.

43  
44 In the rule, what the Board has told  
45 us, is that it intends to weigh heavily on the  
46 recommendation of the Regional Advisory Councils. I  
47 cannot predict what a new policy might look like but  
48 the Board has stated its plan to do that.

49  
50 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other questions or

1 discussion.

2

3

(No comments)

4

5 CHAIRMAN BANGS: What's the will of the  
6 Council. We probably need to move forward with a  
7 motion to support or not support the proposed rule so  
8 what's the will of the Council.

9

10 Mr. Douville.

11

12 MR. DOUVILLE: I would move that we  
13 support the new proposed rule.

14

15 MR. HERNANDEZ: Second.

16

17 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay, it's been moved  
18 and seconded to support the new rule for rural  
19 determination. Any discussion.

20

21 Mike.

22

23 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Chairman.

24

25 I would support because it offers  
26 flexibility that is not in the old rule to make  
27 determinations and it appears that the Regional  
28 Advisory Councils will have a little stronger say. But  
29 what we need is flexibility because, you know, each  
30 situation is sometimes unique.

31

32 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.  
33 Douville. I agree, I think that some of the situations  
34 where aggregation has happened such as Saxman doesn't  
35 take into consideration the character of the community  
36 and the flexibility that's needed to make that  
37 determination so I would agree with you.

38

39 Anyone else.

40

41 Mr. Schroeder.

42

43 MR. SCHROEDER: Just a little bit of  
44 clarification and maybe I need Pippa for this as well.

45

46 In the discussion, and I believe in the  
47 Federal Register notice there's reference to the  
48 decennial review of urban/rural status and if you could  
49 just let us know, Pippa, where that stands, I'm not  
50 completely clear what the new rule would do to the idea

1 that the rural status has to be reviewed every 10  
2 years, and then I'll have a follow up on that.

3  
4 MS. KENNER: Thank you. Through the  
5 Chair. There would no longer be a decennial review of  
6 the rural/nonrural determinations.

7  
8 MR. SCHROEDER: Just a followup  
9 statement on that. If that is the case that's another  
10 strong reason for the Council to support this rule  
11 because what's happened over the life of the program  
12 has been that certain communities have felt that  
13 they're definitely on the edge and that they have to  
14 spend a lot of their energy to maintain their rural  
15 status or to regain their rural status so this would be  
16 a very positive move if the requirement of a decennial  
17 review were eliminated.

18  
19 I do understand that -- I believe,  
20 Pippa, in your presentation last night that change in  
21 status could still be made based on a proposal that  
22 could be made by -- could you clarify that, is that a  
23 proposal made by the public, by a Regional Advisory  
24 Council or by a community.

25  
26 (Pause)

27  
28 MR. SCHROEDER: So in other words,  
29 since decennial review is gone, would there be some  
30 vehicle where a community status could be changed.

31  
32 MS. KENNER: Thank you, again, this is  
33 Pippa Kenner. Through the Chair.

34  
35 The Board hasn't indicated to us any  
36 future policy or actions on that in this proposed rule  
37 so I'm hesitant to comment. They would be  
38 administering the rural/nonrural determination process.

39  
40 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other discussion.  
41 Questions.

42  
43 John.

44  
45 MR. YEAGER: Thank you. For the fellow  
46 Council members is that, under my assumption that  
47 without the specific word of deference to the Regional  
48 Advisory Councils not in this proposed rule that we  
49 have that, or it would be expected that we have that  
50 flexibility from the Board or would it be best to have

1 that language somehow implemented into this.

2

3 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any comments.

4

5 Cathy.

6

7 MS. NEEDHAM: I guess in follow up to  
8 that like one of my questions, or when I sit and think  
9 about when I think about developing a policy to  
10 implement the rule, you know, policies come in to  
11 implement the rule and how you're going to do it and  
12 then they can be left open to interpretation after  
13 that. So right now if the Board, the current Board  
14 structure and the people who serve on the Board have  
15 stated that they would give deference -- or have  
16 Regional Advisory Council input into this process, but  
17 is that going to be the case in 10 years when that  
18 Board mixup is a little bit different and would they  
19 interpret policy or change policy to fit the makeup of  
20 the Board. And so not having something in the  
21 regulation to add that extra layer for everyone to know  
22 that that Regional Advisory input needs to be  
23 considered, that just seems like that would be --  
24 adding that language to the regulation would be an  
25 additional safeguard.

26

27 That's just my understanding of how it  
28 sort of works or has worked in the past, but I could be  
29 wrong.

30

31 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Cathy.  
32 There is the legal aspect of deference so I don't know  
33 that would work in a -- Cathy.

34

35 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair. Maybe instead  
36 of the word deference just make sure that it's -- it's  
37 just like when the Secretaries did their review it said  
38 with RAC input or something. So maybe they're not  
39 giving us deference but it's definitely in the  
40 regulation where the Board needs to give consideration  
41 to Regional Advisory Council's input into determining  
42 when a community is nonrural.

43

44 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other discussion.

45

46 Bob.

47

48 MR. SCHROEDER: At meetings some time  
49 ago with respect to the earlier versions of rural  
50 determination, the Council made a strong case, this

1 Council made a strong case that rural determinations  
2 were very closely tied to taking. The logic being,  
3 that the Council is due deference under ANILCA for  
4 anything that affects the taking of fish and wildlife  
5 for subsistence uses. The logic that the Council put  
6 forward and this may have been when Mr. Littlefield was  
7 Chair, was that quite clearly that if someone was  
8 eliminated, if a community was eliminated that would  
9 definitely influence their taking of fish and wildlife  
10 for subsistence purposes. So the Council could simply  
11 reaffirm its previous statements to those effects. The  
12 idea being that although rural determination at first  
13 glimpse isn't a taking activity, quite clearly if a  
14 community subsistence harvest is completely eliminated,  
15 this would be a very strong affect on complete  
16 elimination of their ability to take fish and wildlife.

17

18 Thank you.

19

20 And as such it would be covered by the  
21 ANILCA directions saying that Council actions need to  
22 be supported unless they violate the three conditions  
23 that we always talk about.

24

25 Thank you.

26

27 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Bob. Mr.  
28 Douville.

29

30 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Chairman. I  
31 agree with you that we should have some, if not  
32 deference, some meaningful say, you know, we have dealt  
33 with this issue for quite a few years and we've also --  
34 we've always stated our position and as forceful as we  
35 could and it didn't get us anywhere, only until we had  
36 a Secretarial Review is when things really started to  
37 change here. You know, I like the new proposed rule as  
38 it gives flexibility, which I said before and not just  
39 focuses on populations alone. There's certainly many  
40 other characteristics in a community that make them  
41 rural in my mind.

42

43 Thank you.

44

45 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.  
46 Douville. Anyone else.

47

48 So we have a motion on the floor to  
49 accept the proposed rule, what does the Council want to  
50 do, do you want to amend to include other language or

1 what.

2

3 MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chair.

4

5 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Frank.

6

7 MR. WRIGHT: Just a comment. I was  
8 just wondering once the rule is made, is there any  
9 other steps that we could, you know, go back into  
10 discussion on this.

11

12 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Wright.

13 Any other discussion.

14

15 (No comments)

16

17 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Larson said that  
18 he could write up a letter, if we choose to support the  
19 proposed rule, write up the discussion that we had that  
20 we wanted to include -- or we want to reflect our  
21 feelings about the Council's deference and then we  
22 could approve that later on in the meeting, after he  
23 gets it typed up, we could look at a document that  
24 would show support. So we have to move on the motion  
25 then we could -- do you want to table it -- should we  
26 table it or do we wait until the later comes out to  
27 approve it.

28

29 MR. LARSON: You need to give me some  
30 direction and I'll bring it back to the Council.

31

32 CHAIRMAN BANGS: So how does the  
33 Council feel, give him direction to bring some language  
34 forward that reflects our discussion.

35

36 Bob.

37

38 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chair. I think  
39 that's a really good idea. Since the Council has  
40 basically plowed this ground so many times in the past,  
41 perhaps it would be -- I'd make a suggestion that our  
42 comments on this proposed rule since as far as I can  
43 remember the Council has been absolutely consistent on  
44 this, on its position, ever since the issue came before  
45 the Council, which is probably 10 years ago or 15 years  
46 ago. And I'd suggest that our Council coordinator not  
47 incorporate those but attach these previous  
48 communications to the Board on this issue and refer to  
49 those in a short letter because people won't read our  
50 20 pages again.

1 (Laughter)  
2  
3 MR. SCHROEDER: But these issues, our  
4 comments will then be very clearly a matter of record,  
5 so that would be my suggestion.  
6  
7 Thank you.  
8  
9 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Bob.  
10 Anyone else.  
11  
12 (No comments)  
13  
14 CHAIRMAN BANGS: So a course of action  
15 should we take.....  
16  
17 MR. LARSON: We have a motion on the  
18 floor.  
19  
20 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Right. Do we want to  
21 table it until the document is presented to us or do we  
22 want to go with Bob's recommendation, either pass the  
23 motion or defeat it and wait for the document to come  
24 out to approve the additional language.  
25  
26 Bob.  
27  
28 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. My advice is  
29 to approve the motion to provide me that direction, I  
30 will bring it back to the Council prior to agenda Item  
31 13, hopefully there'll be some other final approvals  
32 that will take place at that point, and at that point  
33 it would be subject to review and amendments and final  
34 passage.  
35  
36 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Larson.  
37 So we have the motion on the floor.  
38  
39 MR. HERNANDEZ: Call for the question.  
40  
41 CHAIRMAN BANGS: The question's been  
42 called for on approval of the proposed rule of rural  
43 determination. All those in favor respond by saying  
44 aye.  
45  
46 IN UNISON: Aye.  
47  
48 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Opposed.  
49  
50 (No opposing votes)

1 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Hearing none, motion  
2 passes. Thank you, Pippa.

3  
4 Okay, next on the agenda we have a  
5 Kanalku enhancement opportunities and I see Mr.  
6 Reifenstuhl has given us a letter and if he could come  
7 down and talk to us a little bit and maybe there would  
8 be some questions. A handout was given to us here this  
9 morning so there's a letter from Steve.

10  
11 Thank you, Steve.

12  
13 MR. REIFENSTUHL: Good morning, thanks  
14 for having me. My name is Steve Reifenstuhl, and I'll  
15 just sit quietly and see if there's any questions.

16  
17 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.  
18 Reifenstuhl. I would like to point out one thing that  
19 is reflected in our previous discussions about letters  
20 we wrote a letter to mr. Reifenstuhl on December 1st  
21 and the letter wasn't received by him until January  
22 22nd, so, you know, that's why we didn't have this  
23 response until now. I just wanted to bring that out,  
24 our communications are not what they should be in my  
25 opinion, but anyway we didn't have a chance to read  
26 this, like I say we just got this this morning. Maybe  
27 you could give us a brief overview of what the letter  
28 contains.

29  
30 MR. LARSON: Yeah, Mr. Chair, you  
31 should reference this document as well.

32  
33 MR. REIFENSTUHL: Okay, thank you,  
34 Chairman Bangs.

35  
36 I happen to be at the Federal  
37 Subsistence Board meeting in I think it was late  
38 January and Mike came up to me and asked if I had seen  
39 the letter and I had no idea what he was talking about.  
40 So when I got back to my office I wrote this response  
41 within three days to get it in because of the urgency I  
42 feel about the issue and so that was the reason for  
43 submitting the letter. The question -- and I didn't  
44 review it this morning, I didn't realize I was going to  
45 walk in here and come right before you, but that's  
46 fine.

47  
48 So the question was is there something  
49 that can be done and, if so, what might that be. The  
50 letter really just outlines what is known about Kanalku

1 Lake, what is not known and then what some of the  
2 options may be. So you already know there is a barrier  
3 that prevents some fish from getting in there. In  
4 terms of enhancement there's some things we know about  
5 the lake, of course, it does support sockeye, but what  
6 we don't know about the lake is what the maximum number  
7 of fry it can rear with the existing food resources in  
8 the lake. So there was a limnology study done that's  
9 cited in here in the -- I think it was in the early  
10 '90s by Barto and there was a paper published on the  
11 work they did but it was based on the Keenings model  
12 which has really come into disfavor at this point. So  
13 based on doing limnology studies looking at the  
14 zooplankton, the depth of the lake, the aphotic zone,  
15 which is the depth the sunlight can penetrate which  
16 would be the productivity level of the lake, all that  
17 was looked at and then they put that into a model and  
18 churn out that it should be able to support a certain  
19 number of fry. That model has tended to over estimate  
20 what a lake could support. They also did some hydro-  
21 acoustic work in the lake that identified smolts in the  
22 fall, then there's a mortality factor, generally of 20  
23 or 30 percent on the smolts but they did a smolt  
24 estimate in the fall and what I recall was around  
25 83,000 -- I think I might have cited that in here but  
26 around 83,000 smolt, and so then those come out, of  
27 course, the following spring and then that's what you  
28 get out to the ocean and you have your marine survival  
29 calculated on that. Unfortunately that kind of work  
30 wasn't done back then but the work that is now funded,  
31 I think, through the Forest Service, is obtaining some  
32 of that recruitment information. In other words, they  
33 know the adults coming into the lake and I think  
34 they're doing some work with smolts going out. I think  
35 it's mostly adults going in.

36

37                   The reason all this is important is you  
38 need to know whether the lake can support more fish  
39 because it doesn't make any sense to even correct the  
40 dam -- or I'm sorry, correct or modify the waterfall if  
41 the lake can't support more fry. Now, it may well  
42 indeed be able to support more, but it would be good to  
43 know that of course.

44

45                   So that is one of the issues you have  
46 heard over and over, is the modify the barrier with a  
47 steep pass, you could get a lot more -- well,  
48 whatever's dying at the base, you could get most of  
49 those into the lake and then they would, of course,  
50 spawn, you would get higher egg deposition, you may get

1 additional fry, you would likely get additional fry  
2 coming out in the spring, and so then if the food is  
3 available you'd get higher smolt production and,  
4 therefore, if you did get higher smolt production then  
5 you would have more adult survival.

6  
7                   So the enhancement opportunities at the  
8 lake, if you could identify it could support more fry  
9 would be to you could take adults, get their eggs, you  
10 could incubate those at Snettisham Facility, which is  
11 not too far away and then bring them back as fry, you  
12 could put them directly into the lake or you could put  
13 them into net pens and feed them and get them a start  
14 and then release them, you can hold them in net pens  
15 all the way to the fall so they're not competing with  
16 the existing fish and then in late November or December  
17 the lake generally gets very cold, metabolism of fish  
18 decreases and you can then let them go to the lake  
19 because they're not eating much and they just  
20 overwinter and would come out in the spring. So it's a  
21 less competitive type strategy.

22  
23                   So, of course, if you can get more  
24 smolt out of there you should have higher adult  
25 production.

26  
27                   Beyond that, if really the objective or  
28 the goal is to have more fish protein, it's much easier  
29 to rear coho in a lake, in net pens. We do that at  
30 Deer Lake across Chatham Strait on the southeast part  
31 of Baranof and we're producing about 2.5 million coho  
32 smolt and you can do that in a small lake as long as  
33 you hold them in net pens and feed them then they go  
34 out the following spring to the ocean and it's been a  
35 very effective strategy. We've done that in quite a  
36 number of lakes. Right now we just use one very large  
37 system at Deer Lake.

38  
39                   I think that's kind of the gist of what  
40 I put in there.

41  
42                   I guess one last thing on the coho, if  
43 there was an interest in doing something with coho it  
44 doesn't have to be done at Kanalku Lake it could be  
45 done at another lake nearby. And I think there are  
46 other opportunities, not at Kanalku, but the question  
47 to me was specifically about Kanalku.

48  
49                   So I think with that, that's the  
50 summary and I'd be happy to take questions.

1 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Steve. Is  
2 there any questions.

3

4 Mr. Bloom.

5

6 MR. BLOOM: Thank you, Chair. One  
7 question I have is in your discussion of fertilization  
8 of Kanalku Lake, you talk about smolt size, but it's  
9 not quite clear to me, could you say a little bit more  
10 about smolt size and marine survival. And then also  
11 I'd like to know, do you have an idea of what your  
12 costs are to produce those 100-2,000 adult cohos out of  
13 Deer Lake.

14

15 MR. REIFENSTUHL: Okay. You did remind  
16 me I did write about smolt size. So I did some  
17 speculating in this letter based on the Barto paper.  
18 The smolt size is the size of the actual smolt, not the  
19 number but the size of the smolt is fairly small coming  
20 out of Kanalku, which suggests to me looking at other  
21 lakes throughout Alaska, that a small smolt size  
22 generally means there's not a huge number of resources  
23 in the system and so they evolve to going to a place  
24 with greater resources, which is the ocean. So the  
25 example I use in the paper is Chilkoot Lake produce --  
26 in the Haines area produces a very small, it's only a  
27 couple of gram, three gram, tiny fish, and they do very  
28 well when they get to the ocean but there's just not  
29 the resources in the lake, compared that with Chilkat  
30 Lake, they produce a very large smolt because there's  
31 very large density of zooplankton in there and so  
32 they'll stay in the lake for two years because they  
33 have lots of groceries.

34

35 So at Kanalku, I suspect, because of  
36 the small smolt size, that there probably is limited  
37 resource in the -- zooplankton in the lake for the fry.

38

39 Does that get to what you're asking Mr.  
40 Bloom.

41

42 MR. BLOOM: (Nods affirmatively)

43

44 MR. REIFENSTUHL: Okay. The cost of  
45 the Deer Lake program is about \$500,000 a year and it's  
46 producing approximately 150,000 to 200,000 adult coho.  
47 So the benefit to cost on that in the long-term would  
48 be about 4-1, so \$4 return, and we do that calculation  
49 based on catch by trollers and also what returns to the  
50 terminal area, which we harvest for cost recovery. So

1 those fish aren't going to waste, they get through the  
2 different fisheries.

3

4 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other questions.

5

6 Don.

7

8 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, thank you, Mr.  
9 Chairman. Steve, I was kind of wondering about coho  
10 rearing in the lake, is there any direct competition if  
11 you're raising the coho in pens and feeding them with,  
12 you know, the existing food availability in the lake  
13 for the wild sockeye. And also, I guess I have some  
14 questions about -- you know you talk about the disease  
15 problem with the sockeye, has that been pretty gotten  
16 under control there at the Snettisham Facility and what  
17 are the risks there, a little bit more about that.

18

19 MR. REIFENSTUHL: Well, sockeye have a  
20 natural virus that occurs in the environment, called  
21 IHN, so all sockeye are carriers. It can be  
22 transmitted horizontally, meaning as adults come  
23 together, it can be transmitted that way, or fry and  
24 adult it can be transmitted horizontally. It also can  
25 be transmitted vertically, so from one generation to  
26 another. It's not just at Snettisham, it's anywhere  
27 that there's wild sockeye there's IHN. In a hatchery  
28 environment, what they see, and I checked on this  
29 number before I put it in this report, it's roughly 10  
30 percent mortality with IHN in the hatchery environment  
31 at Snettisham, so through all years you're losing about  
32 10 percent of those eggs.

33

34 Now, if you put those fry in a lake and  
35 they're just going to the lake and they spread out and  
36 feed on their own, there's less likely chance of IHN  
37 outbreak but it can happen. If you keep them in net  
38 pens in a higher density and you're feeding them  
39 there's some likelihood -- I mean it will happen on  
40 occasion, you'll have an IHN outbreak that -- it  
41 doesn't happen very often, there's lakes in Canada on  
42 the Stikine Tahltan Lake where they utilize this  
43 strategy, and to my knowledge they haven't had an  
44 outbreak at Tahltan but it can happen. I mean it's  
45 something to be aware of. You -- the way you manage  
46 around it, really, is you're operating any egg take  
47 facility or handling of adults very much like a  
48 hospital environment. So there's a lot of  
49 disinfection, there's separate use of tools to cut down  
50 on cross contamination. There's a whole book published

1 on how to culture and work with sockeye and you don't  
2 have to do this with other species and it's all because  
3 of the IHN. Now, other species have other naturally  
4 occurring diseases.

5  
6 And I don't think I got to one part of  
7 your question, perhaps.

8  
9 MR. HERNANDEZ: Raising coho in net  
10 pens in the lake, is there.....

11  
12 MR. REIFENSTUHL: Oh, the competition.

13  
14 MR. HERNANDEZ: .....competition, yeah.

15  
16 MR. REIFENSTUHL: No, there's not.  
17 Because you're feeding them a fish food. Now, the only  
18 maybe very mild competition, there's zooplankton in the  
19 lake, they drift through the net pens, any zooplankton  
20 drifts through the net pen will probably be taken, or  
21 some of them will be taken but that's pretty minor for  
22 the total surface area, or volume of a lake.

23  
24 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Art, and then Frank.

25  
26 MR. BLOOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
27 Could you talk a little bit more about what would be  
28 required to modify the falls so that more fish could  
29 make it up and also this is a very unusual situation  
30 where something like 25 to 50 percent of the returning  
31 adults don't make it to the spawning ground, you would  
32 think that would have some sort of -- that would be  
33 reflected in the natural selection, there would be  
34 something in the adults that would have changed to work  
35 with that situation.

36  
37 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Excuse me. We did get  
38 a reference document that shows the escapements after  
39 the falls and before the falls were modified, but, go  
40 ahead.

41  
42 MR. REIFENSTUHL: So the modification  
43 would need, I'm not an engineer, but it would need to  
44 be a steep pass. So you design a steep pass based on  
45 the species you're targeting. Sockeye, as you know, is  
46 a very good jumper, strong swimmer, and you would  
47 probably not want to upset the ecology of the lake so  
48 you would design a steep pass so you're not getting  
49 other species in, particularly pink and chum. And so  
50 it would be a fairly steep pass, but to do it you need

1 enough horizontal relief, of course, to get that  
2 incline proper. So not -- I mean it's been 35 years  
3 since I was at the falls so I don't recall -- but it's  
4 likely, what you'd have to do is just on the edge of  
5 the stream you would blast a channel that would get the  
6 incline that you desired and then you would put your  
7 steep pass in there. On the top side you have to put  
8 some kind of concrete diversion so that a portion of  
9 that stream will enter the steep pass and provide  
10 enough water volume so that the fish can get up through  
11 the steep pass.

12

13                                 So that's kind of all there is to that.  
14 It's not hugely complicated, it just takes a fish  
15 engineer to go out there survey it and then they could  
16 design that fairly quickly.

17

18                                 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Frank.

19

20                                 MR. REIFENSTUHL: No, wait I think that  
21 I didn't get another part of Mr. Bloom's question. I  
22 should have a pen here to write these down.

23

24                                 MR. BLOOM: It was just a question  
25 about the natural selection or evolutionary part  
26 of.....

27

28                                 MR. REIFENSTUHL: Oh, yeah, I love  
29 speculating on evolution.

30

31                                 (Laughter)

32

33                                 MR. REIFENSTUHL: So I'd heard that  
34 there was an earthquake at one time that modified these  
35 falls and maybe precluded fish, but I think there are  
36 examples all over Southeast, you know, I'm aware of  
37 some, so 10,000, 12,000 years ago when it was fully  
38 glaciated it pushed out all the salmon, Dolly Varden  
39 and so forth and then as the glacier's receded and the  
40 ocean came up, a lot of the lakes that are now hanging,  
41 that are say 100 feet in elevation and greater, will  
42 have Dolly Varden but not -- and some of them will have  
43 sockeye or kokanee really because they can no longer  
44 get back into the lake but there are quite a number of  
45 systems like that. If they're greater than 200 foot  
46 elevation with a very steep relief there's usually no  
47 fish species, and I'm talking about in Baranof,  
48 Chichagof and Admiralty Islands.

49

50                                 But there are systems like just south

1 of here at Bordino where there's cobble and the water  
2 just goes through the big cobble and stream -- there's  
3 no surface flow. And the sockeye have evolved being  
4 tiny, they're very, very small. Large fish can't get  
5 through interstices of those boulders. I would think  
6 that something like that is evolving at Kanalku,  
7 assuming this is correct about the earthquake, I think  
8 that the pressure is that the stronger jumpers and  
9 swimmers are getting up and the weaker ones are not and  
10 so it may be a system where you have kind of the best  
11 and strongest jumpers of any sockeye around.

12

13 But, again, that's just a guess.

14

15 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Frank, did you have a  
16 question.

17

18 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, I was just wondering  
19 about I don't know much about the phytoplankton and how  
20 much salmon that lake can support in Kanalku, so maybe  
21 I could get a little explanation of where the  
22 phytoplankton comes from, is it the fish that die that  
23 produces it or -- and if you do get more fish in the  
24 lake will it produce more phytoplankton to support the  
25 bigger stock.

26

27 MR. REIFENSTUHL: Thanks, Mr. Wright.

28 So the -- I guess the way this all works is that  
29 everything is based on carbon, nitrogen, phosphorus,  
30 and so it's really the runoff, the geology and the  
31 groundcover, the trees, so those elements are coming  
32 into the lake and that's what kind of starts the  
33 productivity, so that's kind of the base level. And  
34 then sunlight creates an energy source and so takes  
35 those minerals and you have chlorophyll A production,  
36 which is the basis of the phytoplankton, and so then  
37 there's different species of phytoplankton and they  
38 grow on that, really produce from the minerals and  
39 sunlight. So the next level is the zooplankton, so  
40 there's got to be enough phytoplankton for the  
41 zooplankton to eat and when I mentioned the sunlight  
42 penetration into the lake, that's called the aphotic-  
43 volume so lakes that have greater sunlight penetration  
44 are generally more productive because everything's  
45 dependent on the sunlight.

46

47 So there's got to be certain levels of  
48 zooplankton for the fry to feed on because when the fry  
49 come out of the eggs, that's what they are going to  
50 feed on, zooplankton, that's the straight linkage

1 between the fy survival is the volume of zooplankton,  
2 which, of course, dependent on all those other layers  
3 that I talked about.

4  
5 And so what we don't know is exactly  
6 how productive that lake is.

7  
8 Now limnology studies we -- we have  
9 that data still so that can be reviewed, I did not look  
10 at that carefully, that is something that can be done  
11 and if I were asked to do it, I wouldn't do it myself  
12 -- I mean I know a bit about limnology and I've done  
13 limnology studies but there are experts with Ph.D's  
14 that I would talk to about that, in particular, for  
15 Kanalku.

16  
17 Does that answer your question.

18  
19 MR. WRIGHT: Yes, it does. So when you  
20 play with Mother Nature and then you put too many fish  
21 into the lake will that kind of disrupt what's going on  
22 up in the lake, because, you know, you put too much --  
23 what goes on after that, so I know when man plays with  
24 Mother Nature they mess it up.

25  
26 MR. REIFENSTUHL: They can, yes. So  
27 that's why I have come out, I guess, cautiously, saying  
28 it's important to know what the carrying capacity is in  
29 the lake and what the productivity is so that you're  
30 not putting too many fish in there to raise on a  
31 limited resource.

32  
33 And, again, to circle back, on the net  
34 pen rearing, you know, in my opinion the better  
35 enhancement strategy is to do that -- if you're trying  
36 to produce more fish for whether it's commercial, sport  
37 or subsistence and you want to avoid some of the  
38 problems you're talking about, then if you rear them in  
39 net pens then you know exactly what you're doing, what  
40 you're producing because you have exact count on what  
41 goes in, how they grow, what you release and then your  
42 fish when they return because you're marking these fish  
43 that you can track them through different fisheries as  
44 well as the terminal area.

45  
46 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Ken.

47  
48 MR. JACKSON: Yes, my question is -- I  
49 know you said you'll take some fish to Snettisham and  
50 you keep them there and you said you would take them

1 back and release them in the fall, with climate change  
2 happening and the chemical make up of the streams, are  
3 they identical or close that they wouldn't lose their  
4 way, I mean it's -- it seems like they would be kind of  
5 messed up by just knowing where to go.

6

7 MR. REIFENSTUHL: Mr. Jackson. That's  
8 a good question and there's a lot of data on that. So  
9 I guess the short answer is, yes, they would know. So  
10 the critical piece is that when salmon of any species  
11 first -- their first saltwater experience, that's  
12 called imprinting and that really locks into their  
13 brain, so when they hit saltwater, that's what they're  
14 going to cue in on to return, so at the base of Kanalku  
15 regardless of how those fish get into the lake they're  
16 going to hit that saltwater, that's going to imprint  
17 and then they're going to be going out with the rest of  
18 the fish that were produced there and, by say natural  
19 means, and they're going to go out into the ocean and  
20 they're going to track all the way out and back using  
21 the same chemical and other cues to return.

22

23 But it is important to realize that all  
24 salmon stray, if they didn't we wouldn't have any fish  
25 here because 12,000 years ago in glaciation they were  
26 all to the south and they wouldn't have occupied the  
27 new habitat. So there's always a percentage that will  
28 stray.

29

30 Now, sockeye has the greatest fidelity  
31 to their site of where they spawn or where their natal  
32 system of all the species, so they stray less than  
33 others.

34

35 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other questions  
36 for Steve.

37

38 Mike.

39

40 MR. DOUVILLE: Just kind of a general  
41 question, not related to Kanalku, but can you -- the  
42 plankton grows where there's light, so if you disturb  
43 the light, say as logging, which disturbs soils,  
44 perhaps bark and other things to run into a lake, which  
45 it will, that probably would disturb the amount of  
46 light that's able to penetrate and, therefore, you  
47 would probably reduce your plankton levels, would you  
48 not -- if not, either by light, but chemically also.

49

50 MR. REIFENSTUHL: Chemically, of

1 course, bark and trees create, you know, more tannin so  
2 that would change the chemistry a little bit, but  
3 presumably, you know, the tannins that come into the  
4 lake and components from vegetation is already there so  
5 that's probably not going to change the chemistry all  
6 that much. And, you know, each freshwater system does  
7 have its micro-chemistry, I mean that's one of the  
8 things once fish get into a stream, micro-chemistry  
9 becomes important.

10

11 But I think your question was more  
12 about if there's reduction in light penetration, will  
13 it productivity and the answer is yes it will.

14

15 And there was another question earlier  
16 that I didn't answer I just recalled, in sockeye  
17 systems one of the most important nutrient cycling is  
18 the dead and decaying sockeye. So although it is, as I  
19 described based on the primary elements and  
20 productivity of chlorophyll A and so forth, once there  
21 is sockeye going in -- and this has been studied over  
22 10,000 yea -- they drill, do core samples in sockeye  
23 systems and you can see periods of hyper activity, low  
24 productivity, when there were a lot of fish escaping  
25 into the lakes and in years when there were many, many  
26 less, and this is over a decadal scales, they can't  
27 tell each year, there's not enough sediment, but the  
28 point is that sockeye are very important to a lake's  
29 productivity.

30

31 And there's -- so a lake turns over  
32 twice a year, meaning that the temperature stratifies  
33 the lake and so in the spring when it warms up the  
34 bottom comes up and it brings nutrients with it to the  
35 surface, there's a circulation in the spring and then  
36 there's another circulation in the fall when the  
37 temperature declines there's another turnover and  
38 that's very important in lake systems, and, in  
39 particular, with sockeye.

40

41 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other questions.

42

43 Don.

44

45 MR. HERNANDEZ: Just one. What do you  
46 think the options are for funding any kind of a project  
47 that might happen if it were feasible.

48

49 MR. REIFENSTUHL: Well, at first I  
50 would look to the Forest Service, I mean I think

1 they're a strong partner with Admiralty Island  
2 Monument. That would definitely be the first that I  
3 would look at. I think that they have what's called  
4 hard targets and fish production can be one of those  
5 hard targets so I would work the system to, you know,  
6 demonstrate that you could set this as a target to  
7 improve the productivity of a system and it's  
8 measurable. So I think that would be one way.

9

10 I think there's a Northwest Fish  
11 Program that has money.

12

13 I don't really seek grants other than  
14 through the State and so I won't be doing that for 10  
15 years.....

16

17 (Laughter)

18

19 MR. REIFENSTUHL: .....but there are  
20 other sources I think that could be tapped.

21

22 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Anyone else.

23

24 (No comments)

25

26 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Well, thank you very  
27 much Steve. I really appreciate -- I just feel like I  
28 went through Salmon Rearing 101 and helpful to get all  
29 that information. Thank you very much for spending  
30 your time.

31

32 MR. REIFENSTUHL: You're welcome,  
33 thanks for having me.

34

35 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Next on the  
36 agenda is the National Park Service. Jim Capra. We  
37 haven't seen Jim in awhile, welcome back.

38

39 MR. CAPRA: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.  
40 Council. Even lightning hitting the plane couldn't  
41 keep me away.

42

43 (Laughter)

44

45 MR. CAPRA: My name is Jim Capra, I'm  
46 with the National Park Service and Park Ranger and  
47 subsistence coordinator for Glacier Bay.

48

49 The presentation today is for the Park  
50 Service's regulation on the horns and antlers and we're

1 asking for input from the RACs, from our SRCs and the  
2 general public for these regulations on harvesting  
3 natural products from animals and plants in the  
4 National Park Service lands. This is statewide.

5  
6 We have been working through the NEPA  
7 documents, the planning and review and the Park Service  
8 decided last April to go with a certain option that  
9 they modified slightly from the original plan. The  
10 problem is the default regulation for National Park  
11 Service lands is that people can't harvest natural  
12 products as a general rule and we have a regulation  
13 that says you can't pick up antlers, plants, rocks,  
14 with certain exceptions on all Park lands. In Alaska  
15 ANILCA recognizes that subsistence use of antlers,  
16 plants, other natural products from animals, whether  
17 it's a natural mortality or something that's shed every  
18 year like antlers is recognized as a normal use under  
19 Title VIII subsistence. So we needed to come up with a  
20 plan to formulate regulations to allow that.

21  
22 The Park Service has a draft set of  
23 regulations. We're working through that trying to get  
24 input on the actual regulations now. The general plan  
25 is to, of course, allow subsistence harvest of antlers,  
26 natural mortality with animals, plants, the biggest  
27 issue frankly has been the harvest of antlers because  
28 that has become a commercial enterprise in some parts  
29 of the state rather than the subsistence activity, and  
30 in the Parks, to allow them to stay as natural as  
31 possible we don't allow the commercial harvest  
32 generally of resources in the Parks, only the  
33 subsistence harvest. The proposed regulations, which  
34 are in the book recognize that Park Service qualified  
35 subsistence users can harvest antlers, natural  
36 products, things from natural mortalities of animals  
37 and plants with written authorization from the Park  
38 Superintendent. This is less restrictive than our  
39 first proposal, which actually specified that a written  
40 permit for everybody harvesting any subsistence  
41 resource of this type, that was just deemed unworkable.  
42 The written authorization from a Superintendent for a  
43 resource can take any multitude of forms. If it's a  
44 commonly harvested resource, it could just be a blanket  
45 letter or statement from the Superintendent saying any  
46 qualified user in the Park area that has C&T for, if  
47 it's an animal, for that species, say caribou, deer,  
48 moose, in that area of the Park can harvest the natural  
49 products from that animal, whether it's antlers, bones,  
50 claws, hooves, anything like that. It could be, if

1 it's a high value resource and it's fairly rare, and  
2 what comes up often is sheep horns, with the decline in  
3 sheep populations across the state it may be more  
4 restrictive and there'll be a limit on the number taken  
5 per year and folks would actually have to get a permit  
6 from the Park, an authorization to collect those  
7 things.

8  
9                   You know, the decision would be made  
10 basically to prevent any adverse impact on the  
11 resources. If there is a limited amount, a very  
12 limited amount out there, regulations for the written  
13 authorization would be more restrictive.

14  
15                   And it does allow for restrictions in  
16 certain areas where there's high public use or safety  
17 concerns to close an area to subsistence harvest. This  
18 would -- in Southeast this will address Glacier Bay  
19 Preserve or Dry Bay, and Unit 5B, most of it is  
20 Wrangell-St. Elias Park and Preserve in Southeast. And  
21 it would be blanket regulation for Alaska across all  
22 Park Service lands.

23  
24                   And the proposed regulation and  
25 definitions are on Page 60 of the meeting booklet.

26  
27                   There is a handicraft definition, what  
28 wild renewable products of wildlife is and defines  
29 barter and customary trade also.

30  
31                   The harvest for -- it specifically  
32 excludes trophy mounts from the definition of  
33 handicraft to reduce the amount of trophy traffic. And  
34 it does also recognize, as not quite separate, but the  
35 taking of furs and -- I'm sorry it's left my head now  
36 -- well, the taking of furs and the sale of those for  
37 cash as being recognized as a normal practice and  
38 customary and traditional -- furs and other activities  
39 that may be designated for specific areas by the  
40 Superintendent would be still recognized as customary  
41 and traditionally sold for cash instead of barter or  
42 trade.

43  
44                   Any comments or questions from the  
45 Council.

46  
47  
48                   (No comments)

49  
50                   CHAIRMAN BANGS: No questions.

1 Mike.

2

3 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Chairman. I  
4 don't have a question but I have a comment. I think  
5 it's a step in the right direction and it looks great  
6 to me particularly for the local people that would use  
7 them would be good.

8

9 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. Anyone  
10 else.

11

12 (No comments)

13

14 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you very much  
15 Jim.

16

17 MR. CAPRA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Nice  
18 to be here.

19

20 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. The next thing  
21 on the agenda is the update on the Stikine River  
22 subsistence fishery.

23

24 Mr. Larson.

25

26 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. My name's  
27 Robert Larson. And in addition to being the Council's  
28 coordinator I am also a fisheries biologist  
29 representing the Wrangell and Petersburg Ranger  
30 Districts. As part of the duties of that position I  
31 deal with management of the Stikine River subsistence  
32 fishery.

33

34 Before you today there is a briefing  
35 document, a two page entitled Stikine River Federal  
36 Subsistence Fisheries Management. In this document it  
37 provides a short background of how the fishery was  
38 started. It gives an idea of how we do management in-  
39 season. There's a permit that's required. We provide  
40 weekly harvest estimates to the Canadian and State of  
41 Alaska fisheries managers. There's a short section on  
42 fisheries performance. For instance in the 2014 season  
43 we had 125 households harvested 56 chinook salmon;  
44 1,527 sockeye and 143 cohos. In this system the king  
45 salmon that count are only large king salmon. So if  
46 they're not 30-inches or larger then they're in a  
47 separate category. But when we talk about Stikine  
48 River chinook salmon we're only talking about large  
49 fish, only those fish that are larger than 30 inches.  
50 There's other components that are -- if you look in the

1 reports you can find jack king salmon, they're called  
2 jack king salmon, they're also called short king  
3 salmon, they're also called other king salmon, but when  
4 you see a chinook salmon referenced in discussions of  
5 TransBoundary Rivers you're looking at fish that are  
6 larger than 30-inches. There's also seasons, when we  
7 report to the Canadians we talk about those fish that  
8 are harvested within our season.

9  
10 We've had closures in king salmon pre-  
11 season for 2013 and '14 and '15 the return forecast is  
12 such that we will not have a preseason closure. The  
13 king salmon season on the Stikine River subsistence  
14 fishery is a directed fishery. According to terms of  
15 the Pacific Salmon Treaty that means that we have to  
16 have the escapement goal plus 7,100 catch for both the  
17 U.S. and Canadian fisheries that are identified as  
18 something other than a directed fishery. Prior to  
19 initiating directed fisheries in either the United  
20 States or Canada and in our case we are a directed  
21 fishery so we're not part of the 7,100 fish base. A  
22 little confusing why we would actually have to have  
23 management actions closing our fishery but that's the  
24 reason, it's not necessarily for conservation, it's an  
25 artifact of a definition of our fisheries.

26  
27 We are now entering the time the  
28 Pacific Salmon Commission needs to rewrite the Pacific  
29 Salmon Treaty. Those Treaties are good for 10 years  
30 before they need to be reauthorized. We're now in the  
31 process of identifying which topics will be discussed  
32 and reviewed by the Bilateral Panels of the Pacific  
33 Salmon Commission. In our case there is a  
34 TransBoundary Panel and the three TransBoundary Rivers  
35 that are under consideration are the Alsek, the Taku  
36 and the Stikine River.

37  
38 The Alsek has a small subsistence  
39 harvest that is both managed by the State and the  
40 Federal government. We work together and as far as I  
41 know there's no issues or concerns in the Alsek. In  
42 the U.S. side there is some questions about the total  
43 return of king salmon to the Alsek River but the  
44 escapements have been on the low side but they've been  
45 above their minimum thresholds. What that means is  
46 there's been some restrictions in both U.S. and  
47 Canadian fishermen on king salmon in the Alsek River.

48  
49 The Stikine River chinook salmon  
50 forecast and returns have been large enough to provide

1 for escapements but they've also had restrictions both  
2 in the U.S. and Canada on the harvest of king salmon.  
3 One of the provisions is that in the Treaty that --  
4 especially at forecast levels that are lower, that we  
5 all do what we can for conservation and to allow a  
6 continuation of those fisheries that don't necessarily  
7 target Stikine River king salmon, they target sockeyes  
8 or, in fact -- in the U.S. fisheries that occur in  
9 marine waters where the harvest of Stikine River origin  
10 salmon is incidental, it's not a directed fishery.

11  
12 I, together with Gene Peltola,  
13 participated in the Bilateral TransBoundary Panel  
14 meeting in Vancouver this January and reported the  
15 results of that to the Federal Subsistence Board, the  
16 Board took that report in consideration when they  
17 adopted their proposal. Their direction to us was to  
18 pursue eliminating the guideline harvest levels for  
19 king salmon, cohos and sockeyes, eliminating those from  
20 Treaty language. That is consistent with the direction  
21 from the Councils in previous correspondences. They  
22 also adopted a regulation that requires subsistence  
23 fishers to check their nets twice daily. There were  
24 several proposals that had considerable more  
25 restrictive fisheries requirements, the Council did not  
26 recommend those changes and the Board, in fact,  
27 followed suit with the recommendation from the Council,  
28 almost exactly.

29  
30 If we look on the regulations that will  
31 be published for the next regulatory year it will still  
32 contain the guideline harvest levels. We will not  
33 manage directly for those guideline harvest levels, we  
34 will manage as part of a total U.S. allocation, the  
35 same as what we've done in previous years. But until  
36 we have -- because the guideline harvests are part of  
37 the Treaty, until the Treaty gets changed then they'll  
38 have to remain in Federal regulations because we can't  
39 act unilaterally to change our regulations if, in fact,  
40 they're also included within the Treaty language.

41  
42 And I think that's where we are.

43  
44 One of the last acts of the  
45 TransBoundary Panel of the Pacific Salmon Commission  
46 was to include the discussions regarding conduct of the  
47 Federal subsistence fishery including the guideline  
48 harvest levels, so we are on the list of topics that  
49 will be considered by the Pacific Salmon Commission.  
50 This is a long process, it's not going to be

1 implemented until 2019. Between now and 2019 the two  
2 countries will consider this long list of topics that  
3 will need to be agreed upon for changes to the Treaty  
4 and there are several that are meaningful, I think coho  
5 management on the Taku is going to be particularly  
6 vexam so we're -- but anyway we're on the list and I  
7 anticipate that because of the actions of the Board,  
8 that the Council's recommendations will be implemented,  
9 but I don't know when it will be.

10

11 And as long as I'm part of this process  
12 I'll come back and report to you, you know, on an  
13 annual basis.

14

15 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Robert.

16 Any questions.

17

18 (No comments)

19

20 CHAIRMAN BANGS: I have one question  
21 that involves the meetings that the Panel has had, has  
22 there been any discussion about the concerns about the  
23 mining operations on TransBoundary rivers.

24

25 MR. LARSON: Not part of -- the  
26 representatives that are part of the Panels are very  
27 much aware of mining activities that may occur in  
28 Canada that may affect water quality both in the rivers  
29 and subsequently in the marine waters of Southeast  
30 Alaska. I can tell you that they are very well aware  
31 of that. There was a special presentation by the  
32 equivalent of the Department of Natural Resources in  
33 Vancouver for those Panel members but it was very much  
34 a separate process. The process that is happening with  
35 the TransBoundary Panels is all about implementing the  
36 Pacific Salmon Treaty it's not about TransBoundary  
37 Mining.

38

39 So those people are interested, they're  
40 concerned, but it's a much different -- there's no  
41 nexus in that and they want to make sure that those are  
42 clearly separate processes.

43

44 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. Any

45 questions.

46

47

48 (No comments)

49

50 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Larson.

1                   Okay. I think it's about time for  
2 maybe a 15 minute break.

3  
4                   (Off record)

5  
6                   (On record)

7  
8                   CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay, thank you. Next  
9 on the agenda is wildlife stock status review and a  
10 summary of Board of Game. Jeff Reeves.

11  
12                   MR. REEVES: Good morning, Mr. Chairman  
13 and Council members. For the record my name is Jeff  
14 Reeves, I'm with the U.S. Forest Service.

15  
16                   Actually I will be presenting a brief  
17 report on a wildlife stock summary that's in front of  
18 you and a special action review sheet. So the Board of  
19 Game stuff will be taken in the next line item, I  
20 believe by Terry.

21  
22                   So there were two handouts given to you  
23 this morning. One is a front and back document, which  
24 should have a little colorized Forest Service logo in  
25 the top lefthand corner.

26  
27                   (Pause)

28  
29                   MR. REEVES: Anyway I was just asked to  
30 throw together just a short briefing on wildlife status  
31 kind of just within Southeast for you guys. The top  
32 part of this document there is basically -- the  
33 information in this came from a combination of either  
34 the unit-wide reports that the State area management  
35 biologists gave to the Board of Game in January at that  
36 meeting or through just personal conversations with the  
37 area management biologist. So if you need any real  
38 specific information regarding wildlife status for your  
39 area or populations, the area management biologists are  
40 listed here and the areas that they cover, so I really  
41 encourage you to contact them. There is also one  
42 biologist in the room here that I believe will be  
43 talking to you guys here in a little bit. So anything  
44 real specific I encourage you just to ask these State  
45 biologists.

46  
47                   But what this document is, is just a  
48 little briefing document, it's broken down by species.  
49 I'm not going to really delve into it but it just, like  
50 I said, it's a summary of comments from these area

1 management biologists as to the status or health of  
2 some of the populations of these species in the game  
3 management units. If there's any Federal permits or  
4 hunts on some of those species I tried to throw a  
5 little summary in there, too. So this is just  
6 basically a review document, feel free, I guess, to use  
7 it at a later point in possible consideration if you  
8 think there's a need for proposals, especially after  
9 Terry talks about Board of Game actions and such.

10

11                   The second document that you received  
12 is just one page with two different tables on it.

13

14                   The top table with the two rows, that  
15 is the current special actions that have been issued in  
16 2015. What you'll see on there is that the first one  
17 that happened this year was a closure in Unit 2 to  
18 subsistence hunting and trapping of wolves. It was  
19 initiated at the end of February when the harvest quota  
20 that was set at 25 as getting encroached upon and so  
21 there was a joint State and Federal closure that  
22 occurred the following weekend to allow trappers time  
23 to get their gear out. About a week to a week and a  
24 half after that another joint closure occurred, which  
25 wasn't probably too much of a surprise but that was on  
26 the fisheries side of things and it closed down  
27 District 1 to State and Federal subsistence fisheries  
28 for eulachon in that area.

29

30                   The bottom table, it's the table of  
31 last year's action and it's just more for reference.  
32 Those were discussed in prior meetings last year.

33

34                   The one thing that you'll just see is  
35 that the two that have occurred this year, they do show  
36 up on last years.

37

38                   That's all I have. If you have any  
39 questions I'll try to answer them.

40

41                   CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Jeff.

42

43                   Don.

44

45                   MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, thank you. I  
46 know with the Unuk River eulachons, you know, we've got  
47 an ongoing problem there and you've just kind of been  
48 giving the automatic, seems like automatic closures  
49 based on previous years poor returns, I was just  
50 wondering if you had anybody out there monitoring this

1 season to see what might show up so we can at least  
2 kind of get an idea of what's happening there.

3

4 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman. Mr.  
5 Hernandez. We don't have anyone physically on the site  
6 monitoring but we've been trying to get -- we do have a  
7 satellite driven camera that we've been trying to get  
8 on the location that, hopefully if that does its job,  
9 it lets the managers know daily, we can just click into  
10 a web file and see what's going on so if there is, all  
11 of a sudden, a big indication of seagulls then we can  
12 try to get on the ground.

13

14 Monday I was with the Ketchikan  
15 biologist and we actually did our first aerial survey  
16 and all I can tell you is it was pretty glum looking.  
17 We did not see any marine mammals staged anywhere, very  
18 few eagles and the few eagles that we did see were just  
19 sitting in trees up through the valleys, they weren't  
20 down along the river yet and seagulls were just non-  
21 existent, too. So hopefully they will start showing up  
22 at some point. But my understanding is they just did  
23 show up on the Stikine this week and I believe on the  
24 Nass or Skena, they've had some show up but as for the  
25 abundance right now, unless they're late, if the timing  
26 for these District 1 eulachon is -- between Skena and  
27 Nass and the Stikine then, you know, it may not be a  
28 good showing. But we just hadn't -- when I say, we,  
29 the State or the Feds, we just hadn't seen any real  
30 positive increasing trends and so the assumption is  
31 that this years returns are still off of some of those  
32 bad years.

33

34 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other questions  
35 for Jeff.

36

37

38 (No comments)

39

40 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Jeff. Call  
41 for Federal hunting and trapping regulatory proposals.  
42 Terry.

43

44 MR. SUMINSKI: Good morning, Mr.  
45 Chairman and Council members. Terry Suminski with the  
46 Forest Service, Subsistence Program Leader for the  
47 Tongass.

48

49 I was going to start out with a report  
50 on the Board of Game meeting earlier this year if

1 that's all right.

2

3

(Council nods affirmatively)

4

5

MR. SUMINSKI: So the Alaska Board of Game met in Juneau January 9th to the 13th. I attended along with Ms. Needham as she was representing the Council and Cal sat in and George Pappas represented OSM. I just wanted to start out by saying we were -- I think the comments by the Councils were very well received by the Board. We had excellent support from the Department of Fish and Game and it just seemed just like a very welcoming environment. I think things went really well, you know, overall.

15

16

I distributed a handout that's entitled Alaska Board of Game action on 2014/15 proposals, and I think you've received this through email previously. So I wasn't going to go into a whole lot of detail on that, just I kind of picked out the top three proposals that I thought the Council might be interested in but other than that you're welcome to ask questions on any of them.

24

25

The first proposal was to reduce the harvest level of wolves in Unit 2 from 30 percent to 20 percent of the fall population and that wounded wolves would count against the hunter's bag limit for the regulatory year. The Council submitted comments supporting this proposal. The Council rationale was that the wolf population was at an appropriate level. 20 percent harvest provides sufficient management flexibility at this time and it can change later if needed and it addresses current ESA listing concerns.

35

36

The Board of Game actually supported part of the proposal. They supported the part that reduced the quota from 30 to 20 percent, but they did not support the part that wounded wolves would count against individual's harvest limit. But they did encourage voluntary reporting and if a wolf was voluntarily reported to the Department -- and the Department determined that those wounds would have resulted in the mortality of that wolf it would count against the quota. The Board's rationale is listed there, you know, the 30 percent quota is working but a quota of 20 percent better reflects how wolves are managed and is more transparent to the public and the proposed endangered species listing process. The recent population estimates are much better. The part

1 about wounding loss they decided not to accept that  
2 because of the difficulty in determining what actually  
3 is a mortal wound and it would just result in some  
4 difficulties and be an objective on that.

5  
6 The next proposal I thought would be of  
7 interest is Proposal 15 and this would allow trappers  
8 to take beavers in Unit 2 with a firearm. The Council  
9 supported this action because of increased opportunity  
10 for subsistence users. The Board of Game supported  
11 this proposal, but not only supported it for Unit 2 but  
12 expanded it through all units, 1 through 5. And the  
13 rationale was that this practice is allowed in other  
14 parts of the state and beaver are often used for food  
15 and this would allow people to take beaver for food  
16 immediately rather than taking them out of a trap after  
17 they've been soaking for a day or whatever.

18  
19 Proposal 28, the Council did not  
20 comment on this one but the Board of Game decided that  
21 the wolverine season should be extended and let's see  
22 -- under current regulations the Federal season extends  
23 through March 1st, the extension by the Board of Game  
24 would extend the State season through February 28th, so  
25 it's within a day of the Federal season. So I just  
26 wanted to point that out that they're now virtually the  
27 same.

28  
29 So that's all I really wanted to point  
30 out in detail. The rest of the proposals that the  
31 Council commented on are listed on that document and if  
32 there's any questions on that I'd be happy to address  
33 them.

34  
35 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Terry. Are  
36 there any questions.

37  
38 (No comments)

39  
40 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Hearing none, thank  
41 you.

42  
43 MR. SUMINSKI: Okay.

44  
45 CHAIRMAN BANGS: You have the next  
46 thing.

47  
48 MR. SUMINSKI: Yeah, the next thing I'd  
49 like to talk about is wildlife proposals to change the  
50 Federal subsistence wildlife regulations are due next

1 Wednesday, March 25th. And I thought I would suggest  
2 some proposals that the Council may be interested in  
3 proposing or thinking about writing proposals for.

4  
5 The first one is the beaver proposal  
6 that the Board of Game adopted which would allow beaver  
7 to be taken with a firearm. Currently, you know,  
8 Federal subsistence users can certainly operate under  
9 the State regulations and take beaver but for  
10 consistency if you'd like to submit a proposal to make  
11 State and Federal regulations the same, that would be,  
12 really, the only purpose.

13  
14 And could -- is it okay if I talk  
15 about.....

16  
17 MR. DOUVILLE: (Nods affirmatively)

18  
19 MR. SUMINSKI: .....yeah, I was working  
20 with Mike Douville on a proposal that would require  
21 deer hunters in Unit 2 to use tag number 5 when  
22 harvesting a doe. Because right now in Unit 2 you can  
23 take five deer, one of which may be a doe, and there's  
24 some concern about people not properly accounting for  
25 those does that are taken. So the idea would be that  
26 tag number 5 would be reserved for taking of a doe once  
27 that's punched, you know, then you wouldn't be able to  
28 use any other tags for does. You could also use tag  
29 number 5 for a buck if you chose not to take a doe.

30  
31 So that's one proposal.

32  
33 And then in the process of looking  
34 into, you know, creating some of these proposals, I  
35 found some other, one was Susan Ohelers, some other --  
36 I think they're just housekeeping proposals in our  
37 regulations.

38  
39 The one is for Unit 2 deer, when the  
40 working group originally established those regulations  
41 they went to a five deer limit, one of which would be  
42 does. But I guess at the time there was some concern  
43 that that limit may be too high so they put in kind of  
44 a safeguard that in times of conservation that the bag  
45 limit could be reduced to four deer. So that was fine  
46 at the time but since then we've gotten in-season  
47 delegation to the Federal managers and what that does  
48 is -- since it's a regulation established by the Board  
49 we can't go any different than that. You know, the in-  
50 season managers can't go different than the four deer

1 bag limit so really the only option would be to close  
2 the season in times of conservation or if you wanted to  
3 go less than four. It's really basically not needed  
4 anymore because with in-season management we have much  
5 more flexibility to establish seasons, bag limits, open  
6 and close the seasons. So I think it's kind of an  
7 artifact, you know, since we've gotten delegation of  
8 authority we really don't need it in regulation anymore  
9 and it actually hampers in-season management.

10

11 So that's one proposal.

12

13 Another proposal, in the Yakutat area  
14 we have two moose regulations that mention the Nunatak  
15 Bench area as a specific hunt area but we have no  
16 definition in our regulations for that Nunatak Bench  
17 area so this proposal would simply provide that  
18 definition. And we've worked with the Park Service and  
19 Steve Kessler worked on it before he left and we think  
20 we have a pretty good definition that would fit the  
21 Federal regulations. The other one is -- and, again,  
22 looking at the Yakutat area, we noticed that there was  
23 -- not only Yakutat, but three places in our  
24 regulations it specifies that hunters can take one  
25 antlered bull, but it also says that you have to get a  
26 State registration permit. But the State regulations  
27 you can take any bull so the Federal regulations are --  
28 the antlered bull really doesn't make any difference.  
29 I mean you could take antlered bulls plus you could  
30 take a non-antlered bull under the State regulations.  
31 So it really just doesn't need to be there. So for  
32 Units, I think it's -- let me just check here -- so,  
33 yes in Unit 1A is a place where it mentions antlered  
34 bull, 1C remainder and 5B, and I think in those three  
35 hunts we could cross off antlered just to make it more  
36 square with the State hunt, which in our regulations  
37 it's required to get the State registration permit  
38 anyways.

39

40 So that's all I had as far as suggested  
41 proposals for wildlife regulatory changes. If you have  
42 any questions I'd be happy to answer those.

43

44 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Anybody have any  
45 questions of Terry.

46

47 Don.

48

49 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, thank you, Mr.  
50 Chairman.

1 Terry, could you explain to me, again,  
2 what the -- how the in-season management works on Unit  
3 2 and what the possibilities are there, I got a little  
4 confused.

5  
6 MR. SUMINSKI: Through the Chair, Mr.  
7 Hernandez. I understand the confusion.

8  
9 Our delegated authority to the in-  
10 season managers is we can't be more liberal than what's  
11 in regulation, we can only -- yeah, we can only -- it's  
12 so weird because it's backwards the way this works with  
13 our delegation. But typically if the Board sets a  
14 regulation we can only be more conservative than that.  
15 But in this case, since there is this conservative,  
16 where the Board specifically said, this is the lowest  
17 you can -- you can read it -- it was meant to reduce it  
18 by one deer but it also limits us from going any lower  
19 because it's in regulation. It says if you need to  
20 reduce the bag limit because of conservation you have  
21 to go to four deer, you can't go to three, you can't go  
22 to two, you can't go to one. And that's just the way  
23 -- it's really kind of weird to think about the way  
24 delegations normally work. That's why it's just kind  
25 of out of step with how we manage deer anywhere else  
26 in-season.

27  
28 MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. I think I  
29 understand that. Does the way the regulations read,  
30 does the in-season management, would it apply to the  
31 doe hunt, could you, as a conservation concern do away  
32 with the taking of does if you need to, according to  
33 the way the regulations work now?

34  
35 MR. SUMINSKI: Through the Chair, Mr.  
36 Hernandez. Yes, we could eliminate doe hunting the way  
37 it's written right now. Because then you would only be  
38 going down to four deer. But, yeah, hunting does, you  
39 know, we've done that before in Unit 4 where we've  
40 reduced the -- well, reduce -- eliminated doe hunting,  
41 so that's definitely within our delegated authority to  
42 the in-season managers. Yes.

43  
44 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Douville.

45  
46 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Chairman.  
47 How would limiting a rural user in the case you're  
48 talking about, reducing the harvest, how would that  
49 affect other users. There's specific language that is  
50 in ANILCA that says before you limit rural users you

1 first have to address other users.

2

3 MR. SUMINSKI: Mr. Douville, through  
4 the Chair. Yeah, that wouldn't be the first step we  
5 would take to, you know, reduce the bag limit for  
6 Federally-qualified users. Depending on the situation,  
7 you know, it would -- maybe eliminate doe hunting, just  
8 depends how bad the situation, there would be a variety  
9 of options. One of those could include eliminating  
10 non-Federally-qualified first and then if it was bad  
11 enough you would continue on, you know, in various  
12 actions to control the harvest. But, you know -- and  
13 typically, at least since I've been involved we haven't  
14 really played too much with the bag limits. It's  
15 generally we look at doe closures or area or time  
16 closures, bag limits aren't all that effective for  
17 controlling harvest. So it's really -- it's, again,  
18 like I said, I think it's mainly a housekeeping issue  
19 with this regulation, it's just not needed anymore and  
20 it just kind of complicates things in a technical way  
21 but not necessarily how we would manage deer in-season.

22

23 Thank you.

24

25 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other questions.

26

27 Mike.

28

29 MR. DOUVILLE: Yeah, I was hoping that  
30 the Council would consider that proposal and I don't  
31 know if you have seen it or would like to look at it  
32 before we even get that far, if that's a possibility.

33

34 MR. SUMINSKI: Mr. Douville, through  
35 the Chair. I think the idea was that we could -- I was  
36 talking to Mr. Larson, we could put these proposals up  
37 on a screen and you could look at them a little bit  
38 later in the agenda when you get into some of your  
39 action items, if that would suit the Council we'd be  
40 happy to do that.

41

42 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yes, thank you, Terry.  
43 I think that would be a good way to go about it and  
44 then we could go through all these different scenarios  
45 and maybe somebody else has an idea of a proposal that  
46 they would be interested in the Council generating and  
47 then we could direct Staff to make up a proposal for  
48 us.

49

50 (Council nods affirmatively)

1 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay, thank you.  
2  
3 MR. SUMINSKI: Thank you.  
4  
5 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Go ahead, Terry.  
6  
7 (Laughter)  
8  
9 MR. SUMINSKI: Mr. Chairman, Council  
10 members. Terry Suminski with the Forest Service.  
11  
12 (Laughter)  
13  
14 MR. SUMINSKI: I really don't have much  
15 to report on the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program  
16 at this point.  
17  
18 We had a call for proposals that went  
19 out in December and that call just closed this last  
20 Wednesday so at this point I don't know how many  
21 proposals we received, but the process from hereon is  
22 we'll validate those proposals. They'll go through  
23 Staff work and then Technical Review Committee  
24 recommendation so this fall you'll have a chance to  
25 consider the Technical Review recommendation and  
26 prioritize those projects for funding from the  
27 proposals that we've received. But unfortunately I  
28 don't have the -- I know of one proposal that we  
29 received but I don't know how many we got. So there's  
30 really not much to say about it at this point.  
31  
32 Thank you.  
33  
34 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any questions.  
35  
36 (No comments)  
37  
38 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay, thank you,  
39 Terry.  
40  
41 MR. SUMINSKI: Thank you.  
42  
43 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay, now, we're down  
44 to the review and approval of the 2014 Annual Report  
45 and you'll find that on Page 70. Mr. Larson.  
46  
47 MR. LARSON: Tell us what to do and  
48 then we'll do it.  
49  
50 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Okay, what

1 we'll do is have a chance to look this over, maybe look  
2 at the annual report at lunchtime if you haven't read  
3 it already. What I think -- I've been told that it  
4 might be prudent for us to go through the proposal  
5 process and tell Staff what we're interested in doing  
6 for proposals on those things that we've just  
7 discussed, direct Staff to draw up the proposals and  
8 then we can look at them later in the meeting and  
9 decide how we want to change them or adopt them.

10

11 So if we could back up just a little  
12 bit and start with the deer tag identification type  
13 proposal that we were talking about as far as Unit 2  
14 and how we're going to deal with the doe tag. I think  
15 Mr. Douville had an idea on how that might be addressed  
16 through a proposal.

17

18 Mike.

19

20 MR. DOUVILLE: There seems to be some  
21 issues with accountability with the system that is  
22 there now. Several years ago, before I was even on the  
23 Council, there was a proposal to be able to harvest  
24 four does in Unit 2 and I argued against it, but there  
25 was customary and traditional the doe season was  
26 established and it's not going to go away, however, it  
27 was reduced to one. And my request at that time was  
28 to, okay, then fix it so it's accountable, and it was  
29 through a special permit you had to go to the Forest  
30 Service and get. And that took care of your doe hunt  
31 and it was an accountable thing, which was fine.  
32 Somehow that went away somewhere and now we just have  
33 five tags, one of which you can use to take the doe but  
34 they're not specific and there's really no  
35 accountability and enforcement has trouble with it.  
36 And, you know, we know that users being who they are,  
37 you know, can and will fudge sometimes. So using like  
38 one tag like five out of sequence for a doe only could  
39 use for a buck, but if you were going to take a doe  
40 after October 15th when the season opens you could only  
41 use tag five out of sequence and once you used that  
42 well then you were done doe hunting and that offers  
43 accountability, which it doesn't put any burden on the  
44 user in any way. It just helps with the accountability  
45 and to me it's more of a housekeeping thing.

46

47 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Don.

48

49 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.  
50 Chairman. It does occur to me though that if we were

1 to adopt a regulation like that we may also have to ask  
2 the State to follow suit because I guess my  
3 understanding is now it's a requirement with the State  
4 that you use your tags in sequence. So I guess that  
5 would be a question I would have if that's going to,  
6 you know, be necessary for the State to change their  
7 regulation as well.

8

9 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Douville.

10

11 MR. DOUVILLE: It may involve the State  
12 but on the other hand only rural users are qualified to  
13 take does on Federal land only in Unit 2 and there is  
14 no State doe hunt so I don't see it as being a big  
15 problem. However, the State does designate tags to be  
16 used in specific areas although they have to be used in  
17 sequence, I think Mitkof you can only use tag one if  
18 you're going to take a deer on Mitkof. So they do use  
19 that as a tool, not quite like I'm suggesting but it is  
20 used as sort of a tool in that way.

21

22 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yes. I.....

23

24 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair.

25

26 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yes, Mr. Larson.

27

28 MR. LARSON: For the sake of moving the  
29 process along, I would recommend that if, in fact, the  
30 Council would like us to produce a proposal on this  
31 subject that the appropriate action at this point would  
32 be to direct us to draft up a proposal for your review  
33 and provide us just some general guidelines and then we  
34 can do it and talk about the specifics and then we'll  
35 be able to use that proposal to have some advice from  
36 our State counterparts, our State subject matter  
37 experts and resolve some of these questions. I think  
38 some of the items that we'll talk about -- if we get  
39 into the proposal without seeing the proposal are  
40 really not appropriate at this stage in the development  
41 of the proposal. So that's my advice. If we want to  
42 move forward with this type of proposal, give us some  
43 sideboards, let us produce a proposal, we'll have a  
44 document that we've put some thought into and then you  
45 can review and edit it prior to final adoption.

46

47 Thank you.

48

49 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Larson.

50 I think that this seems like a logical approach to

1 dealing with the abuse that could be happening with  
2 using the doe tag and using it again and again and  
3 again if you don't have a specific tag for the doe. So  
4 I think it's a good proposal that we should look at.  
5 What's the thoughts on that with the Council.

6

7

Don.

8

9

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I  
10 definitely agree with Mike that we need to address the  
11 situation and doing it in a relatively simple way using  
12 tags, it -- you know, people already have -- it's  
13 already part of the system would make a lot of sense.  
14 So I think we should at least pursue this. We might  
15 end up having to deal with the State on making it some  
16 kind of a joint management there. But, yeah, we should  
17 definitely pursue some kind of a proposal.

18

19

CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Does everybody  
20 agree that this is probably a good direction to go and  
21 have them draw us up a proposal and then we could  
22 discuss it.

23

24

(Council nods affirmatively)

25

26

CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Next type of  
27 proposal, the description of the Nunatak Bench. What  
28 is the will of the Council on that.

29

30

(No comments)

31

32

CHAIRMAN BANGS: I think it's probably  
33 more of a housekeeping type of proposal that would make  
34 it easier for users to understand.

35

36

Mr. Larson.

37

38

MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. This is of  
39 sufficient weight that it's not an administrative --  
40 there's no administrative avenue, we can't do it for  
41 you, but we think it needs to get done so we'd  
42 appreciate a proposal.

43

44

CHAIRMAN BANGS: Does the Council think  
45 that's a good idea.

46

47

(Council nods affirmatively)

48

49

CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Direct them to  
50 put a proposal together for the description.

1                   The delegation of authority for in-  
2 season managers in Unit 2 deer limits, to reduce the  
3 Unit 2 deer limits. So Terry explained to us that  
4 they're only allowed to reduce it by one deer and it  
5 seems like a housekeeping proposal to make it.....  
6

7                   Don.  
8

9                   MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.  
10 Chairman. Yeah, I think Terry's explanation was a  
11 little complex but understandable now so I think -- it  
12 is something that needs to be addressed and we should  
13 put in a proposal along those lines.  
14

15                   CHAIRMAN BANGS: I see some agreeing  
16 with that one as well.  
17

18                   (Council nods affirmatively)  
19

20                   CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. The proposal or  
21 the potential housekeeping proposal on the one antlered  
22 bull so it mirrors the State proposal or State  
23 regulation. Anybody have any thoughts on that.  
24

25                   Yeah, John.  
26

27                   MR. YEAGER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I  
28 feel we should just take the procedure there and have  
29 the proposal drafted so we could look at it.  
30

31                   CHAIRMAN BANGS: Everybody in  
32 agreement.  
33

34                   (Council nods affirmatively)  
35

36                   CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay, does that cover  
37 them all -- oh, the use to allow the firearms to trap  
38 beaver, I don't know how you trap them with a rifle  
39 but.....  
40

41                   (Laughter)  
42

43                   CHAIRMAN BANGS: .....that was another  
44 one that the State had adopted, and it would be a  
45 housekeeping, I guess, to mirror their regulations and  
46 make it not more restrictive for subsistence users but  
47 to give them the equal option.  
48

49                   Mike.  
50

1 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
2 Well, the State administers trapping even on Federal  
3 land and I don't know if it's considered subsistence or  
4 not and I don't even know if it's necessary to even  
5 have to do that.

6  
7 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Larson.

8  
9 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. Unless the  
10 Council or the Board changes the current regulations it  
11 would be legal to trap a beaver under State regulations  
12 with a firearm but illegal for subsistence users under  
13 our regulations to do that same activity. The Council  
14 recommended that the Board adopt that regulation change  
15 for Unit 2, that was the proposal that was in front of  
16 the Council at the time. So that's -- anyway that's  
17 the situation we have right now is that it would  
18 currently be legal under State rules but illegal under  
19 our Federal subsistence rules.

20  
21 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other thoughts.  
22 Cathy.

23  
24 MS. NEEDHAM: That was my understanding  
25 from when we went to the Board of Game, that the Board  
26 stated that they'd hope to see a similar regulation  
27 come out of the subsistence side of things.

28  
29 And that original proposal before the  
30 State was for Unit 2 but the Board actually passed it  
31 across all units and looked at potentially going  
32 statewide in other areas as well, I think. My  
33 understanding of it is right now since they adopted  
34 that regulation the subsistence regulations were more  
35 restrictive in this regard and so I would support,  
36 actually, putting a forward to make sure that  
37 subsistence users are allowed to do the same under  
38 those regulations.

39  
40 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Anyone else.

41  
42 Mr. Jackson.

43  
44 MR. JACKSON: Yeah, I would support and  
45 this is something we talked about back in Kake, is we'd  
46 like to teach the children what their elders used to do  
47 and that was to eat the beavers after -- you know,  
48 rather than just taking the pelts and taking them the  
49 same day without having to trap them and leave them in  
50 there would be probably better for us to train them, to

1 cook and eat it.

2

3 Thank you.

4

5 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Ken. Mike.

6

7 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Chairman. I  
8 would agree with Cathy, after listening to it  
9 explained, it would make sense for us to make a  
10 proposal.

11

12 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay, does everyone  
13 agree.

14

15 (Council nods affirmatively)

16

17 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. We'll go  
18 forward with that one.

19

20 And I think that does it for the -- was  
21 there anymore. Any more proposals that people feel  
22 like they would like to have submitted.

23

24 (No comments)

25

26 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Well, hearing none I  
27 guess we'll have those drafted up and maybe we'll get  
28 them up on the screen and we can discuss them later on  
29 in the meeting.

30

31 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. Regarding the  
32 timeline for that I suggest we set aside a time prior  
33 to agenda Item 13, it would be after agency reports and  
34 we can -- I think we have time if we adjust the  
35 presentations at this point we will have adequate time  
36 either this afternoon or tomorrow morning to do that  
37 work.

38

39 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Larson.

40

41 Okay. We're down to our annual report.  
42 I guess we could probably break for lunch. I don't  
43 think I gave us enough time yesterday for lunch,  
44 everybody was kind of scrambling. I know there's not  
45 too many restaurants to choose from at this time of  
46 year and so maybe we could break for lunch now and come  
47 back at 1:00 o'clock, would that be okay, that would  
48 give us an hour and a half.

49

50 Mr. Hernandez.

1 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, thank you, Mr.  
2 Chairman. Was today the day of the fundraiser dinner,  
3 is there anybody that can remind us, I can't remember.  
4  
5 MR. LARSON: It's at noon.  
6  
7 CHAIRMAN BANGS: And that's at noon.  
8  
9 MR. LARSON: Noon to 2:00.  
10  
11 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Noon to 2:00, okay,  
12 well, then I guess we won't break then, I'm glad you  
13 guys reminded me of that. I apologize.  
14  
15 Well, we could try to get through the  
16 annual report if everybody feels comfortable with what  
17 they've read in it so far, we could discuss that and  
18 that will put us up to about noon.  
19  
20 (Pause)  
21  
22 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any discussion on the  
23 annual report.  
24  
25 (No comments)  
26  
27 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Anything that we would  
28 like to add.  
29  
30 Mr. Schroeder.  
31  
32 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, is this  
33 an appropriate time to talk about correspondence and  
34 the lack of which correspondence gets through the  
35 Federal process.  
36  
37 CHAIRMAN BANGS: If you feel that's  
38 something that we might mention on the annual report, I  
39 think this would be a good time to discuss it.  
40  
41 MR. SCHROEDER: I'd like to see if  
42 other Council members would weigh in on that and see if  
43 we want to make that an annual report item.  
44  
45 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Cathy.  
46  
47 MS. NEEDHAM: I agree with Mr.  
48 Schroeder's statements from earlier in our meeting that  
49 there seems to have been a problem more recently of  
50 Council correspondence getting to its destination in a

1 timely manner. There are a number of letters that  
2 we've written. We had, you know, the one that we did  
3 to NSRAA that wasn't delivered. We're unsure where the  
4 TransBoundary Mining letter is in terms of being  
5 forwarded to the Secretary of State. We just seem to  
6 write these letters -- we made comments to the Board of  
7 Game and the Board of Game hadn't received our comments  
8 prior to their meeting to be put in their record so  
9 they were given that at their meeting, and I think the  
10 same thing happened with the Board of Fish. So I think  
11 it might be important to put into our annual letter.

12

13                   You know, the last time we put  
14 something like this in our annual letter regarding how  
15 we never got our Council materials, now we get our  
16 Council materials early so it's good to raise this to  
17 the Federal Subsistence Board and let them know that  
18 we're concerned that letters that we are drafting  
19 aren't being delivered in a timely fashion.

20

21                   CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Cathy.

22 Anyone else.

23

24                   (No comments)

25

26                   CHAIRMAN BANGS: I would agree with  
27 both Mr. Schroeder and Ms. Needham.

28

29                   MR. SCHROEDER: Through the Chair.

30

31                   CHAIRMAN BANGS: Go ahead, Bob.

32

33                   MR. SCHROEDER: Robert, I don't have a  
34 copy of my Council manual, could you refresh us on the  
35 correspondence policy.

36

37                   (Laughter)

38

39                   MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. The  
40 correspondence policy has been unchanged since 2007  
41 regarding content. The most recent changes in process,  
42 I believe, or maybe what is, you know, evolving needs  
43 to be addressed. And it's to the best of my knowledge  
44 that the Office of Subsistence Management is aware of  
45 this. But the process that is different now is that  
46 all of our correspondence for filing and recordkeeping  
47 purposes for archiving has a file code. It seems a  
48 fairly simple requirement to include a file code on  
49 Council correspondence but I think it's an evolving  
50 internal process that needs, you know, it needs some

1 fine-tuning. It's also a process of a review of  
2 factual and legal policy reviews that are sometimes  
3 slow in coming so there is some changes to the  
4 correspondence policy. It's not changes to the policy  
5 itself, it's changes to the process on how those  
6 letters get delivered.

7

8 MR. SCHROEDER: Well, just to follow up  
9 and as much to put things on the record for when you  
10 write this up, Bob. I'd just note that the Council  
11 only has the opportunity to meet twice a year and that  
12 everybody's a volunteer on the Council and is putting  
13 in a lot of time and effort to be on top of issues and  
14 when the Council decides that it's important to  
15 communicate on issues with other agencies is because  
16 they're important for subsistence uses in Southeast  
17 Alaska. If our comments and our letters are not  
18 getting through that's seriously restricting the  
19 effectiveness of this Council.

20

21 I don't believe the Council has any  
22 desire or intention to somehow get sideways with the  
23 Program or not have the Program informed as to what we  
24 do. We are part of the Federal Subsistence Program,  
25 it's not that somehow there is them and us in this  
26 respect. However, we absolutely have to be able to  
27 communicate. This is our stated purpose for the  
28 Council's existence, which is mentioned and directed in  
29 ANILCA. ANILCA does not have any mention of a  
30 correspondence policy wherein the communications of the  
31 Council need to go through legal or technical filters  
32 before the Council is able to communicate these things.  
33 Likewise, the Council is -- there's nothing in ANILCA  
34 that says that Council communication needs to be  
35 approved by some other entity other than the Council.

36

37 So I think this is just -- hearing Ms.  
38 Needham's statements, that tracking some of these  
39 things, I think this is a really serious issue and so  
40 it's one that requires action. I even wonder whether  
41 the Council might be interested in a more direct  
42 communication if our communications are not going  
43 through, and that communications to the Board of  
44 Fisheries or Board of Game, these aren't really  
45 controversial things. Many of the Board members here  
46 write their own letters to the Board of Game and Board  
47 of Fish and are familiar with those processes. Other  
48 things are really important, if the TransBoundary  
49 communication has not gone through, well, the train  
50 will leave the station sometime without the input from

1 this Council.

2

3                   So I guess I strongly support doing  
4 something on this. I'm not sure exactly how strident  
5 we should be at this moment so I obviously favor being  
6 pretty firm on this issue and that an answer saying  
7 that, well, there are changes in course and it takes  
8 awhile to do things and et cetera, et cetera, I don't  
9 find that satisfying and I wouldn't find it satisfying  
10 if that was the response to this question.

11

12                   CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.  
13 Schroeder.

14

15                   Any other comments.

16

17                   (No comments)

18

19                   CHAIRMAN BANGS: I'm wondering if it  
20 would be appropriate if we held off on making any  
21 action on our annual report until we saw if -- if Staff  
22 could draw up the conversation leading towards  
23 something we could add to it with correspondence, that  
24 we could make sure that everybody's aware and feels  
25 good with what we have already here so when we do bring  
26 this back up we can go over the correspondence issue  
27 and then take action on the whole annual report.  
28 Unless there's something else we could add to that, we  
29 should do that at this time; is there any other issues  
30 that you would like to add.

31

32                   (No comments)

33

34                   CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay, I think that's  
35 what we'll do. Is we'll just allow Staff time to draw  
36 up another issue response to the Board concerning  
37 communication and then we'll deal with the annual  
38 report at that time.

39

40                   I have one other thing. I wanted to  
41 give Mr. Wallace a chance to respond to the petition --  
42 or the proposal on rural determination, he said he had  
43 a short presentation that he didn't -- he wasn't able  
44 to give to us but it did make it to the Federal Board  
45 and he wanted us to be aware of that, and he wanted to  
46 do it after lunch so I just want to make sure that if  
47 we come back at 2:00 o'clock after this fundraiser, is  
48 that going to be too late.

49

50                   MR. WALLACE: That's fine.

1 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay, that'll work  
2 then, we'll do that after lunch.  
3  
4 I guess the fundraiser goes from noon  
5 to 2:00, right, is that correct.  
6  
7 MR. WRIGHT: We probably don't have to  
8 stay there the whole time.  
9  
10 (Laughter)  
11  
12 MR. WALLACE: Mr. Chair.  
13  
14 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yes.  
15  
16 MR. WALLACE: Mr. Chair. I could do  
17 that now if it would be better for the Council.  
18  
19 CHAIRMAN BANGS: If that works for you  
20 that would probably be appropriate and we could --  
21 yeah, this would be a good time.  
22  
23 MR. WALLACE: Again, thank you, Chair  
24 and thank you Council. Lee Wallace, W-A-L-L-A-C-E.  
25  
26 REPORTER: Thanks, Lee.  
27  
28 (Laughter)  
29  
30 MR. WALLACE: Thank you for this time.  
31  
32 You know last night wasn't the venue  
33 for questions as it was presented. In this venue,  
34 however, with sitting at the Advisory Council there is  
35 that opportunity for interaction and dialogue and we do  
36 thank this Council for past dialogue and for past  
37 support.  
38  
39 I guess what I want to walk away with  
40 today or actually before I leave Sitka tomorrow, is  
41 kind of a firm understanding and a firm stance of the  
42 Southeast RAC as far as their written comments that  
43 they're going to bring forth to the FSB. Because next  
44 Monday Dan and I are going to be up at the tribal  
45 consultation at Anchorage. And it was actually asked  
46 if Chairman Mike will be on board with the tribal  
47 consultation and in my viewpoint I do hope so because  
48 the RACs have been a vital part of this change and  
49 then, again, I stated last night that the RAC Chairs  
50 have been present at the FSB Boards and, again, that's

1 vital because they give vital input from your region.  
2 And so I certainly hope that Mike will be in attendance  
3 at the tribal consultation.

4  
5 I know at that first day at the FSB  
6 last January they had the tribal consultation circle  
7 and I mentioned that it's a new process and it's  
8 evolving and hopefully it's going to continue going  
9 down the right direction for gathering input and  
10 dialogue for tribal governments and the Federal  
11 government agency and the FSB and so that's why I  
12 really want to see Mike attend that meeting.

13  
14 Are you going to attend, Mike.

15  
16 CHAIRMAN BANGS: I hadn't planned on  
17 attending it. I haven't been given permission to  
18 attend it but I will look into it.

19  
20 MR. WALLACE: Yes. And I'll make  
21 contact also with some officials and see if we can have  
22 you there as well as all the other Regional Advisory  
23 Chairmans. Again, I think it's a pretty vital part of  
24 this whole process.

25  
26 Like I said I really want to leave  
27 Sitka here with the good knowledge that you guys have  
28 taken into consideration what you heard last night. Of  
29 course your Council coordinator was down in Saxman and  
30 he heard testimonies and comments from Saxman as well  
31 as supporters of Saxman. You know, we had ANB, ANS  
32 file letters and resolutions in support of the changes.  
33 We had the local Tlingit and Haida Central Council  
34 Chapter of Saxman submit a letter and resolution in  
35 support of the changes. And not only did they do -- in  
36 part of their letters and resolutions they -- you know,  
37 when Pippa presented the slide show both last night and  
38 she read through it this morning, you know, the  
39 question is do you agree or disagree and, if so, why,  
40 and I believe Saxman and our supporters that put forth  
41 resolutions and letters they answered those questions  
42 of why. And first and foremost I'll go through the  
43 bullet points of the whys.

44  
45 We certainly agree with the elimination  
46 of the 10 year review period. Here we are 99 months  
47 past 2006 and we're still dealing with it, so let's  
48 eliminate that and that was clearly presented both in  
49 Saxman as well as last night and, again, I'm going to  
50 say it here, we're certainly against the 10 year review

1 period.

2

3 Of course we agree with the Regional  
4 Advisory Councils having deference.

5

6 You know I served on the Council some  
7 years ago for a brief time and I observed the non-  
8 deference that the Councils had not -- had not received  
9 the deference. But now I see the deference happening  
10 and that should continue, it's a good thing. You guys  
11 hear from the local Southeast region and you guys  
12 brings that message back to the Anchorage meetings so  
13 that's really vital.

14

15 And, yes, we agree with the  
16 simplification.

17

18 What Pippa presented was a very one  
19 page -- one page, and actually it's a lot longer than  
20 one page of all the redlining they did in the April  
21 2014 meeting. When we attended the April 2014 FSB  
22 meeting I, quite frankly told them, I said, with all  
23 those alternatives they could turn to, I think there  
24 was about 10 of them, to change the way things are and  
25 I said, really none of those really speak for Saxman.  
26 There was very little change in those alternatives.  
27 And as a result, and maybe not just my comments, but  
28 others, you know, the FSB Board decided to throw all  
29 those out and redline them and that's why we got to the  
30 simplification that you seen on the screen and that  
31 simplification giving Regional Advisory Councils more  
32 flexibility and not only the Regional Advisory Councils  
33 by the FSB more flexibility. Because I think with the  
34 documents that we presented, through the help with Dr.  
35 Dan Monteith and his colleagues we clearly presented  
36 that and that hopefully was taken into consideration.

37

38 And the other big bullet point was  
39 aggregation point. That was the whole reason why  
40 Saxman's been here was the aggregation, let's combine  
41 us with Ketchikan, and the Ketchikan Gateway Borough.  
42 We spoke against that and our documents we presented  
43 clearly dispelled that whole thing that there shouldn't  
44 be no aggregation.

45

46 Threshold population was talked about  
47 in the April meeting as well as other meetings and it  
48 was really proven that that whole population threshold  
49 was arbitrary. I pointed out, you know, looked at  
50 different Federal agencies and you have population

1 thresholds as high as 50,000 in a program. If you're a  
2 community of 50,000 you qualify as being a rural  
3 community in some Federal agencies. And then it goes  
4 down to 2,500 and different levels, and so it's all  
5 over the board with population threshold.

6

7 I know this Council had, in addressing  
8 some of that unanswered correspondence, you guys wrote  
9 to the Secretaries saying, hey, we want to consider  
10 changing the population thresholds. So, yeah, again,  
11 that was pretty arbitrary.

12

13 The other criteria is, our children go  
14 to the Ketchikan schools. Our people working in  
15 Ketchikan, or working in the Gateway Borough. you  
16 know, that was all very arbitrary and it really didn't  
17 fit.

18

19 And so last night, you know, I spoke of  
20 the trust responsibility. You know, the Secretaries  
21 gave that to the FSB. Now, the FSB is given the  
22 Regional Advisory Councils, in effect, that trust  
23 responsibility. When they're giving the Regional  
24 Advisory Councils that trust responsibility and  
25 entailing what that trust responsibility is doing  
26 what's in the best interest of the Federally-recognized  
27 tribe. And so, again, that's part of why I want to,  
28 when I leave Sitka, I want to really definitely know  
29 that, you know, I have Southeast RAC's support for  
30 Saxman.

31

32 And with that I just want to close  
33 there.

34

35 And, you know, last night I gave the  
36 testimony about looking at the FSB website, clicking on  
37 the Regional Advisory Council, I clicked on every one  
38 of them and the Southeast RAC, it does list the  
39 nonrural and the rural communities in our region and  
40 Saxman is on that rural list and there's three  
41 communities in our region in Southeast that are  
42 nonrural, and I agree with that list and I would hope  
43 that the Southeast RAC would also agree with that list.  
44 Although you're not charged -- Pippa mentioned that you  
45 guys really aren't charged with at this time looking at  
46 the communities and identifying what they are, but,  
47 again, Saxman's been here for 99 months with this issue  
48 and Saxman would clearly state that Saxman's on the  
49 rural list and we should be and we must be on that  
50 list. And although I think what is going to be charged

1 down to you folks, is, what I understand in attending  
2 all these meetings, they're going to, probably at the  
3 next meeting, identify the nonrural communities in your  
4 region. So on your website right now they list Juneau,  
5 Douglas and Ketchikan, all others are rural. I agree  
6 with that list right now. With the 99 months action  
7 must happen now, you know. I'm as tired of this  
8 process as many of you guys are. I know -- I'm looking  
9 around the Council, Don was on the Council years ago  
10 and Mr. Douville was there, Mike, you've been there,  
11 Frank Wright's been there, Judy [sic] and the rest are  
12 kind of newer on the Board, or the Council, but, yeah,  
13 it goes back eight years and three months, 99 months of  
14 rural determination for Saxman.

15

16                   So with that, though, I'm going to  
17 close and I'll give Dr. Dan Monteith some time to  
18 present what he needs to present.

19

20                   Thank you.

21

22                   Gunalcheesh.

23

24                   DR. MONTEITH: I will take just 15, 30  
25 seconds.

26

27                   My concern, and I think the tribe's  
28 concern is the flow of information and it was brought  
29 up here in terms of reports and that. I think our wish  
30 and our hope is that that letter will be strong in  
31 terms of the recommendations behind the motion. I  
32 think we probably would have been more comfortable if  
33 the motion had been -- there had been some more  
34 language in the motion, even, but -- because in the  
35 final analysis, I think they look at that, and not  
36 always the supporting documentation.

37

38                   I'll just give you one example, and  
39 that was our reports that we gave to you last year that  
40 I think was very strong and actually made them move  
41 away from the aggregate data and help them realize that  
42 the sort of aggregate data they were using isn't very  
43 applicable in Southeast Alaska. Quite frankly legally  
44 isn't defensible from an academic scholarly standpoint  
45 and that brought about some huge change because they  
46 said -- I hope that was part of it.

47

48                   Long story short. The Board had never  
49 really looked at that documentation. And we said  
50 please refer to page so and so, and they said what

1 documentation. So I think that brings up a number of  
2 procedural issues. I know the question at hand is the  
3 rule that they're asking for and I guess my hope is  
4 that the letter -- the supporting letter will be strong  
5 and we'd like to, once, again, give you the executive  
6 summary and our report, the longer document, to maybe  
7 go along with the letter.

8

9 Thank you.

10

11 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, gentleman.  
12 I assure you and I know that Mr. Wallace knows that  
13 this Council has supported Saxman much longer than 99  
14 months. We've always supported Saxman. And we hope  
15 that things are straightened out and I appreciate your  
16 testimony.

17

18 Thank you.

19

20 Mr. Douville.

21

22 MR. DOUVILLE: Yeah, we were only asked  
23 to address the new regulation and we did support that.  
24 The only thing that I thought of that may be of some  
25 concern is that Saxman's stay is scheduled to expire in  
26 -- I don't know the exact date, 2017 or '16, but should  
27 this process be bogged down I would certainly like to  
28 see that stay extended until these issues have been  
29 resolved. I'm not sure how you would do that but, you  
30 know, it did cross my mind that it could expire before  
31 it gets resolved.

32

33 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mike.  
34 That's a good point. Maybe we should consider that as  
35 something to address through a letter, to make sure  
36 that things happen before the expiration, one way or  
37 another.

38

39 Okay, thank you very much.

40

41 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chair.

42

43 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Oh, Mr. Schroeder.

44

45 MR. SCHROEDER: Well, I just wanted to  
46 thank Lee and Dan for coming again one more time before  
47 the Council to very succinctly and politely represent  
48 the case of Saxman. And I also wanted to say, Lee,  
49 that we don't want to see you here again on this issue.

50

1 (Laughter)

2

3 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yes, Mr. Wallace.

4

5 MR. WALLACE: Mike, in response to Mr.  
6 Douville's comment about the stay and it's timeline,  
7 and definitely he raises a good point, maybe the  
8 timeline may run out before 2017 and thus, you know, we  
9 are very concerned with that. Our timeline to file a  
10 petition and complaint in Federal Court, done so, prior  
11 to our deadline as a placeholder and no one really  
12 wants to go to court. The NARF attorneys on our behalf  
13 don't want to go to court and the FSB doesn't want to  
14 go to court. So I guess the other thing you could do  
15 is urge, like our resolutions that were presented, now  
16 is the time end this and not force it into going into a  
17 timeframe where we are going to be going into  
18 litigation; no one wants to go to litigation. There's  
19 no need for us to go to litigation.

20

21 Thank you.

22

23 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. If there's  
24 no more questions I think it's time to break for lunch  
25 and there is that fundraiser across the street. So  
26 we'll be reconvening at 2:00 o'clock.

27

28 Thank you.

29

30 (Off record)

31

32 (On record)

33

34 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay, we'll call the  
35 meeting back in session and we're down to agency  
36 reports.

37

38 Do we have any reports from tribal  
39 governments.

40

41 (No comments)

42

43 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Native organizations.

44

45 (No comments)

46

47 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Forest Service, but I  
48 think -- is Tom still -- he's not here is he. Is he  
49 still sick?

50

1 MR. LARSON: Tom is.....

2

3 (Pause)

4

5 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Larson.

6

7 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. I don't think  
8 that Tom will be able to give us a report on the  
9 changes of personnel within the subsistence program.  
10 He's been sick. I would like to say and maybe I can  
11 just quickly mention that Tom Whitford is our new  
12 program manager, and he was looking forward to meeting  
13 you guys. He takes the place of Steve Kessler. Most  
14 recently he's from Montana, now living in Anchorage and  
15 fully engaged in the subsistence process. So he's very  
16 much -- very sorry that he can't be here. He will be  
17 here, I'm sure, you know, at some later date, and  
18 you'll get to know him better. And I don't see Pat  
19 Heuer in the audience, and so we'll track him down in a  
20 few minutes.

21

22 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Then we'll come  
23 back to the Forest Service report. I think we should  
24 go on to the National Park Service. Jim Capra.

25

26 MR. CAPRA: Mr. Chairman. Members of  
27 the Council. Thank you. My name is Jim Capra, I'm  
28 with the National Park Service. I'm a subsistence  
29 coordinator for Glacier Bay.

30

31 I have just one item to share really on  
32 the Park Service and this was a statewide proposal that  
33 we made, again, it doesn't affect Southeast much for  
34 the foreseeable future but you may know from the news  
35 that the Park Service has been at odds with several  
36 proposed regulations and regulations in the state  
37 relating to predator control and our policy and  
38 guidelines doesn't allow the specific harvest of  
39 predators to allow for more harvest of deer, moose,  
40 other species to upset that kind of natural balance in  
41 favor of another. And the Park Service has commented  
42 on the State -- to the State, the Board of Game on more  
43 than 50 different regulations over the past decade or  
44 so, and now is proposing regulations that basically  
45 will, as a blanket, in our regulations, in National  
46 Preserves, for all types of hunting, sport and  
47 subsistence, that we just cannot -- the rules that are  
48 enacted by the State which apply in the Preserves will  
49 not -- if they're for predator control purposes, will  
50 not be effective in the Preserves, rather than going at

1 these one at a time.

2

3 It also cleans up a few small issues,  
4 housekeeping issues mostly.

5

6 One is to adopt, this applies to  
7 subsistence or sporthunters in Preserves and Parks for  
8 subsistence hunters, adopts the State hunter harassment  
9 law for hunters and trappers. We did not have a tool  
10 to enforce the State law because it was under a  
11 different, it wasn't under the wildlife codes, it was  
12 under a different code for the State so we adopted that  
13 as one of our regulations. It allows the use of bait  
14 from Natives -- or use of native -- parts of native  
15 species to be used as bait. The Park Service has a  
16 regulation that prohibits bait generally, and this is  
17 an Alaska specific one that would allow the use of, say  
18 home preserved salmon eggs or fresh salmon eggs, either  
19 one, for fishing and sport and subsistence, we don't  
20 have the concern we're going to introduce invasive  
21 species with the native fish to the stream.

22

23 And the third item was to make it  
24 easier, faster and more responsive to the local  
25 population to enact closures for conservation reasons  
26 in the Preserves and Parks for hunting and trapping.  
27 It's a process thing and it makes the process much  
28 speedier and there's much more local comment.

29

30 It went into the Federal Register as a  
31 proposed regulation in September last year. The  
32 comment period was extended once, until, I believe, the  
33 end of this month, I'll have to check on that for you,  
34 but it's still a proposed regulation, the final ones  
35 have not come out.

36

37 And if the Council -- it's just an  
38 informational item. There aren't any Park Service  
39 lands even near Southeast that have predator control  
40 issues on them right now but it is a statewide issue  
41 and it could affect Southeast sometime in the future.

42

43 Thank you.

44

45 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Jim. Any  
46 questions.

47

48 (No comments)

49

50 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Seeing none, thank you

1 for your report.

2

3 MR. CAPRA: Okay.

4

5 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Those that are online,  
6 could you make sure that your phone is on mute, unless  
7 you're ready to speak.

8

9 So we're going to move to a report  
10 online from -- I hope I'm saying this right, Deane  
11 Johnson from the Pacific Northwest Research Station,  
12 are you on line.

13

14 MS. JOHNSON: Yes, I am, thank you.

15

16 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay, if you'd like to  
17 give us your report, that would be great. Thank you.  
18 Welcome.

19

20 MS. JOHNSON: Well, thank you very  
21 much. I'm really happy to be invited to speak today  
22 and I want to summarize our results so far and invite  
23 participation from members of the Council and any of  
24 the users that might be interested in giving us their  
25 input.

26

27 First of all my name is -- my full name  
28 is Adeliade Johnson, and I've been a hydrologist with  
29 the Forest Service for over 20 years and I have been  
30 lucky to have the opportunity to work with Linda Kruger  
31 who is a social scientist with the station and she had  
32 been compiling information from Native subsistence  
33 users and specifically she was interested in noting  
34 perceptions of change and I wanted to provide some  
35 guidance of some of the physical changes that are  
36 happening in our environment to link with some of her  
37 notes of Native observations.

38

39 And so we proceeded with the project by  
40 utilizing the shore zone database, which as you know  
41 has linked -- it links photography along the coast with  
42 units of shore lines and these units range in length  
43 from just meters to kilometers. So quite -- they can  
44 be quite detailed. And these units have information on  
45 species that are in the inter-tidal, tidal, and sub-  
46 tidal zones. And we link this information with depth  
47 information and so we're able to get details of slope  
48 for these segments and upon that we linked information  
49 on increasing sea level and also tectonic information  
50 as well as isostatic rebound or the land that is

1 rebounding due to de-glaciation. So the land is  
2 basically moving up. And so when we put all of those  
3 information bits together we came up with a map of  
4 Southeast Alaska and we were able to merge that land  
5 change with the shore zone segments.

6  
7                   And then from that point we were able  
8 to get a map that shows areas where there will be minor  
9 and major changes in some of the resources that are  
10 utilized by subsistence users. The areas of change are  
11 typically to the north where there are quite a bit of  
12 isostatic rebound and -- but merged upon that there is  
13 greatest change where the slope slopes (ph) and so the  
14 areas that are adjacent to the estuaries and stream  
15 systems you have most of the change and I don't know if  
16 the handouts are -- have been given to the full  
17 audience there but I'll just outline the six villages  
18 that we've observed some of these potential changes.

19  
20                   In the Yakutat region is where there is  
21 primarily sediment, estuaries and current dominated  
22 systems there is a bit of expected increase in shore --  
23 the sediment type, whereas looking at the Hoonah area  
24 there is quite a bit of expected change in estuaries, a  
25 reduction in estuaries and also that would be the case  
26 with Angoon and Kake. And a subtle increase -- and  
27 some increases in the rock sediment type. And, so, in  
28 general, there will be a shift of the associated  
29 species. And what we want to do at this point is to go  
30 out to the communities and link some of our  
31 expectations of the effects of land change and climate  
32 change to observations of local users and to do that  
33 we'd like to involve student interns in order to better  
34 understand the resource use and how the resources are  
35 changing and merge that back into our research results.

36  
37                   And ultimately we would like to  
38 summarize existing and future (indiscernible) resource  
39 data associations for communities and use  
40 (indiscernible) but also coordinate our research  
41 efforts with advisory input from communities, agencies,  
42 villages and also work with the sustainability council  
43 and others to better gain an understanding of changes  
44 that we can expect in the future.

45  
46                   And with that I'll open it up to any  
47 questions and I look forward to interacting with you  
48 more.

49  
50                   CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. Is there

1 any questions from the Council.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Well, I have a short  
6 question, what could we do in the way of continuing  
7 giving you information or how do you want us to  
8 communicate with you, is there a way we could make your  
9 request work well.

10

11 MS. JOHNSON: Well, I would love to be  
12 able to potentially get more information on subsistence  
13 users -- subsistence users, and the needs of  
14 subsistence users and also gain a better understanding  
15 of some of the subsistence needs that are used in  
16 Southeast Alaska.

17

18 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Does anybody  
19 have any comments.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 MS. JOHNSON: Oh, and I.....

24

25 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Go ahead.

26

27 MS. JOHNSON: Oh, I also just wanted to  
28 -- for -- we're putting in a proposal to the Western  
29 Wildland Environmental Threat Assessment Center and, if  
30 possible I'd like to be able to put your name down on  
31 the proposal as a collaborator and be able to state  
32 that we will link with you to better understand some of  
33 the points that I made in terms of the subsistence use  
34 and subsistence needs and poise ourselves to be able to  
35 move the information that we're gaining to your users  
36 so that there's a cycle of giving the information to  
37 people that might be interested and gain information  
38 from subsistence users.

39

40 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. I'm not exactly  
41 sure how we can help but I'm sure the Council would be  
42 willing to share information. Is there some way that  
43 you could attend a future meeting and speak with us in  
44 person and show us more of your research papers.

45

46 MS. JOHNSON: Oh, I'd love to.

47

48 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Well, we  
49 haven't set our meeting date or place but we'll be  
50 discussing that later and I think I could say that we

1 would be willing to stay in contact with you and share  
2 any information that might help your research papers.  
3 I think you'll have to keep in touch with our  
4 coordinator and he will pass on any information to us  
5 and I think if any of the local organizations  
6 throughout the region, they could probably supply you  
7 with different information that might help you.

8  
9 MS. JOHNSON: That sounds great. And I  
10 will meet with -- I have a meeting with Jennifer  
11 Handlen next week with Linda Kruger to discuss our  
12 project and I would love to meet with Cal Casipit next  
13 week and also get a copy of Bob Schroeder's subsistence  
14 -- it's a subsistence paper that I was told about today  
15 that summarizes some of the food resources and use of  
16 them.

17  
18 CHAIRMAN BANGS: He's listening as you  
19 speak so he's aware of it. So thank you very much for  
20 your presentation. Is there any other questions or  
21 comments that anyone would like to make.

22  
23 (No comments)

24  
25 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Well, thank you  
26 very much for your presentation.

27  
28 MS. JOHNSON: Well, thank you very  
29 much. And I don't know if my email address was given  
30 but if anybody has any further questions or comments  
31 they can send them to me at [ajohnson03@fw.fed.us](mailto:ajohnson03@fw.fed.us).

32  
33 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay, very good.

34  
35 MS. JOHNSON: Thank you so much.

36  
37 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yep, thank you again.

38  
39 MS. JOHNSON: Okay, bye-bye.

40  
41 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Moving along  
42 here, the next thing I'd like to cover is charter  
43 revisions. Mr. Larson.

44  
45 (Pause)

46  
47 MR. LARSON: What page is that? Can  
48 you remind me what page we're looking at?

49  
50 CHAIRMAN BANGS: 70.

1 MR. LARSON: 70.

2

3 CHAIRMAN BANGS: 73, I think.

4

5 (Pause)

6

7 MR. LARSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The  
8 Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council  
9 Charter can be found on Page 73. There is an  
10 opportunity for the Council to make some minor changes  
11 but the changes that are proposed for the Council are  
12 changes that the Council themselves cannot make. These  
13 are changes that the Secretary will -- that they make.  
14 And if you look on Page 75, those proposed changes are  
15 in yellow.

16

17 The proposed change are one of the  
18 options that was discussed by the Office of Subsistence  
19 Management at our last meeting, remember there was an  
20 option for changing the terms of Council member's --  
21 one of those options was from three year terms to four  
22 year terms and whether or not there needed to be an  
23 alternate member, that those service times when a  
24 Council member was not reappointed into a position,  
25 allowing that Council member to continue in that role  
26 until he was replaced. So those concepts that were  
27 discussed with all the Councils have been incorporated  
28 into this section that is highlighted in yellow. The  
29 Council can endorse those or they could, in fact, make  
30 some recommendations to change them. I'm not sure that  
31 there's a good opportunity for changes to these, but  
32 they have not been adopted yet, but they probably will  
33 be -- or they will be unless there's some other thing  
34 that happens that I'm not aware of.

35

36 But, anyway, so the new charter will  
37 look like what it says on Page 75 with the changes that  
38 no longer will you be having three year terms, but  
39 you'll have four year terms and you will serve until  
40 you are reappointed for at least 120 days, that would  
41 be your optional time. And there will be an alternate  
42 that is preselected. There has been some discussion  
43 that has not been finalized about exactly how to engage  
44 a person that's an alternate into this process. I  
45 think that still has some room for implementation,  
46 whether or not they travel to every meeting. I don't  
47 think that was their intention but it's certainly their  
48 intention that an alternate member be fully briefed on  
49 all the materials that the Council members have and be  
50 available to participate if there was a Council member

1 that was missing. It would also serve as a position if  
2 there was a Council member that did not fill out his  
3 term, then that member could be immediately reappointed  
4 from the alternate position.

5  
6 Thank you.

7  
8 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Larson.  
9 Is there any questions.

10  
11 (No comments)

12  
13 CHAIRMAN BANGS: One question. If the  
14 alternate was appointed, would they serve for four  
15 years or would they just fulfill the person -- the seat  
16 that they're taking place for that amount of time  
17 that's left on their term.

18  
19 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. The idea that  
20 would be that there would be an alternate in place all  
21 the time, whether or not they select a new alternate  
22 every year, I think that that is more likely than it  
23 would be to have an alternate selected and then they  
24 would not consider new alternates for four years. I  
25 think that the idea was that there would be an  
26 alternate selected for that cycle, every cycle.

27  
28 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any discussion on the  
29 proposed change.

30  
31 (No comments)

32  
33 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Does the Council want  
34 to take an action on approving or endorsing the changes  
35 or just see what happens.

36  
37 (No comments)

38  
39 (Laughter)

40  
41 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Well, the four year  
42 terms sounds like a good idea to me and I could  
43 appreciate sometime when we don't have another Council  
44 member to be able to get a quorum together.

45  
46 Mr. Jackson.

47  
48 MR. JACKSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. So  
49 the people that are serving now, their terms aren't  
50 extended for four years, but they have to be

1 reappointed to get the four year term.

2

3 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Larson.

4

5 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. I am not  
6 exactly sure how this transition from the three year  
7 terms to the four year terms will be done. It very  
8 well might be that all new Council members would be  
9 appointed to a four year term and the three year term  
10 appointments would be phased out, you know,  
11 accordingly, so that's what I think is going to happen  
12 but there might be alternatives that I'm not aware of  
13 other than that but I think that's what's going to  
14 happen.

15

16 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Larson.  
17 Is there any other changes that we would like to see.  
18 Anybody on the Council have any ideas.

19

20 (No comments)

21

22 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Seeing none -- Mr.  
23 Jackson.

24

25 MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman. We did  
26 discuss something else about possibly getting some  
27 younger members to participate and I don't know  
28 whatever became of that. It would be nice for them to  
29 learn and then, you know, just sign up for it or get  
30 put into those positions. I don't know what the  
31 process is or -- and when I say younger I don't know  
32 how old you have to be to get appointed.

33

34 Thank you.

35

36 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. There was  
37 considerable discussion regarding that exact topic.  
38 This is not the only Council that considered engaging  
39 younger people as a high priority. But the decision  
40 was made that that kind of engagement would be better  
41 done through a process of an education or communication  
42 component, where there would be some outreach to  
43 schools or to groups of people that were of younger age  
44 and to not include that -- to include those kind of  
45 issues in the charter would be problematic for the  
46 people writing the charter. So that what they've said  
47 is this is an agency issue and if you want to move  
48 forward, then do it, and the agency, I believe, is  
49 engaged in doing that exact thing.

50

1 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Robert. At  
2 the meeting, the Federal Board meeting in January, the  
3 Chairs met and one of the issues about entering the  
4 young into the program was spoke about and one of the  
5 things that came up -- well, there were several things  
6 that came up in ways that we could engage the youth and  
7 one of them was, when the meeting is in your community,  
8 try to engage your government class or other leadership  
9 roles that are existing in your community to come to  
10 the meeting, at least, like an educational thing. And  
11 that was one of the things to try to bring the youth  
12 into the program more. But we just couldn't come up  
13 with a feasible way of putting them on the Council.  
14 But there was a lot of ideas and I think it's in the  
15 works and the program is listening to the Chairs that  
16 brought the word from the Councils that they were  
17 interested in bringing the youth program into the -- to  
18 teach the youth about what this process is all about.  
19 So I felt comfortable that they're heading that way and  
20 maybe there'll be some good ideas that come out of it.

21

22 Thank you for bringing that up, Ken.

23

24 Mr. Schroeder.

25

26 MR. SCHROEDER: Just one thing for  
27 information. I believe, Robert, the charter is renewed  
28 each year, is that correct?

29

30 MR. LARSON: It's every other year.

31

32 MR. SCHROEDER: Okay. And then a  
33 second thing, that, Ken, I'm wondering maybe if that  
34 would be a good item for our annual report, which we  
35 haven't finalized just yet. And another barrier for  
36 younger people getting on the Council is that the way  
37 that we get evaluated is based on, sort of like your  
38 resume, you know, did you do this and were you a leader  
39 at this and what sort of experiences you had and it's  
40 pretty hard for somebody who is 21 or 22 or 25 to have  
41 been in any of those roles so that it would be hard for  
42 someone to be recommended for appointment. If you kept  
43 the criteria saying, was a he a president of something  
44 or did he serve on boards or did she commercial fish  
45 some place, so I really agree with you there.

46

47 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Ken.

48

49 MR. JACKSON: Mr. Schroeder, through  
50 the Chair. I think that somewhere along the line we're

1 going to have to ease off on some of the restrictions  
2 to get more people interested, especially women. I  
3 think that we leave out a big part of our subsistence  
4 people because they know the seasons, how to put up the  
5 food, the culture and the history of our people,  
6 sometimes better than the men do, and we have -- for  
7 some reason we've left them out. They do -- or they  
8 can have input. When we report to our organizations  
9 back home there's two or three women on there and, you  
10 know, they have more questions to ask than most of the  
11 guys. But, you know, I appreciate -- you know, I know  
12 that the resume part is kind of deep for some of us to  
13 even -- because I never -- I'd never made up a resume  
14 before, all I ever was before, all I ever was was just  
15 a fisherman and a logger and it was hard for me to --  
16 when they asked for it I -- I don't like to do  
17 paperwork, I'll be honest with you, I'm the worst  
18 person with a phone or a computer, but, getting back to  
19 the -- I was going to ask the Organized Village of  
20 Kake, because they always seem to come up with grants  
21 to send people to participate and observe and to learn  
22 these things and do reports back to the Council and/or  
23 the school. So this might be some way to get them  
24 interested and have them do a report. And they do ask  
25 them to do that. So I'll ask them when I get back,  
26 through your information.

27

28 Thank you.

29

30 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Ken. So  
31 would the Council be interested in putting a short  
32 thing, an issue in the annual report, about trying to  
33 encourage youth participation. I don't know how we  
34 would word that but what did you have in mind, Mr.  
35 Schroeder.

36

37 MR. SCHROEDER: Well, I think bringing  
38 it up is essential because this is a Council concern.  
39 I'd want more discussion and probably the more specific  
40 you can get the better so that if the Council wanted a  
41 particular representation then say it. You know so if  
42 you wanted a younger member or another couple of  
43 younger members or female members, say it, that that's  
44 what the Council wants. So maybe we'd need a little  
45 discussion on that when we do the annual report.

46

47 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Does that sound good.

48

49 (Council nods affirmatively)

50

1 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. I think that's  
2 a good idea. So is there any more discussion about the  
3 charter changes that possibly might happen.

4  
5 (No comments)

6  
7 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Hearing none, I  
8 guess we'll wait and see how the charter comes out and  
9 see if those changes go through and then we'll talk  
10 about our annual report tomorrow morning.

11  
12 So the next thing on the agenda is Mr.  
13 Rich Lowell, ADF&G.

14  
15 MR. LARSON: Or Jennifer.

16  
17 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Or Jennifer, but he's  
18 what I have here. But you can both come.

19  
20 MR. LOWELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
21 Members of the Board.

22  
23 I don't have a formal Staff report for  
24 you folks today but what I wanted to do was come and  
25 introduce myself. Ryan Scott is our regional  
26 supervisor, he's been in that position a very short  
27 period of time. He had a conflict with the meeting up  
28 in Anchorage regarding the wolf ESA petition. He asked  
29 me to attend in his absence. He regrets that he can't  
30 be here. He does look forward to remaining engaged in  
31 this process.

32  
33 To introduce myself, I am the area  
34 wildlife biologist for Game Management Units 1B and 3.  
35 I'm stationed in Petersburg. It's a position I've held  
36 for 14 years, and I've recently been asked to serve as  
37 the acting management coordinator for the region until  
38 we get that position filled. Interviews were conducted  
39 last week and we expect to have an announcement  
40 regarding a permanent replacement for Ryan, who had  
41 previously, before rocketing to the top, been the  
42 management coordinator, and I imagine many of you are  
43 familiar with Neil Barton prior to his departure to  
44 Dillingham.

45  
46 I'd like to just congratulate Chairman  
47 Bangs on being confirmed as the Chairman. I think  
48 that's an excellent choice.

49  
50 I'd like to thank the Council, in

1 particular, for their very prompt action on the special  
2 action request to close wolf hunting and trapping  
3 seasons on Prince of Wales Island. This body acted  
4 very swiftly and we -- although our target was 25  
5 wolves, we ended up, I believe, at 29, is where we  
6 stand. But given the circumstances and giving people  
7 enough time to get their equipment out of the field,  
8 that did, indeed, you know, I'd just like to thank this  
9 body for a very, very quick and decisive action with  
10 regard to that.

11

12 And that's all I have for you.

13

14 I know many of the faces and the faces  
15 that I don't know, I know the names. So I've been in  
16 the region for 23 years now. I've worked in Ketchikan,  
17 Juneau and now Petersburg. So if you have any  
18 questions for me I'd be glad to attempt to address them  
19 and that's all I have.

20

21 Thank you.

22

23 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Rich.

24

25 Don.

26

27 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, thank you, Mr.  
28 Chairman. Rich. I thought it might be a good  
29 opportunity to ask you a question here.

30

31 It's kind of been identified that  
32 generally Central Southeast has been probably in the  
33 worst shape for deer hunting in the recent past here,  
34 it's kind of your district, I just wonder if you have  
35 any -- we have a proposal opportunity here, so I  
36 thought maybe I'd just ask you if you thought there was  
37 any particular problem or situation or something that  
38 needs addressing in Central Southeast that might help  
39 improve things. It just seems like -- I don't know,  
40 maybe there's just a combination of factors that  
41 somehow make the Central part of Southeast problematic  
42 for deer populations, and maybe you have some thoughts  
43 on that.

44

45 MR. LOWELL: Well, I hope that's not a  
46 comment on my management strategy.

47

48 (Laughter)

49

50 MR. LOWELL: But the Board's well aware

1 that -- or the Council's well aware that the Board of  
2 Game has authorized an intensive management project for  
3 the Central Panhandle portion of Unit 3 and that  
4 includes Mitkof Island and Lindenberg Peninsula on  
5 Kupreanof Island where deer populations have been  
6 chronically low as you've indicated. And we have taken  
7 action and actually we remain engaged in that process,  
8 our desire was to gather some baseline information on  
9 both deer and wolf populations within the area before  
10 we actually engaged in any kind of predator removal and  
11 so we have made considerable progress with regard to  
12 trying to evaluate the deer situation there, both in  
13 terms of finding a method that can be used to measure  
14 changes of deer abundance accurately so that if we do  
15 apply a treatment in terms of removing wolves, will we  
16 be able to measure and detect a response in the deer  
17 population. So we've made some progress in that arena,  
18 both with traditional deer pellet surveys, vegetation  
19 surveys, browse utilization and now -- and also some  
20 DNA pellet mark/recapture stuff, so we feel like we've  
21 kind of got started on the deer aspect. And now we're  
22 turning our attention more to try to determine what our  
23 wolf population look like, how many packs we might  
24 have, what their movement patterns are. So I think we  
25 have a sizeable budget request in to Federal aid, to  
26 get some money to conduct that research and we'll be  
27 addressing that.

28

29                   Trying to put our finger on the cause,  
30 why we are stuck in this chronic low deer population is  
31 a bit of a complicated question.

32

33                   As you know we had a series of very  
34 deep snowfall winters starting in '06/07, we've had  
35 above average snowfall something like three out of the  
36 last five years during a three out of a five year  
37 period up until last winter which was mild, and this  
38 year we're very low snow. So you've got weather  
39 factors. You've got predation by wolves and obviously  
40 to some degree black bear predation on fawns. You've  
41 got habitat changes associated with Forest management  
42 and it's not likely that it's any one of those factors  
43 that is causing the chronic decline we've seen, it's  
44 likely a number of those factors working in concert.

45

46                   And so we're trying to sort that out  
47 and we are making some progress on getting a better  
48 feel for what our deer populations are, what our wolf  
49 populations are.

50

1 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Don, follow up.

2

3 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, one other follow  
4 up. Do you see the increasing moose populations on  
5 Mitkof and Kupreanof as affecting the deer winter range  
6 and having a possible effect.

7

8 MR. LOWELL: Through the Chair, member  
9 Hernandez. That is one that I had left out but, yes,  
10 that is one that we had highlighted as a contributing  
11 factor as well. Those two species are likely  
12 competitors. We did just a very brief browse analysis,  
13 or fecal pellet analysis for moose at Thomas Bay, which  
14 is on the mainland, of course, but, you know, in some  
15 degree similar to what we see in Unit 3 and essentially  
16 these -- we're not traditional moose habitat in the  
17 Unit 3 islands, where moose are a relatively new  
18 species, having expanded out from the 1B mainland,  
19 mostly the Stikine River, Thomas Bay, so what impact  
20 those animals are having on the deer population remains  
21 a question that we also were going to look at with  
22 regard to fecal pellet analysis for both species to  
23 identify browse. But the one that we had done earlier  
24 or several years ago, just as a brief look at Thomas  
25 Bay suggested that Vaccinium blueberry species were  
26 prevalent in moose diets and, of course, that's also an  
27 important browse species for deer as well. So there  
28 could well be something occurring between those species  
29 that is exasperating the problem we're seeing.

30

31 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

32

33 Mr. Schroeder.

34

35 MR. SCHROEDER: Rich, thanks much for  
36 coming by. The Council's really benefitted from a good  
37 relationship with the Division of Wildlife Conservation  
38 and we miss Doug Larsen but I know he's having a good  
39 time.

40

41 I know you're not really here to give a  
42 detailed report on things but if you're comfortable in  
43 giving us some sort of update on how mark/recapture  
44 works with DNA and if that seems like it's pretty  
45 successful because right now we don't have a big deer  
46 issue that's before the Council but at other times some  
47 of the thorniest issues that have come up have been  
48 issues where there's an experience of subsistence  
49 hunters who are saying there just aren't any deer  
50 around and we can't get deer but then the super hard

1 data on how many deer are there often weren't  
2 available. So will be saved by DNA mark/recapture.

3

4 MR. LOWELL: Through the Chairman.  
5 That remains to be seen.

6

7 We have done some experimentation with  
8 the DNA mark/recapture population or density estimation  
9 on both Prince of Wales, which is where it was  
10 basically born with some graduate students that have  
11 been working there, Todd Brinkman, and then we took  
12 that also to Northeast Chichagof where we applied it.  
13 Now, in both of those areas deer are occurring at  
14 higher densities than they are in Unit 3 where we've  
15 tried it. The question that remains is will that  
16 technique be effective where deer abundance is very,  
17 very low. Because what you do with your  
18 mark/recapture, you do a transect or path sampling, not  
19 really a grid, but let's call it a transect and you  
20 collect fresh fecal pellets that are then sent to the  
21 lab and you try to identify the individual deer through  
22 that and then you go back and sample it again and see  
23 how many recaptures you have. So it's a proportional  
24 estimation. The problem is that we're still awaiting  
25 the lab results from Unit 3 or Lindenberg and Mitkof,  
26 but our ability to recapture deer, because they're in  
27 such low abundance could be problematic. So we don't  
28 -- our fingers are crossed. We're awaiting the  
29 results. But we're cautiously optimistic, I guess is  
30 the way to respond to that.

31

32 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. Any other  
33 questions for Rich.

34

35 Mr. Jackson.

36

37 MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman. Thank you,  
38 Rich. Just a remark that I've observed and hunted on  
39 Kupreanof most of my life and I think we saw our first  
40 moose in 1978. And in the last few years, I was  
41 working reforestation in the woods, you know, in  
42 probably the last 20 years but I noticed that there was  
43 places where there was sunk cabbages as big as this  
44 room here that were torn up and that was natural deer  
45 food, you know. And the moose have tore everything up.  
46 They took the berries, they took the skunk cabbage,  
47 they took the alder and the deer couldn't reach up that  
48 high. They are competing with each other.

49

50 But the other thing is, and I haven't

1 seen it, but the guys say there's elk on the island. I  
2 think they come from around your area, the Wrangell  
3 area.

4

5 (Laughter)

6

7 MR. JACKSON: And another one is a  
8 couple of guys say they saw cougars, so I don't know.  
9 I've never seen them. But that doesn't mean they're  
10 not there. But we'll do the best we can to watch. And  
11 I really appreciate you reporting.

12

13 Thank you.

14

15 MR. LOWELL: Mr. Chairman. And, you  
16 know, that's a two way street, I very much appreciate,  
17 you know, I have several contacts in the community who  
18 are letting me know what they see with regard to that.  
19 You know, another factor, we've now changed from a  
20 deer/wolf system to a deer/wolf/moose system, is that  
21 at times when our wolf population may have fluctuated  
22 more with the deer population, now they have an  
23 alternate food source and quite a big package with  
24 moose around. So the moose numbers could be helping to  
25 sustain our wolf numbers at high levels as well.

26

27 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Follow up.

28

29 MR. JACKSON: Yeah, Rich, through the  
30 Chair. My son is probably one of the only guys that  
31 hunts wolves, or traps wolves on the island and I have  
32 to say just in the last two or three weeks he's trapped  
33 five or six and they're huge. And he's going to Kuiu  
34 Island too, and there's a lot of sign there, you know,  
35 but the wolves are swimming back and forth, we're  
36 thinking because it's not a very big area, it's just  
37 like Petersburg, Mitkof, and Kupreanof, it's close. So  
38 he trapped a marten for some reason, I don't know how  
39 the Fish and Game knows, but it came across from Kuiu,  
40 so it's kind of hard to tell because the moose are  
41 showing up on Kuiu Island now and it's starting to  
42 become a problem because we're seeing them all over the  
43 place. But the black bears are becoming more abundant  
44 too. And we'll just have to see what shakes out, you  
45 know, but I have to say the wolves seem to be a little  
46 more abundant and I think we're going to have to -- we  
47 were supposed to get some guys -- but some guys from  
48 Craig and Klawock came up last year after they had  
49 their quota down there, they came up through Rocky Pass  
50 and they were supposed to come up this year but they

1 didn't show up.

2

3 Thank you.

4

5 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Ken. Any  
6 other questions for Rich.

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Jennifer, do you have  
11 something to say there.

12

13 MS. YUHAS: This is our agency report  
14 time, Mr. Chairman, in general.

15

16 CHAIRMAN BANGS: In general.

17

18 MS. YUHAS: So since the -- thank you  
19 -- since the RAC met last we've obviously had a change  
20 in State administration and so we have a new  
21 Commissioner, Sam Cotten, and there's also a new  
22 position that's of interest to this particular RAC. Mr.  
23 Larsen gave the report on the Stikine issue and the  
24 Treaty Panel meeting and so previously you were  
25 introduced to Stephanie who had taken David Bedford's  
26 position on the panel and now that is occupied by  
27 Charlie Swanton, who's our new Deputy Commissioner at  
28 the Department. I'm hanging up on a phone call here so  
29 it'll stop ringing. And so Charlie is the  
30 representative of the State to the Panel and is the one  
31 who is representing the subsistence needs on that panel  
32 and it's his desire to do so and his job to do so but  
33 he just couldn't be at this meeting to introduce  
34 himself, he's attending the Board of Fish meeting in  
35 Anchorage. As you know, sometimes we're double or  
36 triple scheduled.

37

38 My job, as you know, is to relate  
39 between the two Federal programs [sic]. I don't know  
40 if the Chairman wanted to have a discussion about the  
41 complications in attending the crossover meetings but  
42 that's definitely on my list of items that I'll be  
43 briefing the Commissioner on very shortly and some of  
44 my communications to OSM and the Federal Program. Not  
45 just the RAC members but also AC members, I'm noticing  
46 a complication, not just between the meeting schedules  
47 but with limited funding approvals for AC members who  
48 wish to attend RAC meetings and wish to attend the  
49 Federal Subsistence Board having difficulties obtaining  
50 funding and approval to attend the Federal meetings.

1 And then also with the recent Board of Fish meeting it  
2 was notable that your Chairman was authorized to be  
3 present for public comments, but in that arena, really  
4 the meat of the discussion takes place at the committee  
5 hearings where he was unable to fully participate and  
6 so you had Harvey Kitka there because he lives in Sitka  
7 and you had Patty here for other reasons, so you had  
8 representation but it wasn't the representation that  
9 the RAC voted on and I don't know if it's appropriate,  
10 if you have concerns, that those be also wrapped into  
11 your annual report as an item, but I definitely will be  
12 communicating those concerns up the line through both  
13 of the agencies that participation at this juncture  
14 seems inadequate for the needs of both the AC members  
15 and the RAC members. So that's on our radar list.

16

17 Lauren Sill is also here from the  
18 Department for our agency report time. She works in  
19 the Division of Subsistence and she has a few reports  
20 for you on what's new, available reports from  
21 subsistence and is available for any questions for some  
22 of the ANS determination and egg weighing issues that  
23 came up at yesterday's meeting, if you have  
24 clarifications.

25

26 So unless the RAC has any questions for  
27 me I would turn things over to Lauren.

28

29 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Schroeder.

30

31 MR. SCHROEDER: Just a question. If  
32 there's anything that you can enlighten us on in the  
33 State involvement in TransBoundary -- the Department of  
34 Fish and Game's involvement in TransBoundary Mine  
35 issues.

36

37 MS. YUHAS: So the Department -- assume  
38 you mean the Department of Fish and Game, which is  
39 where they house me, although I am the State liaison to  
40 the Board so I represent, you know, the State, those  
41 discussions are taking place in the Department of DNR  
42 rather than Fish and Game, and I'm not speaking for the  
43 Forest Service but I am aware that Beth Pendleton has a  
44 meeting coming up in the next day or so with our Lt.  
45 Governor and our Commissioner regarding that issue and  
46 so she has been present for a lot of your discussions  
47 and plans to revisit that with the new administration.  
48 I cannot speak right now for the Department of Natural  
49 Resources in where those discussions are going but they  
50 have been elevated.

1                   And each time you discuss these issues  
2 I am sending emails and sending those comments up the  
3 line as I did this morning, sending an email right away  
4 to the Commissioner's office, you know, letting them  
5 know that, you know, the issue came up again, this is  
6 what was said and copying our appropriate directors and  
7 copying the CACFA folks, the Citizen's Advisory Council  
8 on Federal areas. Sara Taylor is their executive  
9 director and that's another avenue for concerned  
10 citizens to follow through. It's a State supported  
11 entity but it represents the citizens rather than the  
12 government of the state for concerns with the Federal  
13 government and their relations.

14  
15                   CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Jennifer.  
16 I appreciate you bringing up the fact that the Board of  
17 Fisheries meeting that they had here in Sitka that I  
18 had support and one of the reasons I had support is  
19 because Patty was representing the State Advisory  
20 Committee for Fish and Game and she was able to stay  
21 the whole meeting and she was able to cover the  
22 committee meeting where, like you say, things that  
23 really happen happen during the committee, and it was  
24 frustrating for me because I get to do public testimony  
25 and then I have to go home and luckily we had support  
26 here with Harvey and Patty, but I appreciate that.  
27 Because I kind of didn't know what to do.

28  
29                   MS. YUHAS: If you're only able to be  
30 approved for a couple of days, my recommendation to  
31 both programs is that the approval be for the committee  
32 hearing. Where, public testimony, you get your three  
33 minutes, you say your peace and there are very few  
34 questions asked, that could be submitted in writing  
35 with a note indicating that you will be available for  
36 the committee meetings because that's one of the  
37 questions that the Board members usually ask, is, thank  
38 you for your testimony, will you be available for  
39 committee, where there is some back and forth dialogue,  
40 negotiations, full discussions rather than a simple  
41 three minutes. So it may be a better use to maximize  
42 your time to be present for the day of committee rather  
43 than present for the day of public testimony.

44  
45                   CHAIRMAN BANGS: Lauren.

46  
47                   MS. SILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My  
48 name is Lauren Sill. I'm a subsistence resource  
49 specialist with the Division of Subsistence. I just  
50 want to take a few moments to give you guys an update

1 on what our division in Southeast has been up to.

2

3                   Recently we've completed some  
4 comprehensive subsistence harvest surveys in five  
5 communities in Southeast recently; Haines, Hoonah,  
6 Angoon, Hydaburg, and Whale Pass and that report should  
7 be published in the next few months, I believe.

8

9                   We've also recently finished a local  
10 and traditional knowledge study on the Stikine River,  
11 salmon in particular, chinook salmon, and that one also  
12 is being written up right now and should be published  
13 this summer, I think.

14

15                   Some current research, we don't have  
16 too much going on right now but we're starting probably  
17 the 13th or 14th year of herring harvest -- the herring  
18 egg subsistence harvest surveys and that will start up  
19 in the next week or two, whenever the herring decide to  
20 spawn. I think it's a really good example of a  
21 cooperative program between Fish and Game and between  
22 the Sitka Tribe of Alaska. That's come in useful -- the  
23 information we've collected has come repeatedly before  
24 the Board of Fisheries in dealing with subsistence  
25 issues there.

26

27                   We have also have just entered into a  
28 new project that's gotten funded with the Hoonah Native  
29 Lands Partnership and it's a collaboration of a lot of  
30 different entities including Fish and Game, the Forest  
31 Service and Sustainable Southeast Partnership that will  
32 be looking at some subsistence issues around Hoonah.

33

34                   And then this spring and summer we'll  
35 be applying to the Alaska Sustainable Salmon Fund for a  
36 project to look at subsistence salmon uses of Klawock  
37 Lake, probably looking -- talking with the residents of  
38 Klawock and Crag and trying to understand a little bit  
39 more about that issue.

40

41                   I also wanted to say that yesterday  
42 there were some questions about the amounts reasonably  
43 necessarily for subsistence and how those numbers are  
44 set and I can try to answer any of those questions if  
45 they still exist.

46

47                   CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. I had one  
48 question, how do you do the weigh thing, that was a big  
49 part of the testimony as far as the weighing of the  
50 branches, is it -- is the branch itself included or how

1 on that.

2

3 MS. SILL: So the way that works is  
4 that once the herring come in and spawn the Sitka Tribe  
5 has a traditional foods program where they go and  
6 harvest herring eggs for their members anyway and so we  
7 go with them and we try to help out and we'll bring --  
8 they harvest what they'll harvest, it's usually, you  
9 know, maybe around 5,000 pounds of eggs. As they're  
10 being loaded, taken off the boat we'll weigh them just  
11 to get a raw weight of how much was brought in and then  
12 we'll process them. So we'll cut off, you know, the  
13 major branches that don't have any eggs. We'll process  
14 them down into different size containers so 25 and 50  
15 pound wetlock boxes, you know, you get slightly get  
16 bigger branches that are being put into those and then  
17 we weigh those boxes repeatedly until we get an average  
18 weight for that. And then we also will take branches  
19 and process them down even further to fit into gallon  
20 size and quart size ziplock bags which are their common  
21 storage containers, and then we'll weigh those  
22 repeatedly until we get an average weight for those.  
23 In the end we'll weigh -- so we have our weights coming  
24 off the boat, which is just the unprocessed weight and  
25 then we'll add up all the weights we have at the end of  
26 our boxes and bags to get a processed weight and just  
27 kind of get an idea of what the difference is of what  
28 comes off a boat versus what gets put up or sent out.

29

30 Does that answer.

31

32 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. Yeah, that  
33 clears up a lot.

34

35 Mr. Hernandez.

36

37 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, so back to the  
38 herring eggs, so you work with the Sitka Tribe to kind  
39 of establish sort of like a baseline what a raw weight  
40 of the branches would be versus the processed weight  
41 and is the amount necessary for subsistence determined  
42 from that, sort of that final processed weight, is that  
43 -- am I understanding that correctly.

44

45 MS. SILL: Through the Chair. Mr.  
46 Hernandez.

47

48 So we weigh before and after partly for  
49 own benefit because we're sort of curious about if  
50 there's a way to look at density of eggs from year to

1 year and how that changes and how processed weight  
2 differs. You know some years, are we getting rid of  
3 more branches than others, so to some extent that's an  
4 academic part that we're just trying to figure out a  
5 little bit more about.

6  
7 For the weights that get used for the  
8 ANS, once we have established what a 25 pound wetlock  
9 box weighs, roughly that year, we'll do -- we do  
10 harvest surveys, and we talk to everybody who's  
11 harvested eggs out of Sitka Sound. And sometimes  
12 people will tell us, you know, I harvested 10,000 eggs  
13 and we'll just write that down, but a lot of times  
14 people will say, well, I shipped, you know, a box up to  
15 my relatives and I put away this many bags for myself  
16 and so we'll take those and convert that into pounds,  
17 and so that pounds would be the processed weight of  
18 eggs.

19  
20 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. Any other  
21 questions.

22  
23 Don.

24  
25 MR. HERNANDEZ: Different topic, if we  
26 could kind of switch here a little bit.

27  
28 The Board of Fish changed the amounts  
29 necessary for subsistence for the Angoon area, I don't  
30 know if there were other communities involved but we  
31 know definitely that they did for Angoon, do you know  
32 anything about what kind of changes were made. Were  
33 they increases, decreases, how did that all shake out  
34 this year.

35  
36 MS. SILL: Through the Chair. So prior  
37 to this year, in 2006, there was an ANS determined for  
38 the entire Juneau management area, which is Districts  
39 11, 12, 14 and 16, so it's a very broad area of  
40 Northern Southeast. And so that was -- it was just  
41 throughout there, it didn't matter where the fish came  
42 from as long as they were harvested in that area and so  
43 this -- during this last meeting, they took that and  
44 sort of -- they broke out different districts. And so  
45 Districts 11, 16 didn't have a C&T finding so they're  
46 not even included in the ANS anymore. So now there's  
47 an ANS just for District 12, which is mainly the  
48 communities of Angoon and Tenakee. And then District  
49 14, which is mainly the community of Hoonah, but also  
50 Excursion Inlet, Pelican, Elfin Cove, those areas. And

1 so now there's an ANS -- so it's hard to compare  
2 whether it's more or less because there was never an  
3 ANS for such a small geographic area as District 12  
4 prior to this year. So for the whole distr -- for  
5 Districts 11, 12, 14 and 16 the ANS was like 4,000 to  
6 10,000 salmon, thereabouts.

7  
8 MR. HERNANDEZ: So do you know what  
9 process they used to kind of determine what the new  
10 number should be for Angoon.

11  
12 MS. SILL: So the determination is up  
13 to the Board of Fisheries and so what we did is we put  
14 together a report, which I can provide for you if you'd  
15 like. And it basically lays out where -- how we have  
16 our data, whether we have data from permits and also  
17 from household surveys and then we basically lay out  
18 options, I think we gave them Options A through G,  
19 basically and it was different -- it was all based on  
20 permit data because our permits are every year. I mean  
21 they're the most consistent sort of data that we have.  
22 And so the options were things, mainly looking at the  
23 last five years, you know, the high harvest and the low  
24 harvest, the average harvest over those five years plus  
25 or minus the standard deviation or looking at the last  
26 10 years, and the same sort of options of a high, a lot  
27 harvest, the average harvest plus or minus standard  
28 deviations and so from those options the Board chose  
29 the one they thought was the best. And I think it was  
30 Option B, which was the recent five year average plus  
31 or minus the standard deviation.

32  
33 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. Any other  
34 questions.

35  
36 (No comments)

37  
38 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Lauren.

39  
40 Okay. The last item on the agency  
41 reports that we can do today is OSM with Chris McKee.

42  
43 MR. MCKEE: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair  
44 and Member of the Council. First of all just by way of  
45 introduction my name is Chris McKee and I'm the  
46 Wildlife Division Chief for the Office of Subsistence  
47 Management. And this has been my first trip down to  
48 attend your Council meeting so it's been a real eye  
49 opener for me to become aware of some of your issues  
50 and also to play the role of mediating the last couple

1 of rural determination hearings we had, both in Saxman,  
2 and here last night, so it was a real pleasure to be  
3 able to be able to get exposed to this. So it's good  
4 to finally meet all of you all.

5  
6 Mostly what I'm here for today is to  
7 just kind of give you a quick Staff update about what's  
8 been going on in our office. I'm not sure -- as many  
9 of you are probably aware about a year ago or maybe a  
10 little over a year ago we were short of Staff to the  
11 tune of about 12 or 13 people, so we were operating  
12 pretty shorthanded and there were several people doing  
13 more than one job sometimes and so -- but over the last  
14 -- particularly over the last six months or so we've  
15 been able to be pretty aggressive in refilling some of  
16 those positions that have been vacated so I just wanted  
17 to give you a quick update on some of the positions  
18 that have been filled recently.

19  
20 First off, Orville Lind was hired as  
21 our Native Liaison. Orville has been working for 23  
22 years in the Fish and Wildlife Service, once as a  
23 Refuge Information Technician, a Refuge Manager and a  
24 Native Liaison in the Bristol Bay region and so we're  
25 real happy to have him aboard. He was working in a  
26 detailed capacity prior to that and we were really glad  
27 that we were able to get him on a permanent basis for  
28 us. I think he's going to do real great work for us  
29 and you'll be seeing a lot more of him in the future,  
30 I'm sure.

31  
32 Karen Deatherage was hired as a  
33 subsistence Council coordinator. She has worked  
34 previously with the National Park Service and the  
35 Bureau of Land Management as an interpretative ranger  
36 and in various aspects of public affairs and she is  
37 going to be the Kodiak/Aleutian Region coordinator.

38  
39 Jennifer Harden was recently hired as  
40 the Anthropology Division Chief. She comes to OSM from  
41 working as a cultural anthropologist at Yosemite  
42 National Park in California and she'll be leading a  
43 Staff of four anthropologists and a social scientist  
44 filling a position that's been vacant for over a year  
45 and a half.

46  
47 Kayla McKinney was hired as our  
48 administrative records specialist. She's coming to us  
49 from the military where she worked as an IT specialist  
50 and has been stationed at Ft. Campbell and Ft.

1 Richardson and she will be assisting our regulations  
2 specialist in record compilation and organization.

3

4                   And more particular to my interests, I  
5 was just able to hire a couple of wildlife biologists  
6 to add to my Staff. Over the last, well over a year,  
7 we've been operating basically half Staff. So prior to  
8 becoming the Chief I was a Staff biologist with OSM for  
9 about four years, so one of the positions that I was  
10 hiring when I became Chief was to hire my old position.  
11 So Lisa Moss was hired as one of our wildlife biologist  
12 and she's coming to us from the upper Mississippi  
13 National Wildlife Refuge where she's been since 2011.  
14 In that position she participated in both inter-agency  
15 and tribal representative capacities on a variety of  
16 resource management issues and she's also worked on a  
17 lot of complex NEPA and Endangered Species Act  
18 documents so we're really anxious to have her. She'll  
19 be starting in our office on the 23rd of April.

20

21                   And then finally Suzanne Worker was  
22 hired as our other biologist. She comes to us from the  
23 Western Alaska LCC where she's been since April of  
24 2012. She's helped make multiple recommendations to  
25 senior Staff and steering committee personnel on a  
26 variety of pretty complex natural resource management  
27 issues and she also has direct on the ground experience  
28 working with some of the reindeer herders on the Seward  
29 Peninsula. So she can come into our office and pretty  
30 much be able to hit the ground running on a lot of on  
31 the ground issues with subsistence users. And so we're  
32 really happy to get her on board as well and she's  
33 going to actually be starting in our office on Monday.

34

35                   So we're finally going to have a fully  
36 Staffed Wildlife Division, which makes my life a lot  
37 easier.

38

39                   So those are just a few of the  
40 positions -- those are the more important positions.

41

42                   We're currently in the process of  
43 trying to hire a couple more people for our Fisheries  
44 Divisions, but those positions are either still in the  
45 advertisement aspect or we're still waiting to hear  
46 back on some final interviews for some of them so I'm  
47 not going to get into those until we have some final  
48 selections for some of those positions.

49

50                   But just to give you an idea that we've

1 been pretty successful in filling a lot of more key  
2 positions in our Staff.

3

4 So that's all I have for you on that.  
5 If you have any questions I'd certainly be more than  
6 happy to try to answer them.

7

8 Mr. Chair.

9

10 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Chris.

11

12 Any questions.

13

14 (No comments)

15

16 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Seeing none, thank  
17 you.

18

19 Okay, I haven't heard if Bert has  
20 called in but I think -- Bert, are you there.

21

22 (No comments)

23

24 CHAIRMAN BANGS: I guess Bert isn't  
25 there. He was going to call in. So I guess we'll take  
26 that up when Bert calls in.

27

28 (Laughter)

29

30 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay, let's take a 10  
31 minute break and we'll see if we can get in touch with  
32 Bert and go back to that after we get done with the 10  
33 minute break.

34

35 (Off record)

36

37 (On record)

38

39 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay, we're going to  
40 go back into session here. We've only got a couple  
41 things left, we'll probably break early. There's not  
42 much left to be done in the whole agenda and we'll be  
43 able to finish up in the morning. I think we need to  
44 give Staff time to write up our documents that we  
45 requested and we'll be able to review those first thing  
46 in the morning. But we did want to give Bert a chance  
47 to address the Council if he's on line.

48

49 (No comments)

50

1 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Are you there Bert.  
2  
3 (No comments)  
4  
5 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Maybe he hasn't called  
6 in yet.  
7  
8 Okay, we have one other thing and I'll  
9 turn it over to Mr. Larson, it has to do with our  
10 biographies.  
11  
12 Mr. Larson.  
13  
14 MR. LARSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. One  
15 of the techniques or one of the attributes of elevating  
16 the visibility and the presence of the Southeast  
17 Councils in their role in being managers of these  
18 resources is to provide a little bit of personal  
19 information and a picture of each of you and the idea  
20 is that if there was some personal contact that the  
21 users could have with the Council, that that may  
22 facilitate some communications. So the Office of  
23 Subsistence Management considers this an important role  
24 for you guys to have is to contribute fully into  
25 putting a face and a person with a name that's on the  
26 Council.  
27  
28 We have some very nice pictures. Some  
29 of you have been good about providing me with a little  
30 summary of yourself and a good picture. Some of you,  
31 and I'm not like going to point any fingers at anybody,  
32 like sitting next to me or something, those of us that  
33 should be considered role models but.....  
34  
35 (Laughter)  
36  
37 MR. LARSON: .....but there are some  
38 that are really not -- you know, have been slow at --  
39 they've been slow at coming around to completing the  
40 process, I'm sure it's been started.  
41  
42 (Laughter)  
43  
44 MR. LARSON: So for those of you that  
45 have finished and provided me with information, I do  
46 have your information and I'd like them all to be  
47 looking very similar so that when they're on OSM's  
48 website they'll have a look to them. So what I'd like  
49 you to do is take some time and get with me and review  
50 exactly what they look like, maybe before we leave this

1 meeting place and we'll have to have some decisions --  
2 it's actually not clear to me, I'll need to do some  
3 further inquiries about whether these should be in  
4 first person or third person, there's some  
5 inconsistencies that I need to reconcile in my own mind  
6 about what it is they should look like. But they're  
7 all pretty close but I would like to have some review  
8 and this would be a good time to do it, so we'll just  
9 fix them as we go.

10

11 Thank you.

12

13 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Larson.  
14 I don't think that was a real good subject for me to  
15 bring up.

16

17 (Laughter)

18

19 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Bert, are you there.

20

21 MR. ADAMS: I sure am.

22

23 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Welcome. You have the  
24 floor and our undivided attention.

25

26 MR. ADAMS: Oh, no kidding, already,  
27 uh, wow.

28

29 Well, thank you very much, Mr. Bangs, I  
30 appreciate that. I just wanted to call in and let you  
31 know I'm still alive, you know, and there's another  
32 issue I will talk with you about towards the end of my  
33 short talk so I appreciate, you know, the opportunity  
34 that I have to connect in with you people. I really  
35 miss coming to these meetings and I have been thinking  
36 about you all for the last couple of days. So I'm  
37 wishing you all good luck and I hope that you can do  
38 real good -- well, I know you will do good work, you  
39 know, on behalf of the people in Southeast Alaska in  
40 regards to subsistence issues.

41

42 So I guess one of the first things I  
43 need to know is are there any new people on board there  
44 since I left.

45

46 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Bert, we have one new  
47 member but he's unable to attend this first meeting,  
48 that's Albert Howard from Angoon.

49

50 MR. ADAMS: Okay. I don't think I know

1 him but I do know of the Howards, uh, okay.

2

3                   Anyhow, the thing that I wanted to  
4 address you on is I got approached by a couple people  
5 here just a couple days ago who spend a lot of time in  
6 Dry Bay fishing and, you know, and doing subsistence  
7 work as well. And the complaint was that they're  
8 unhappy with the fact that the people are not able to  
9 use their cabin for commercial and subsistence issues.  
10 So I wanted to put that on the table for you guys, if  
11 you already haven't, you know, take and consider about.

12

13                   So that's that. I just wanted to let  
14 you know I miss you and maybe I'll see you again  
15 sometime in the future.

16

17                   CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Bert. I  
18 think there is some question about what was the problem  
19 that you mentioned, it didn't come through very clear  
20 for all of us.

21

22                   MR. ADAMS: Yeah, I'm sorry. There's  
23 some people who live and fish in Dry Bay during, you  
24 know, the fishing season and I understand, and I  
25 haven't seen any documentation on this at all but they  
26 told me that they are unhappy with the fact that they  
27 would not be able to use their fishcamps or cabins, you  
28 know, for both commercial and subsistence fishing.

29

30                   I don't know if you all got wind of  
31 that, maybe Jim Capra, I know he's there and might be  
32 able to shed some light on that as well.

33

34                   CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yes, Jim is here and  
35 we've got the -- I think we understand that problem  
36 now. So, yeah, thanks for bringing that up, that's  
37 something that should be looked into for sure. I don't  
38 think anyone's heard of that here. Maybe Jim has.

39

40                   MR. ADAMS: Yeah.

41

42                   CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yeah, he has heard of  
43 that, so maybe we'll ask him more about that. And I  
44 just want to say we really miss you too, and is there  
45 any questions for Bert, or anybody that wants to say  
46 anything.

47

48                   (No comments)

49

50                   CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay.

1 MR. ADAMS: Well, before any questions  
2 I'd just like to say, you know, that I'm not -- the  
3 State, you know, here in Yakutat tried to do the same  
4 thing to not allow us to use our fishcamps, you know,  
5 for commercial and subsistence fishing but we were able  
6 to, you know, take care of that okay so we're fine  
7 there. But, yeah, it's been tried before and I think,  
8 you know, we need to be mindful of it if it every pops  
9 up again.

10  
11 But I'll be happy to take any  
12 questions.

13  
14 (No comments)

15  
16  
17 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Bert. We  
18 definitely miss you here at the meeting. We're  
19 hopefully going to attend a meeting in Yakutat soon,  
20 possibly this fall, if the schedule works for us. But  
21 thanks for calling in.

22  
23 MR. ADAMS: Yeah, no kidding, I  
24 appreciate you taking the time to hear me. And I look  
25 forward to your visit to Yakutat in the fall, it's  
26 going to be a great experience.

27  
28 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Bert.

29  
30 MR. ADAMS: All right. Goodbye to  
31 everyone and have a good rest of the meeting.

32  
33 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thanks, again, bye.

34  
35 MR. ADAMS: All right, bye.

36  
37 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. We're pretty  
38 well wrapped up as far as we can go with the agenda  
39 today. We were going to go over our proposal  
40 recommendations and our letters first thing in the  
41 morning so we'll reconvene at 9:00 a.m., and hopefully  
42 we'll be done before noon or thereabouts.

43  
44 So if there's any other things that you  
45 want to present on the annual report, now would be the  
46 time to mention them. I know Cathy had a question  
47 about the letter. Do you want to address that Cathy.

48  
49 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
50 Can you remind me, I had a question about the actual

1 annual report or.....

2

3 CHAIRMAN BANGS: I think you had a  
4 question, and I think Robert clarified that we were  
5 going to make sure that the follow up on where the  
6 TransBoundary Mining.....

7

8 MS. NEEDHAM: Okay.

9

10 CHAIRMAN BANGS: .....letter went.

11

12 MS. NEEDHAM: Okay, thanks. I had a  
13 number of things to add to some stuff that we are going  
14 to be seeing tomorrow so I was a little bit confused.

15

16 I had asked during -- when we were  
17 going over the agenda to add an agenda item about the  
18 TransBoundary Mining letter and us asking the Secretary  
19 of the Interior and Agriculture to forward it on to the  
20 Secretary of State. And previously it was reported  
21 that the Secretaries received that letter but it was  
22 unclear whether or not the Secretary of the State had  
23 received it and so I had asked to add an agenda item to  
24 get a status on that and I understand that that Robert  
25 can either tell us that now or when we go over our  
26 annual report -- new draft of our annual report.

27

28 CHAIRMAN BANGS: I think Mr. Larson is  
29 prepared to go over that with our annual report, is  
30 that correct, that.....

31

32 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. The -- I was  
33 in the process of looking at our annual report, and  
34 Issue 1 is a discussion of TransBoundary River Mining  
35 and the status of that letter. It seems to me that  
36 that would be the appropriate place to approve that  
37 language but we'll do whatever the Council wants.

38

39 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay, thank you. I  
40 think that would be appropriate.

41

42 Cathy.

43

44 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So  
45 my understanding is that the Staff's going to be  
46 working on our potential wildlife proposals and then  
47 our annual letter and then we still have a rural  
48 determination letter as well. In discussion, you know,  
49 Mr. Hernandez -- you know when we had our discussion  
50 Mr. Hernandez had kind of brought up a point that's

1 been resonating in my head since then and that is he  
2 was asking whether or not just anybody off the street  
3 would be able to put a proposal in to change rural  
4 status, and it's kind of -- it was unclear to me what  
5 the real answer to that question was.

6  
7 But it seems like maybe when we're  
8 covering the rural determination, our response to rural  
9 determination, that we could ask or in our comments say  
10 something to the affect that we think maybe proposals  
11 should only come through or be able to be made by a  
12 Regional Advisory Council. And in that, then if  
13 somebody within a community -- an individual within a  
14 community actually wants to request that a change in  
15 rural status be made, they would have to come to us and  
16 make a case to the Regional Advisory Council before we  
17 would consider making that proposal to the Federal  
18 Subsistence Board. It might be a venue for -- since  
19 we're asking the Federal Subsistence Board to give us  
20 deference, or consideration in those nonrural  
21 determinations.

22  
23 And so I guess I would recommend that  
24 the letter that the Staff is drafting right now kind of  
25 address that particular issue as well since we have a  
26 point in time to comment on that and we didn't really  
27 discuss it any further than when Mr. Hernandez had  
28 asked that question.

29  
30 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yes, Mr. Schroeder --  
31 Mr. Larson.

32  
33 (Laughter)

34  
35 MR. LARSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And  
36 one of my roles is to provide you with good counsel  
37 about those kind of things that may intersect with  
38 Office of Subsistence policies.

39  
40 One of the primary strengths of this  
41 system is that it is a grassroots initiated process  
42 unlike some of the other management processes that we  
43 have that decisions are generated at some higher level,  
44 always the strengths of this system is that possible  
45 changes to the system are allowed to be made at the  
46 lowest possible level. So a person can interject a  
47 thought into the program. And I can fully understand  
48 Cathy's point, we really don't need to have frivolous  
49 or those kinds of proposals that are clearly adverse to  
50 the interest of subsistence users but, in fact, that

1 seems to me to be the role of the Council, to filter  
2 that kind of information and make knowledgeable  
3 recommendations to the Board and have the -- the stated  
4 purpose of the Board is to provide them with deference.  
5 So, of course, I would -- you know, when it comes time  
6 to review and edit this letter, recommendation to the  
7 Board we will add anything you want to in there, but I  
8 would hope that you'd think about that concept prior to  
9 short-stopping the ability of any one person to provide  
10 a recommendation or a solution to the Board.

11

12 So that's all I have to say about that.

13

14 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

15

16 Any discussion on that.

17

18 (No comments)

19

20 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. I had one  
21 question and I was wondering if Mr. Capra could help us  
22 understand a little bit better and if there's something  
23 we could do to figure out what the problem is in  
24 Yakutat or Dry Bay.

25

26 MR. CAPRA: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

27 Recently we've had requests from several folks with  
28 commercial fishing camps under permit on Park Service  
29 land in Dry Bay and I can't speak for the Forest  
30 Service on the camps across the river. The camps are  
31 limited to use for support of commercial fishing only  
32 and we've had allowances to use them for subsistence  
33 use in the past and our current interpretation that  
34 we're getting is that that may have been inappropriate.  
35 And the folks who, I believe it's four people, are  
36 concerned about this.

37

38 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. Any  
39 questions.

40

41 Don.

42

43 MR. HERNANDEZ: That sounds like kind  
44 of a strange ruling to me. I don't know how the Park  
45 Service works necessarily but, you know, it is Federal  
46 public land and it does seem to be under the  
47 jurisdiction of Title VIII of ANILCA, which, you know,  
48 it does clearly state the uses of the public lands  
49 shall be so to cause the least adverse impacts on  
50 subsistence users so why the Park Service would make a

1 ruling that commercial fishing operations would take  
2 some kind of priority over subsistence uses is kind of  
3 a mystery to me.

4  
5 MR. CAPRA: Chairman Bangs. Council  
6 member Hernandez. The problem isn't the subsistence  
7 use which is clearly allowed under Title VIII, it's the  
8 legislation that allowed the use of cabins for  
9 commercial fishing and limited it to commercial fishing  
10 use and non-recreational use. We fully support the  
11 subsistence use of the Park lands where it's allowed in  
12 the legislation. But the kind of exclusive use of a  
13 cabin by one individual is the problem, and the  
14 interpretation of that, and that's in regulations on  
15 using cabins for the Park Service are in four different  
16 sections and there are different sections for  
17 commercial fishing, public recreational use,  
18 subsistence and each one has a different set of rules  
19 you have to follow for existing cabins, new cabins. We  
20 do provide free use of the public use cabins for the  
21 subsistence only moose season for every qualified  
22 users, but it's the use of these specific cabins for  
23 commercial fishing that we're having to look at again  
24 and these people are concerned.

25  
26 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Don.

27  
28 MR. HERNANDEZ: Well, I mean as a  
29 comment, I think it is certainly something that should  
30 be looked into and I guess it would be probably of  
31 interest to the Council of any, you know, further  
32 developments that might happen here, new information or  
33 changes or anything. But, yeah, I guess we would take  
34 an interest in that so appreciate your report.

35  
36 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yeah, I agree, Don, I  
37 think it's worth looking into to see if there's some  
38 way we could facilitate the subsistence of those  
39 cabins. I understand, kind of get the drift of why  
40 they did that, but I don't know it's maybe some  
41 direction the Council could go in the future once we  
42 maybe could bring that up at a future meeting and look  
43 into more information about it and a better  
44 understanding.

45  
46 Thank you, Jim.

47  
48 MR. CAPRA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And  
49 it is a topic of discussion this coming Thursday --  
50 well, next Thursday, the 26th, in our government to

1 government meeting and I'll also be meeting with the  
2 superintendent of the Park and briefing him on that  
3 also.

4

5 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. Okay, I  
6 think we're at the point where we could recess until  
7 9:00 o'clock tomorrow morning and we'll go over the  
8 last few things that we need to approve and I think  
9 we'll be close to an end.

10

11 Thank you.

12

13 (Off record)

14

15 (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

