

1 SOUTHEAST ALASKA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

3
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5
6 VOLUME III

7
8
9 James and Elsie Nolan Center
10 Wrangell, Alaska
11 October 23, 2014
12 8:30 a.m.

13
14
15 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

16
17 Bertrand Adams, Chairman
18 Michael Bangs
19 Arthur Bloom
20 Michael Douville
21 Donald Hernandez
22 Aaron Isaacs
23 Kenneth Jackson
24 Harvey Kitka
25 Cathy Needham
26 Patricia Phillips
27 Robert Schroeder
28 Frank Wright
29 John Yeager
30
31
32
33
34
35 Regional Council Coordinator, Robert Larson

36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45 Recorded and transcribed by:
46
47 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
48 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2
49 Anchorage, AK 99501
50 907-227-5312/sahile@gci.net

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2
3 (Wrangell, Alaska - 10/23/2014)

4
5 (On record)

6
7 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. I think
8 everybody's here. I'd like to get started so we can
9 get through. We've got a lot left to do before we have
10 to adjourn early afternoon so people can catch their
11 flights.

12
13 So we're here to try to finish up on
14 Proposal FP15-13. And I think we were there at one
15 point last night and then we got real tired and -- so
16 anyway, does anybody know where we at as far as what
17 wording was at the last.....

18
19 Mr. Larson.

20
21 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair, there is a
22 amendment to the main motion that's on the floor. The
23 amended language is to the best of my recollection on
24 Page 91, under alternative I, as proposed in 15-13.
25 But the additional language is to have that paragraph
26 changed to for inspection by law enforcement personnel
27 within 12 hours at the fishing site.

28
29 It was a little confusing last night,
30 but that's my notes to where we actually ended up.
31 There was other discussions, but I think that's the
32 item that was actually on the table.

33
34 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Maybe we
35 could get the individual who made that amendment give
36 us their reasoning behind that amendment.

37
38 Don.

39
40 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.
41 Chairman. I'm quite sure that I was the one who made
42 that final amendment. And of course, you know, we were
43 getting kind of rushed last night and trying to put
44 something together in a hurry, which is never a good
45 idea. I offered that up.

46
47 And having a chance to go back and, you
48 know, just kind of sit down and think about it last
49 night, about that wording, I would wonder if the
50 Council would allow me to maybe re-offer the amendment

1 maybe with a little slightly different wording, but
2 under the same concept of what I was hoping to
3 accomplish there.

4

5 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: If it's okay to
6 retract the second, I think that we could go ahead and
7 do that, if the Council agrees.

8

9 (Council nods affirmatively)

10

11 MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. With that in
12 mind, my basic idea was to essentially make it so that
13 a person fishing would be checking their net twice a
14 day. I think my choice of words essentially following
15 the example that was put forward by the Advisory
16 Committee, subsistence permit must be available for
17 inspection by law enforcement personnel within two or
18 twelve hours is maybe a little bit more complicated
19 than necessary. And by putting that stipulation of
20 within twelve hours, it kind of puts the fisher on sort
21 of a timeline that might not work so well.

22

23 You know, it's kind of like once you
24 check your net, depending on what time of the day you
25 checked it, you're kind of obligated to be back at a
26 certain time to re-check it. And that may not work
27 that well. Maybe a little more flexibility would be
28 desirable.

29

30 So I would propose us changing the
31 wording that -- keep it simple, straightforward, easy
32 to understand. That the regulation would read a net
33 must be attended twice a day.

34

35 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Is there a second
36 on that amendment.

37

38 MR. YEAGER: Second.

39

40 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: There's a second.
41 It's been moved and seconded to approve that amendment.

42

43 Any discussion.

44

45 Ms. Phillips.

46

47 MS. PHILLIPS: Just a clarification.
48 So that is replacing I, a net must be checked at least
49 twice a day.

50

1 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: That's correct.
2
3 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you.
4
5 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Is the way I
6 understand.
7
8 Any other discussion.
9
10 Mr. Douville.
11
12 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Chairman.
13 Originally, it -- it's in my head that Don did offer
14 this amendment, require nets be checked at least once a
15 day. And then we moved from that, making another
16 amendment, which we just withdrew. So in my head we
17 have this required nets to be checked at least once
18 day. That was the original amendment -- or the last
19 one that I recall before it started getting several
20 change -- or at least two more changes.
21
22 So where are we at exactly? We were
23 amending this one we still had I think on the table.
24 And we were making amendments here on this last
25 sentence right here. And that's what I understand,
26 although I could be wrong. But I think that's where we
27 were.
28
29 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Larson.
30
31 MR. LARSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
32 believe that Mike Douville is correct. That the main
33 motion as amended that's before the Council is very
34 similar to the OSM's recommendation. And that's to
35 check the net, you know, once a day.
36
37 Now, that main motion has been further
38 amended by Mr. Hernandez. And that's the amendment
39 that is currently before the Council, is amendment to
40 the main motion. And that is to change that wording to
41 a net must be tended twice a day.
42
43 So you would need to act on the
44 amendment in order to have a main motion back before
45 you.
46
47 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yes, Mr.
48 Douville.
49
50 MR. DOUVILLE: If I remember the

1 conversation correctly, we had exactly this type of
2 amendment once before us yesterday. And it was nothing
3 -- the problem with it that time was that you could go
4 check your net and then ten minutes later check it
5 again, you know what I mean? So we didn't go with
6 that. But we already discussed that once already.

7

8 I'm more in favor with going with the
9 original amendment. Require nets be checked at least
10 once a day. And that's all we need.

11

12 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Hernandez.

13

14 MR. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chairman. I guess
15 we did not vote on that -- it would be not the
16 amendment, but the final version that was put forward
17 there with the net must be checked once a day. And as
18 an alternative, I offered up the amendment to change
19 that to twice a day.

20

21 So no. There was no vote on the once a
22 day. It was just my suggestion that we change it to
23 twice a day, which I guess I assumed that we would vote
24 on that amendment. If that twice a day amendment was
25 voted down, then we're back to the original once a day
26 wording.

27

28 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Any other
29 discussion on this. We can move along.

30

31 Mr. Yeager.

32

33 MR. YEAGER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
34 think that checking the net twice a day is very
35 reasonable. And I think it sets a good expectation on
36 the fisher that this net isn't to be left in the water
37 and left alone for a longer than reasonable amount of
38 time.

39

40 So I like the wording of that. And I
41 think it's very reasonable. And I think if someone is
42 going to -- anyone can work the system. So I think if
43 we get hung up on the what ifs and miss the point and
44 try to get some fingers in this, I think we're not
45 going to make our deadline this afternoon.

46

47 So I'm very in favor of twice a day.
48 And I think it sends a message to the fisher that we're
49 onboard with this and that we're watching this to make
50 sure it's a responsible fishery.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
2 Yeager.

3
4 Mr. Larson.

5
6 MR. LARSON: Well, I hate to belabor
7 the point, but I think it's important that we
8 understand where we've been and where we are.

9
10 Yesterday there was an amendment to the
11 main motion that was adopted by the Council. And that
12 was to change I to check the net once a day, as
13 recommended by the OSM preliminary conclusion. So that
14 amendment was voted on, eleven to one. And that's the
15 main motion that's before the Council now.

16
17 Procedurally, it's not common for
18 bodies to revisit amendments that have just been
19 changed, but I believe it's possible. And so if you
20 wish to move forward with amending the main motion
21 again, that's perfectly acceptable. But you should
22 remember now where we were to get to this point.

23
24 So we did vote on that amendment and
25 now the amendment before you is twice day.

26
27 So thank you.

28
29 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
30 Larson. So everyone clear on what we're doing.

31
32 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman.

33
34 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Ms. Phillips.

35
36 MS. PHILLIPS: I have had wisdom of
37 Floyd Kookesh rolling through my mind off and on
38 through this meeting. I appreciate the clarification
39 we just received, but that was not the deliberation of
40 the Council. It was a comment of our coordinator. So
41 we voted. The RAC voted. And he clarified our actions
42 of yesterday. And I just really need to set that tone.

43
44 Thank you.

45
46 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Ms.
47 Phillips. So the motion before us is fishing nets must
48 be checked twice a day.

49
50 Is there any other discussion.

1 Would anyone entertain the question.
2
3 MR. HERNANDEZ: Question.
4
5 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Question's been
6 called on the amendment. All those in favor, respond
7 by saying aye.
8
9 IN UNISON: Aye.
10
11 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: All those
12 opposed, nay.
13
14 MR. DOUVILLE: Nay.
15
16 MR. YEAGER: Nay.
17
18 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. We have
19 two nays. Okay. Motion carries.
20
21 Okay. Is there any other discussion or
22 amendments to this proposal.
23
24 Patty.
25
26 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, are we on
27 the main motion now?
28
29 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yes. We're on
30 the main motion. And that is on the proposal as we've
31 amended it so far.
32
33 Patty.
34
35 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. Permit
36 holders will consider active fishing conditions and
37 manage their nets according to avoid waste of the
38 salmon resource. Permit holders will manage their nets
39 a minimum of every six hours. An amount of prime
40 gillnet fishing sites is limited on the Stikine River.
41 Permit holders may keep their nets in operation for up
42 to 24 hours, at which point they must defer the site to
43 other permit holders wishing to have an opportunity to
44 fish at the fishing site.
45
46 Mr. Chair, this was a comment from the
47 public that I wish to enter into the record.
48
49 Thank you.
50

1 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Ms.
2 Phillips. Is that what you have in mind as a motion?
3 Or.....

4
5 MS. PHILLIPS: No, Mr. Chair. I think
6 this proposal has been talked quite sufficiently and we
7 are repeating ourselves a lot of the time now. So it's
8 not a comment that I wish to take action on.

9
10 Thank you.

11
12 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Ms.
13 Phillips. So we're at the main motion. And it's on --
14 as amended. To make it simple, it's the preliminary
15 conclusion by OSM with the modification we made to make
16 fishing nets be checked twice a day instead of once a
17 day. And that's where we're at, as far as I
18 understand.

19
20 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. Maybe a
21 clarification as the maker of the motion for my
22 benefit. I heard the word tended twice a day and it's
23 been repeated as checked once a day.

24
25 Do we care about the word here, Don?

26
27 MR. HERNANDEZ: I think tended would be
28 the proper term.

29
30 MR. LARSON: Then Mr. Chair, perhaps
31 you should just check with the Council to see if those
32 words are interchangeable or if there's people that
33 have an understanding of what one word means versus the
34 other word.

35
36 So the conflict it seems in my notes is
37 that we voted on -- checked and the motion was tended.
38 So.....

39
40 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
41 Larson. So is there any discussion on this change of
42 words.

43
44 Mr. Yeager.

45
46 MR. YEAGER: Thank you. I think the
47 common terminology of checked would be more appropriate
48 and clarifying than tending.

49
50 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Ms. Phillips.

1 MS. PHILLIPS: I believe the motion --
2 the amendment was checked. But we can ask our
3 recorder.
4
5 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Was it checked,
6 okay.
7
8 So the term is checked that we voted
9 on. So are you okay with that.
10
11 MR. LARSON: But that wasn't the
12 motion.
13
14 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. So the
15 words are what the hang up is. And how do deal with
16 that. Don would have to retract that. Or.....
17
18 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair, I believe if
19 Don voted in the affirmative on checked, then it's
20 checked.
21
22 MR. HERNANDEZ: That's perfectly fine
23 with me if we use that word. Whatever most people
24 understand the best, that's perfectly fine.
25
26 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
27 Hernandez.
28
29 So we're now back to the main motion.
30 Is there any more discussion.
31
32 MR. KITKA: Question.
33
34 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: The question's
35 been called on Proposal FP15-13, as amended by the
36 Council. All those in favor, say aye.
37
38 IN UNISON: Aye.
39
40 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Opposed, nay.
41
42 (No opposing votes)
43
44 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Motion carries.
45
46 Mr. Chairman, we've completed our
47 proposal. Now I think the next proposal is FP15-14.
48 And I think that could be easily taken care of.
49
50 Mr. Schroeder.

1 MR. SCHROEDER: In light of our action
2 on FP15-13, I move that we take no action on FP15-14.

3

4 MR. KITKA: Second.

5

6 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: It's been moved
7 and seconded to take no action on FP15-14. Any
8 discussion.

9

10 (No comments)

11

12 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Question.

13

14 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Question's been
15 called. All those in favor of taking no action on
16 FP15-14, respond by saying aye.

17

18 IN UNISON: Aye.

19

20 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: All those
21 opposed, nay.

22

23 (No opposing votes)

24

25 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Motion carries.

26

27 Okay. The next proposal is FP15-15,
28 restricting use of seines and gillnets in the Klawock
29 River.

30

31 Jeff Reeves. Thank you.

32

33 MR. REEVES: Good morning, Mr.
34 Chairman, Council. For the record, my name is Jeff
35 Reeves. I'm with the U.S. Forest Service. The
36 materials for FP15-15 will begin on Page 110 in your
37 book. And the analysis begins on Page 111.

38

39 So Proposal FP15-15 was submitted by
40 this Council and it requests that the Federal waters of
41 the Klawock River and lake drainage be closed to the
42 use of seine and gillnets during the months of July and
43 August. Is it noted that the recent escapements of
44 sockeye into the lake have been very low and that use
45 of seine and gillnet gear in this area poses an
46 unacceptable risk of over-harvest.

47

48 With a State-managed subsistence
49 fishery within the same area, both the proponent and
50 the Craig Fish and Game Advisory Council have also

1 submitted proposals to the Alaska Board of Fisheries
2 requesting similar action within the State fishery.
3 Action by the Board of Fisheries will occur in February
4 of 2015.

5
6 The Klawock drainage, for those who
7 aren't familiar with it, is located essentially on the
8 western side of Prince of Wales Island and is a very
9 important subsistence resource for both the people of
10 Klawock and the other nearby communities. The river is
11 approximately a mile and a half long and drains out of
12 Klawock Lake. The lake itself is five miles long and
13 has four major streams draining into it, which are
14 important for sockeye spawning.

15
16 There has been recent concern over the
17 habitat issues within these streams due to the effects
18 from past timber harvest practice. Klawock sockeye
19 salmon weir counts have been in decline in recent
20 years. The Prince of Wales hatchery maintains an
21 aluminum bipod weir on the river just below the lake.
22 From 2001 to 2011 the weir operation began in early
23 July to specifically count sockeye. Prior to 2001 and
24 since 2012 the weir was typically utilized beginning in
25 late July to capture coho.

26
27 Historic weir counts within the
28 draining during the 1930s averaged just over 35,000
29 sockeye. From 2000 to 2010 weir counts have ranged
30 from 6,198 to 22,739. Since 2011 the weir counts have
31 been less than 5,000 sockeye. Historic weir counts and
32 the percentage of the return by month can be found in
33 Table 1, which is on Page 116 in your materials. The
34 past weir data suggests that 64 to 97 percent of the
35 sockeye return occurs in the months of July and August.

36
37 Subsistence harvests since 1969 can be
38 found in Table 2, which is on Page 118 of your
39 materials. And although the entire lake drainage is
40 open for subsistence fishery, the majority of the
41 sockeye harvested are taken in the marine waters during
42 the month of July.

43
44 Directed harvest of sockeye within the
45 river and lake is not common, as many users tend to
46 believe that fish within the river and lake should be
47 left alone. However, during lower abundance fishing
48 years it is not uncommon to see subsistence fishing
49 within the mouth of the river, upstream of the Highway
50 Bridge. Key respondent interviews in 2002 thought that

1 the mouth of the river should be closed to seine nets
2 to ensure that escapement makes it into the river and
3 the lake.

4

5 Reported harvest of sockeye and the
6 total number of subsistence permits issued has
7 fluctuated since 1969. Reported subsistence harvest
8 has ranged from a low of 238 to as high as 6,661, and
9 typically occurs in the marine waters outside of
10 Federal jurisdiction.

11

12 On site harvest surveys have suggested
13 that the reported harvest from returned permits is on
14 average 60 percent of the actual harvest. Harvest
15 since 2009 has been in decline.

16

17 Within the Ketchikan Management Area,
18 subsistence fishing for pink salmon, chum, and coho
19 salmon also occurs under separate seasons. Although
20 state regulation typically allows for the retention of
21 incidentally harvested salmon, trout, and char within
22 these fisheries, conditions since 2012 on the Ketchikan
23 Management Area permit have prohibited retention of
24 incidentally taken sockeye from Klawock.

25

26 Prior to 2006, the only sockeye harvest
27 reported under Federal subsistence fishing permits from
28 Klawock was seven incidentally taken during a Federal
29 coho salmon fishery. However, since 2006 directed
30 harvest of sockeye has been reported on Federal
31 permits. These harvests have ranged from nine to 301
32 and have been taken with dipnet, gillnet, seine net,
33 and hand lines. Seines and gillnets have comprised 81
34 percent of the total harvest reported on Federal
35 permits, with nearly all of this harvest occurring
36 between July 7th and August 7th.

37

38 There is no directed sportfishing for
39 sockeye within Klawock, as State regulations prohibit
40 directed sportfishing for sockeye in both the
41 freshwater portion of the drainage and within a defined
42 area of saltwater from the Klawock cannery to the mouth
43 of the river.

44

45 Nearby commercial harvest of sockeye
46 occurs in Districts 3 and 4, with District 4 effort
47 typically beginning in early July, with the majority of
48 these harvested sockeye being of Canadian origin. The
49 District 3 fishery typically begins late July and early
50 August and the District is broken into three

1 subdistricts. Subdistrict 3B is located immediately in
2 front of the Craig Klawock area, where sockeye must
3 migrate through to the Klawock River. Commercial
4 harvests can be found in Table 3, on Page 120. And it
5 is unknown as to what component of those harvests are
6 from Klawock.

7
8 The proposal would restrict the use of
9 seines and gillnets within the Federal sockeye fishery
10 in the Klawock drainage, but action on this proposal
11 will not affect the State-managed fishery. Restricting
12 seines and gillnets through both Federal Subsistence
13 Board and Alaska Board of Fish actions should allow for
14 more sockeye to escape into Klawock Lake.

15
16 The preliminary conclusion is to
17 support the proposal as returns of sockeye to the
18 Klawock drainage have been in decline since 2001.
19 Restricting the use of these gears during these months
20 should allow for more sockeye to enter into the lake.
21 A restriction during July and August should protect
22 anywhere from two-thirds to nearly 97 percent of the
23 sockeye once they've entered the river. Restricting
24 seines and gillnets should not create an undue burden
25 as Federally-qualified users will be able to fish with
26 other legal gear types during these months.

27
28 Klawock River sockeye can be easily
29 monitored through the weir at the fish hatchery on the
30 drainage. And should sockeye escapements improve over
31 time, the Federal Subsistence Board could easily re-
32 institute use of these gear types in the Federal waters
33 through either special action or the regulatory
34 process.

35
36 Now, one other note to note that's
37 important about this proposal is for the action from
38 this proposal to effectively work, it's going to need
39 to coincide with actually the State Board of Fish
40 taking appropriate action. When you look on the map,
41 you'll see there's an area defined as Klawock Estuary.
42 And since estuary is mostly like probably below the
43 mean high tide line, action will not affect that area,
44 which is why there's the concurrent Board of Fish
45 proposal.

46
47 So I guess the challenge to the Council
48 is going to be the -- the support recommendation comes
49 because of the conservation concerns. And it's going
50 to be up to the Council to decide what is the most

1 appropriate recommendation for the Federal Board, as
2 the Federal Subsistence Board will act in January and
3 the Board of Fish will be in February. So not to
4 confuse the process, but the Federal action will have
5 some form of protection. However, like I said, it only
6 works its best if the State has taken some form of
7 similar action.

8

9 So in a sense the challenge in this is
10 do you as a Council go forth with a support
11 recommendation to the Board, with a possible
12 recommendation that their action either be deferred
13 until after the State Board of Fish or we have an
14 action that is in a sense concurrent with State action.
15 The one aspect that we probably want to avoid is that
16 if the Board of Fish does take no action, and we have a
17 Federal action, then it may force the Federal program
18 into having to take a special action, which might close
19 to all users. And none of us really would like to get
20 there. But if the majority of this harvest that
21 there's concern over is occurring the estuary, Federal
22 action wouldn't really solve the problem even if there
23 was a closure.

24

25 So obviously we want to do what's best
26 for Klawock sockeye.

27

28 And with that, I will be open for
29 questions.

30

31 Thank you.

32

33 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
34 Reeves.

35

36 Any questions from the Council.

37

38 Mr. Kitka.

39

40 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
41 Jeff, I noticed when you said on Tables 3 and 3B, in
42 2001 it looked like the commercial fishery take took a
43 big jump, which probably caused some decline in the
44 Klawock River. And the subsequent years seem like the
45 amount of harvest in that area was really huge. So we
46 definitely need something from the State to happen out
47 there.

48

49 Thank you.

50

1 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
2 Kitka. Any other questions.

3
4 Cathy.

5
6 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
7 Along the same lines as Harvey's comment, so the
8 analysis before us shows that there is a conservation
9 concern. And I'm wondering if you can run down actions
10 that have been taken to address that outside of closing
11 a Federal fishery. And it doesn't look like there's
12 been any Federal special action taken either on that.
13 So we are saying it's a conservation concern, but what
14 have we done so far that has been directed to address
15 that specifically.

16
17 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman. Ms.
18 Needham. Up until now -- no, there has not been any
19 special actions. A lot of times even by the time that
20 if the State manager chooses to take some action, it's
21 usually beyond the season of the sockeye fishery. And
22 the one positive note that we do have is the fish
23 resource monitoring program did fund a Klawock
24 monitoring project for -- it started this year and
25 it'll continue for three more years. So we are getting
26 the pickets and the weir in July 1st, so we are able to
27 track escapements now during the course of the fishery.

28
29 It is kind of like I mentioned earlier.
30 In order for any action to really benefit this
31 location, it's going to need to be a joint action. So
32 -- and who knows. Next year could be a different year
33 and we may start seeing something. But up until this
34 point there has not been actions at least Federally.
35 And from the State side, I can't think of any either
36 that may be an extension to the fishery in some prior
37 years when needs weren't met. But.....

38
39 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Jeff.
40 Any other questions for Mr. Reeves.

41
42 Cathy, follow up.

43
44 MS. NEEDHAM: So you mentioned the fish
45 resource monitoring program. That we had a new project
46 this year where the escapement was monitored for the
47 full season. And I'm wondering if you have the numbers
48 -- updated numbers for 2014 based on being able to
49 monitor for a longer period of time.

50

1 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman. Ms.
2 Needham, yes. In fact, if you'd like to jot these down
3 -- for adult sockeye returns this year through this
4 past last week, the sockeye weir count for adult
5 sockeye is 5,905. And 299 of those were in July.
6 3,528 in August. 2,020 in September. And 58 after
7 October 1st.

8
9 The largest contribution was the August
10 portion, which was 60 percent of the escapement.

11
12 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Jeff.

13
14 Any other questions.

15
16 Harvey.

17
18 MR. KITKA: Thank you for the figures,
19 Jeff. I just was wondering -- I had heard that sockeye
20 run returns this year were really late. Is there any
21 corresponding numbers or dates when they were
22 different.

23
24 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman. Mr. Kitka,
25 yes. There is indication sockeye seemed to be later.
26 I know the commercial fishery data, which hopefully
27 someone from the State could jump on -- in the
28 estimates that I saw on the website, there was a lot
29 more outside waters harvest than typically used to
30 seeing for sockeyes. The subsistence fishery itself
31 closes August 7th, so there's really no indication of,
32 you know, anyone targeting them after that.

33
34 The general feel from the fishery that
35 I got from talking to some individuals was that some
36 did a lot better towards the end of the fishery, which
37 could be indication when you see that August was the
38 biggest contribution in the return. But the one thing
39 that was surprising was a good portion of the September
40 fish that came through the weir were really dark fish.
41 So whether they were out there later in marine waters
42 and came in that way or they just held in the river, we
43 don't know.

44
45 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
46 Reeves.

47
48 Cathy.

49
50 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Reeves, to the best

1 of your knowledge, has the community of Klawock ever
2 looked at doing voluntary reduction of harvest or tried
3 to take actions to address the potential -- or the
4 conservation concern voluntary rather than by pushing
5 through regulations.

6

7 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman. Ms.
8 Needham. That -- you know, I hate to say it, but I
9 don't know. I have had communication with Klawock
10 Cooperative Tribal Council prior to, you know, the
11 implementation of the project because I wanted to make
12 sure that a monitoring project was in their best
13 interest. And at that time, that Council was very
14 supportive of gathering further knowledge. I do know
15 there's been a few times that residents have come in to
16 both the in-season manager -- and I know they've also
17 contacted State management about, you know, sometimes
18 concern over the lateness of fish and wanting the
19 fishery increased, you know, in duration and stuff like
20 that.

21

22 But as for like what might be typical
23 of what we know happens down in Hydaburg, where their
24 folks are willing to back off from the system, I
25 haven't heard of anyone coming together as a group and
26 asking for that. But it could be a positive step to
27 seek. I don't know. I could probably confer to Mr.
28 Isaacs there. He lives in the community and he could
29 probably give a better idea, too, of maybe what he's
30 heard or what, you know, he knows from community
31 members.

32

33 MR. ISAACS: Mr. Chairman.
34 Unfortunately, I've stepped out of all the
35 organizations that I'd been involved with. After a
36 while you just reach a point where you get tired of the
37 bickering and so on. I've talked to different ones on
38 the IRA Council and everyone is aware that the sockeye
39 runs into Klawock are getting later and later. Not
40 only are they getting later, when I was out there
41 fishing with my boys, the sockeye are inundated with
42 humpies.

43

44 I remember the first day we fished. We
45 got about 45 humpies and about six sockeyes. And we
46 had to dump everything out and just pick our sockeye
47 out of it. So in all the research you're involved
48 with, keep this in mind. That the sockeyes are getting
49 later into Klawock River.

50

1 But the other thing that I was told by
2 one of the higher Council members was they wanted some
3 kind of a -- they needed some research on the actual
4 sockeyes coming into Klawock River.

5
6 The other thing I wanted to mention --
7 and this information comes from one of our elders from
8 Craig. He always told me that a lot of people think
9 that the fish that are coming into Klawock area come
10 down through Warren Channel up into Naukati and that
11 area. And he said the fish that we were catching out
12 at Granite Point and Cape Paddington are going to
13 Canada. Now, however that information can be used --
14 up to you.

15
16 So the fish coming into Klawock River
17 comes down our -- comes through Warren Channel. And
18 you look at the map and look at where we've fished when
19 we were youngsters, that makes more sense.

20
21 But the Klawock River -- no matter what
22 we do with the Klawock River sockeye, be careful with
23 everything little thing you do with Klawock River
24 sockeye. In research, determinations -- be really
25 careful. Because Klawock River sockeye is one of the
26 highest productive sockeye streams on the island. And
27 if it's closed or shortened, you're going to get a lot
28 of response from the Great Klawock area. And
29 particularly Klawock.

30
31 I go down to the IRA Councils and it's
32 half scary to sit there from the people that are
33 sitting on that Council. Because they're tough when it
34 comes to sockeye fishing. So again I hope though that
35 every bit of information goes into these studies.

36
37 Thank you.

38
39 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
40 Isaac.

41
42 Mr. Kitka.

43
44 MR. KITKA: One more question. I just
45 was curious if you guys have what would be the minimum
46 escapement that you would see before you start closing
47 this area.

48
49 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman. Mr. Kitka,
50 to tell you the truth, I don't think there is a magic

1 minimum number. But I know for sure that we would
2 definitely like to see some of the prior numbers that
3 we saw when the monitoring program first came in back
4 around -- you know, 2001 there. Those escapement
5 numbers from 2004 to 2009 obviously are more numbers
6 that we like to see. That's for sure.

7
8 The good news with this one is that
9 because the hatchery has to maintain that weir for
10 their coho returns and their brood stock and their --
11 this weir pretty much covers the duration of the
12 return. So -- and it very rarely does get, you know,
13 compromised with water flows. And if it does by then,
14 it's usually late fall. And you can see that by
15 October there's just very little, you know, sockeye
16 coming back.

17
18 So we're capturing -- or, you know, we
19 should be getting a fairly accurate minimum escapement.
20 Hopefully that's a point we can get to. Where we can
21 determine maybe a magic number for escapement, but the
22 caveat that we have to deal with is that obviously the
23 fishery is the only fishery actually under a regulation
24 -- under State management. And so it is defined by a
25 season. And the season begins typically when the fish
26 start returning. So as to whether you could have like
27 the situation at Redoubt where you could predict, it's
28 hard to say. And it would probably take a number of
29 years even to get there. So.....

30
31 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Jeff.
32
33 Cathy.

34
35 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
36 Mr. Reeves, can you -- on Table 1, when we look at the
37 escapement number, do we know -- do sockeye returning
38 to Klawock, are they predominantly four year or five
39 year fish. And then can you also remind me. We have
40 enhancement on Klawock for sockeye for a long time. Am
41 I understanding that's no longer going. So what year
42 did that cease.

43
44 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman. Ms.
45 Needham, for the age data -- and perhaps if I'm
46 speaking wrong, Ben might know better. But I believe
47 the majority of the returning fish are five year olds
48 to Klawock, based on past literature. But that's one
49 -- definitely when I get back, too, I can try to look
50 up, validate that, and send it to you.

1 The enhancement -- before I came on
2 this trip I was talking to the current hatchery
3 manager. And we looked back through the hatchery
4 reports to the State and we believe that the last
5 enhancement or release year was like either 2007 or
6 2008. But there's been no sockeye production since
7 then through the hatchery.

8
9 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

10
11 Anyone else.

12
13 Cathy.

14
15 MS. NEEDHAM: So based on that, this
16 year's escapement doesn't include the -- the brood year
17 that came back this year was not a year that it had
18 been enhanced -- that the fishery had been enhanced.
19 We're coming off of a brood year during a year that was
20 not enhanced essentially. We're coming off a brood
21 year of 2009 predominantly.

22
23 MR. REEVES: That would mostly likely
24 be correct.

25
26 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other
27 questions for Mr. Reeves.

28
29 Thank you, Jeff.

30
31 ADF&G.

32
33 MS. YUHAS: Good morning. Thank you,
34 Mr. Chairman. For the record, my name is Jennifer
35 Yuhas with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. And
36 I did just put in a request.....

37
38 MR. ISAACS: We can't hear you.

39
40 MS. YUHAS: For the record, my name is
41 Jennifer Yuhas, with the Department of Fish and Game.
42 And I just put in a request with our folks in Juneau to
43 check on the last date of the stocking, per Ms.
44 Needham's question.

45
46 One thing before I get to our official
47 position is that Mr. Reeves pointed out there is a
48 companion proposal for the Board of Fish that goes
49 along with this one. And all of the testimony that's
50 given here and the dialogue from the RAC will be

1 produced in the transcripts. Which Mr. Larson and I
2 stay in contact. And I'll make sure that I've got that
3 to our managers and the Board of Fish members for their
4 deliberations on the companion proposals, so that they
5 have all of this information. The run timing, the
6 difference in the climate and when the fish are coming
7 home -- that will all be provided to the debate for the
8 Board of Fish proposal.

9
10 On the Federal proposal, the Department
11 supports reasonable opportunities for subsistence, but
12 were neutral on the allocation. That's a mandate.
13 That's what we have to do until the Board of Fish makes
14 a ruling, which they're going to do in February. After
15 they've taken a position, then the Department supports
16 what the Board of Fish has already done. You see that
17 a lot when we support the regulations we already have.
18 That's the way our mandate is structured.
19 Unfortunately, the Federal Board will be meeting in
20 January and the State Board will be meeting in
21 February.

22
23 Procedurally, the Council does have
24 some options to either defer this proposal and have the
25 Federal Subsistence Board take action after the Board
26 of Fish has met if you're going to have, as we said
27 before, any success over the companion proposals acting
28 together or you can take action contingent up action by
29 the Board of Fish so that you can save time. The
30 drawback for that would be that if there's new
31 information at the Board of Fish, it doesn't go into
32 the consideration when the Federal Board is debating
33 this one because of the timing of that.

34
35 We do support the increased opportunity
36 and we realize it doesn't work without the Board of
37 Fish proposal.

38
39 I'm open to questions regarding that.

40
41 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Ms.
42 Yuhas.

43
44 Any questions.

45
46 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.

47
48 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Ms. Phillips.

49
50 MS. PHILLIPS: I don't get what is the

1 increased opportunity that you're talking about.

2

3 MS. YUHAS: Trying to provide fish up
4 the river.

5

6 MS. PHILLIPS: But this proposal is to
7 close for the use of seines and gillnets.

8

9 MS. YUHAS: And we understand that the
10 Board of Fish proposal has to be the companion for this
11 to have any effect -- to provide fish up the river.

12

13 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.
14 Anyone else have any questions for Ms. Yuhas.

15

16 Cathy.

17

18 MS. NEEDHAM: Can we ask a general
19 question or were you going to continue on with the
20 Department's.....

21

22 MS. YUHAS: I'm finished providing
23 information that hasn't been asked. And I'm always
24 open to hard questions, I don't know if I'll have the
25 answer.

26

27 MS. NEEDHAM: To your knowledge, in
28 this cycle are there any Board of Fish proposals that
29 have been put forth that are being considered that
30 might address management action in the commercial
31 fisheries to address the conservation concern within
32 the Klawock drainage.

33

34 MS. YUHAS: Through the Chair. The
35 companion proposal for this can only address.....

36

37 MS. NEEDHAM: I thought I said
38 commercial.

39

40 MS. YUHAS: Yes. Okay. Yes. The
41 companion proposal for this at the Board of Fisheries
42 will pertain to the gear and the species. And as I was
43 explaining in the subcommittee and at previous
44 meetings, the Board of Fish and Board of Game process
45 is as I've described more organic than the structured
46 Federal Subsistence Board. So once those are on the
47 table, it's not restricted to one fishery in general.
48 The discussion will take place over the fish, whether
49 that's sport, commercial, subsistence and how that
50 affects the allocative aspects is up to the Board of

1 Fish at that meeting.

2

3 So to close the commercial fishery in
4 the State waters -- or restrict the commercial fishery
5 in the State waters is a discussion that can happen at
6 the Board of Fish, while this body is bound to only
7 discuss the subsistence fishing.

8

9 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Ms.
10 Yuhas.

11

12 Cathy, follow up.

13

14 MS. NEEDHAM: Right. I understand
15 that. But I'm trying to get at the question that I
16 asked Mr. Reeves earlier about we have a conservation
17 concern on our system and it doesn't look like until
18 now these proposals are in the -- any management
19 activities have been taken to address that conservation
20 concern, even though we all feel that there is a
21 conservation concern. And I'm wondering how this is --
22 by putting new proposals through the subsistence first,
23 how that's managing for our subsistence priority. And
24 so I'm trying to clarify whether I'm just missing the
25 fact that there have been management actions in the
26 past. And it sounds like there has not.

27

28 MS. YUHAS: Through the Chair. Our
29 previous testimony has revolved around emergency orders
30 which have gone through the debate of whether that was
31 effective or not and so that's been an ongoing
32 discussion for the last three years. The timing of
33 which is first -- we are disappointed that the Federal
34 Board is happening first. Because the proposals were
35 submitted technically to the Board of Fish before they
36 were submitted to the Federal Subsistence Board. But
37 then one's going to hear it before the other. We
38 understand fully the Board of Fish needs to take action
39 before the Federal Subsistence Board. That's where
40 we've got the rub with the timing of which came first.
41 We set our meeting calendar three years ago, so we're
42 blaming the Feds for the meeting calendar this time.

43

44 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you,
45 Jennifer.

46

47 MS. YUHAS: Sorry, Chuck.

48

49 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Ms. Phillips.

50

1 MS. PHILLIPS: This might be -- I don't
2 know who to ask. But -- so there's a seine management
3 group that -- on the southern end. And does our
4 Federal biologist sit in on those seine management
5 meetings because of our concerns with our stock
6 assessment of our, you know, subsistence harvested
7 streams.

8
9 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman. Ms.
10 Phillips, you know, to tell you the truth, I've never
11 been to a seine management meeting. I don't know of
12 any that have actually occurred down in our area. If
13 the area management biologist for Ketchikan had one and
14 extended an invitation, I would certainly love to sit
15 in and so. But like as for, you know, what's out there
16 that might be more formal as, you know, the such like
17 we're dealing with the whole Kootznoowoo stuff where
18 there's more meetings revolving around that, then --
19 you know, if those exist I would love to know and I
20 would love to attend.

21
22 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman.

23
24 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Patty, follow up.

25
26 MS. PHILLIPS: It is my understanding
27 that those seine management meetings are open to the
28 public. But so I see from the Table 3 the commercial
29 harvest -- the sockeye. And isn't this commercial
30 harvest of sockeye -- I don't -- if this is the right
31 word -- predicated on escapement, that they allow them
32 to fish these districts. So where is this escapement
33 calculated from, and so that escapement should also
34 apply to this Klawock system.

35
36 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Patty.

37
38 Any response.

39
40 All right.

41
42 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman. Ms.
43 Phillips. I mean I'm not, by any means -- not going to
44 speak for a state-managed fishery. The one thing I can
45 tell you is at least with the 3B numbers, that the 3B
46 fishery is opened up -- I can't tell you which stat
47 week, but it is under the pink management plan. So
48 sockeye numbers aren't really directing and it's not a
49 directed sockeye fishery. So the sockeye that are
50 listed in the 3B numbers are obviously harvested in the

1 course of trying to commercially harvest pink salmon.

2

3 And the only reason I put these numbers
4 in there is because this is the sub-district that's
5 immediately in front of the drainage. But as for the
6 nitty-grittys to the fishery, I'd have to defer to the
7 State.

8

9 MS. PHILLIPS: I have one follow up,
10 please.

11

12 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Patty.

13

14 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
15 So if the State is being more organic, which I consider
16 holistic or attempting to be holistic, then it seemed
17 like there would be a collaborative outreach to our
18 subsistence manager to partake of the management of
19 specific stocks, especially stocks of concern.

20

21 Thank you.

22

23 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thanks, Patty.
24 Any other questions or a response.

25

26 MS. PHILLIPS: None required.

27

28 MS. YUHAS: So noted.

29

30 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Hernandez.

31

32 MR. HERNANDEZ: Just a comment, Mr.
33 Chairman. It is a little bit worrisome when we hear
34 that, you know, sockeye runs are tending to come later
35 and have a tendency more to be mixed with the peak of
36 the pink salmon runs, which is what the seiners target.
37 So that -- you know, that could indicate a problem for
38 the future.

39

40 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Don.
41 And Ms. Phillips.

42

43 MS. PHILLIPS: It was brought to my
44 attention that there's a Seine Task Force meeting in
45 Petersburg in November. And I would request that Jeff
46 participate on behalf of the Subsistence Program --
47 Federal Subsistence Program.

48

49 Thank you.

50

1 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Patty.

2

3 That's a good idea.

4

5 Anyone else. Hearing none -- oh. Ms.

6 Yuhas.

7

8 MS. YUHAS: I just wanted to respond to

9 the comment about the timing. The reason I brought up

10 that these transcriptions and our conversation would be

11 provided to both the Department and the Board of Fish

12 members for the deliberations is that it is a very big

13 piece -- the timing and the mix and that's what the

14 Board of Fish is tasked with trying to decipher. And

15 so it's very important information for them for their

16 decisions as far as how they're going to modify things

17 to address that problem. And that's why I mentioned it

18 would be provided for those discussions.

19

20 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

21

22 Mr. Isaacs.

23

24 MR. ISAACS: Yes. Jeff, I'm trying to

25 absorb all this information you're peeling off to us.

26 What will be the consensus of all this information you

27 have on Klawock River.

28

29 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman. Mr. Isaac,

30 I guess I'm not sure what you're asking there. But

31 obviously this is the information that I could find.

32 What we see is that obviously based on return numbers

33 and a poor performance even in a subsistence fishery,

34 that there is some issue with occurring at the

35 location. So, you know, this -- I believe action by

36 this Council on this sets a precedence for -- as Ms.

37 Yuhas said, it could go forth as to what -- to the

38 Committee with the Board of Fish, so they can make an

39 appropriate decision.

40

41 We as management entities want to do

42 what's best for the fish because just as long as we

43 have fish, people will be happy. And we can continue

44 obviously a very historic and important fishery. So,

45 you know, ideally this maybe could be a precedent

46 setting point from this point on that gets the

47 community involved to want to do what's best for their

48 -- you know, their important stock. Managers -- you

49 know, if we can get a positive ball rolling, that would

50 be great.

1 MR. ISAACS: Last month or so when I
2 called you about the issue of possible closure, when
3 you use the word closure with Klawock River, you're
4 talking a very broad area. But I told Jeff then that
5 if this goes through, I would tell him that he will be
6 the one to tell the Klawock people and higher councils
7 they're going to close this area. Because I will speak
8 against it in every way I can.

9
10 I am very worried about whatever is
11 going to happen to Klawock River sockeye. I have to go
12 back now about 1982, '83, when there was an escapement
13 of about -- what, 600 sockeye, Mike? 600. And that
14 was when we came up with that proposal to shut it down
15 from Friday night till Monday. I was on the advisory
16 council then that did that.

17
18 It's very -- not only important to us.
19 It's emotional to some of the guys that sit on that
20 council. And those people are very adamant about we do
21 with the Klawock River sockeye.

22
23 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
24 Isaacs.

25
26 Mr. Hernandez.

27
28 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.
29 Chairman. Another thought that I don't think was
30 brought out here that might be part of the discussion.
31 Does either the State or Federal agencies have any kind
32 of information on the make up of the people who are
33 fishing these respective fisheries, State and Federal,
34 in terms of are they for the most part local residents
35 or do people come from other areas to fish on the
36 Klawock River.

37
38 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman. Mr.
39 Hernandez, for the Federal data that -- I mean I could
40 actually dive into the database and look at where
41 Klawock harvest was reported. And I could, you know,
42 easily tell you where the permit holder resided at
43 least then -- whether community residents. For the
44 State data, you know, I really can't answer on that.
45 But I would say based on my observations as I drove
46 over the bridge and see, you know, the fishery in
47 action that who's out there tends to be local.

48
49 Yeah. It may have been different in
50 prior years and I know we've heard that before. And I

1 recall Mr. Douville at the Advisory Council Meeting
2 speaking on that, that the user groups definitely
3 changed. And with the increase in ferry, you know,
4 costs. And it's not as easy to bring a boat over like
5 some used to and stuff like that. But pretty much now
6 I would say that it's -- the majority is local users.
7 But whether they're Craig or Klawock, that I wouldn't
8 be able to tell you -- unless I physically knew the
9 person.

10

VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Follow up, Don.

11

12
13 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah. I was more
14 interested -- I guess I should have been more specific
15 as to whether they were -- you know, tended to be
16 Federally-qualified or non-Federally-qualified.
17 Because then as I understand it, in the marine waters
18 they could be non-Federally-qualified fishers fishing
19 there.

20

21 So I don't know.

22

23 Do you have any comment on that,
24 Jennifer.

25

26 MS. YUHAS: I just put a request in for
27 the breakdown, but it seems like that would be
28 pertinent for the Board of Fish meeting as well. I
29 will say there's that threshold of three. So, you
30 know, we can say, you know, where from and I'm not sure
31 if we have to have more than three people from an area
32 to say -- it's got some weird -- that whole
33 confidentiality thing that we've run into before.

34

35 So I put the request in to say, you
36 know, can we get a report on residency and local or
37 non-local. So I'll see what comes back from that and
38 we'll definitely have that ready for the Board of Fish
39 discussion as well.

40

41 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other
42 questions.

43

44 (No comments)

45

46 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Hearing none.
47 Thank you both.

48

49 Yes, Mr. Adams.

50

1 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: You guys can go. I
2 would like to maybe take a stand down on this proposal
3 for now. Because Doug and Ryan have to leave here at
4 10:00 o'clock. And I promised them a half hour this
5 morning to make a report on wolves and moose in Berners
6 Bay.

7
8 So I would like to maybe allow them to
9 do that right now, if it's okay, Mr. Chairman.

10
11 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yes. That would
12 work.

13
14 MR. LARSEN: Well, thank you, Mr.
15 Chairman, and members of the RAC. For the record, my
16 name is Doug Larsen. I'm the Southeast Regional
17 Supervisor the Division of Wildlife Conservation at
18 Fish and Game. And I'll have this title for one more
19 week before I retire, so this will be the last Council
20 meeting I'll have an opportunity to sit -- at least as
21 an agency representative. But I look forward to
22 interacting with the RAC in the future as a citizen.

23
24 And I want to thank you all for the
25 stewardship, the cooperation, and the really great
26 relationship that the RAC has had with the State
27 system. We in Wildlife had really appreciate the
28 cooperative interactions. We've really appreciated the
29 kindnesses that the RAC has shown us at meetings and
30 working on issues -- tough issues. And we really
31 appreciate that. And I wanted to make sure that that
32 got into the record.

33
34 With me today is Ryan Scott. He's our
35 Management Coordinator. And as I step down, Ryan will
36 be assuming my role at least in an acting status until
37 my position is filled. Ryan brings a great amount of
38 history and knowledge and experience working with
39 wildlife here in Southeast Alaska and I think the
40 region is certainly in very good hands. And he I think
41 will be very good in working together with the RAC on
42 future issues.

43
44 This morning, Mr. Chairman, I had a
45 PowerPoint that I wanted to present in terms of update
46 on the Unit 2 wolf work that we've been involved in and
47 some of the implications associated with some of the
48 recent activities there. In the interest of time --
49 both your time and our time -- I will try and hit those
50 things verbally without the power point. I think I can

1 hit the high points to where you can at least be
2 familiar with what we're doing and where we intend to
3 go or hope to go in the future cooperatively with the
4 Federal government. And then we'll leave some time
5 hopefully for some questions, if you have any.

6
7 And then I'll turn it over to Ryan
8 because I know there's some interest in getting an
9 update on the Berners Bay moose drawing permit process
10 and system that we have in place now. And I know that
11 has implications on the Federal side and you have
12 interest. So I'll move ahead quickly here and try and
13 cover the wolf stuff and turn it over to Ryan.

14
15 So as I think all of you know from past
16 interactions with us -- and I've come to the RAC in the
17 past and given updates on the wolf work. We've been
18 doing wolf research in Unit 2, Prince of Wales and the
19 adjacent islands, since the 1990s. And historically we
20 used radio collars. Captured wolves and put radio
21 collars on. Originally it was VHF collars, so you
22 would have to go out and actually fly to get locations.
23 Now with modern technology we have GPS collars. We get
24 numerous locations from each individual wolf. Gives us
25 a really good sense for the demographics, how big an
26 area they're covering. We used those collared animals
27 to help us actually visually observe animals to see how
28 big the packs are, how many individuals are in the
29 packs.

30
31 So that process has been very good.
32 And historically we used information through that
33 process to come up with a population estimate. And as
34 you may recall, we have a guideline that's in
35 regulation -- State regulation -- that says we will
36 harvest up to -- but not to exceed 30 percent of the
37 fall population estimate. Of course our challenge has
38 been coming up with that fall population estimate.

39
40 When Dave Person was doing his work in
41 the '90s and 2000s, we were able to get a reasonable,
42 we think, estimate at that time because of the work
43 that was going on on the collared animals. As those
44 animals went off the air -- their collars died and we
45 didn't have animals collared, it became more and more
46 challenging. Our last really good estimate until
47 recently was in the mid-1990s. And at that time we
48 estimated there were roughly 340 wolves in Unit 2.

49
50 More recently we've been in the process

1 of developing a new technique, which involves not so
2 much invasive captures -- although we still do some of
3 that to get some of the demographic information. But
4 there's a process by which you can use DNA from
5 animals' hair. And for those of us -- CSI -- you know
6 how that can work. And it can be a -- it's a pretty
7 fast evolving technology and it's been very helpful in
8 helping us to come up with better estimates.

9
10 So this last year -- actually the last
11 two years -- 2012 and 2013 -- we had hair boards, which
12 are scented so that these wolves when they approach
13 them, they will actually roll on the hair boards. And
14 we have remote cameras to watch their behaviors at
15 these scent sites. We get the hair. We send the hair
16 into a lab in Missoula, Montana. The analyses are done
17 and we get back actual individual wolves. So we can
18 identify how many individual animals are in a given
19 area. And then we can also determine how often we're
20 recapturing those individuals.

21
22 And through some formulas that are way
23 beyond my level of expertise, we are able to come up
24 with an estimate of the overall number of wolves within
25 a study area. And our study area, as you may recall,
26 has historically been the central part of Prince of
27 Wales Island. We'd love to do it across the whole
28 island, but obviously there's a lot of logistics and
29 costs the bigger you get. So what we end up doing is
30 getting as good an estimate as we possibly can within
31 that study area and then extrapolating across the whole
32 of Unit 2.

33
34 Obviously there's serious
35 considerations when we do that. We don't know whether
36 what we see for densities in that study area are in
37 fact indicative of what it is in the south and the
38 north. We don't know that. And so our estimate has to
39 be bordered with some confidence limits.

40
41 So in doing that hair board work, what
42 we came up was for this last fall of 2013 -- was an
43 estimate of about 220 wolves, which is down from 350-
44 ish roughly that we had in the past. Now, that's in
45 line with what we have anticipated in terms of talking
46 with trappers, people who spend a lot of time on the
47 island. You know, we've all I think come to the
48 conclusion that wolf numbers are lower than they were.
49 How much exactly we didn't know until recently. And
50 now we think well, you know, it went from 350-ish

1 roughly to 220-ish. But we have confidence limits that
2 130 to 378. So it's a fairly broad confidence limit.

3
4 Well, in doing that work, one of the
5 things that has become clear to us -- and it always was
6 clear, but has become even more clear more recently, is
7 that we need to spend quality time with the users. And
8 as I shared with you, Mr. Chairman, this morning, in
9 order for wolf management to be successful -- I would
10 say anywhere, but particularly right now in Unit 2, you
11 need three pieces to the stool. You need State
12 involvement and cooperation. You need Federal buying
13 in cooperation. And most importantly in my mind, you
14 need the user buying in cooperation.

15
16 Last April we had a meeting in Craig.
17 We had about 85 people at that meeting. Mr. Douville
18 was there thankfully and offered really good insights
19 with his expertise and knowledge. And at that meeting,
20 the real high users recognized that okay, yes, numbers
21 are down. We need to work together to figure out how
22 we can ensure that we harvest at a sustainable level
23 collectively. And so trappers were telling us -- look.
24 If we need to reduce the harvest, fair enough. We get
25 it. We understand that that's important.

26
27 For me that was -- and for us as agency
28 -- and I think for all of us collectively, that's a
29 huge inroad. If we have the cooperation of the users,
30 I think we can succeed in maintaining those sustainable
31 harvest levels. And as we maintain sustainable harvest
32 levels, there's no issue with having to list the wolf
33 as endangered or threatened. That's huge.

34
35 So at this point we don't believe that
36 there's a need to list the wolf. And we share that
37 same feeling with the Forest Service and the Fish and
38 Wildlife Service. But one of the things we need to do
39 is to ensure that we can demonstrate that we can
40 harvest at a sustainable level.

41
42 Well, one of the proposals that the
43 department put in this year was to lower that limit --
44 that guideline harvest level from 30 percent to 20
45 percent. Now, whether or not that happens is in many
46 ways immaterial because we have the ability to manage
47 it lower than 30 percent. It just says we can manage
48 for up to 30 percent. The reason the department put
49 that in there was that frankly given the unreported and
50 the unaccounted for harvest that we know occurs, we

1 felt that a 20 percent upper limit would actually make
2 more sense.

3

4 And frankly, I think going forward at
5 least in the near term, I don't envision we're going to
6 be managing at a harvest level more than 20 percent.
7 Really I think lower than that at least for a while.
8 But whether or not we keep that 30 percent so that in
9 the future we need to go higher, you know, that's -- in
10 many ways in my mind, that's sort of secondary.

11

12 What's more important -- and I think
13 has been successful thanks to people like Don Hernandez
14 and Mr. Douville in particular, who spend time on the
15 island, are from Prince of Wales, is the State working
16 with them on behalf of the RAC. Coming up with
17 estimates of what we think would be reasonable
18 harvestable levels has been I think quite successful.

19

20 Most recently, given the numbers that
21 we have and recognizing that the lower limit that we
22 have in our confidence estimate is 130, if we go to 20
23 percent of that, that's 25 wolves. Actually, it's 26.
24 But we've talked about this and we feel that a harvest
25 this year of 25 wolves would be within the guidelines
26 that would allow us to maintain sustainable levels.

27

28 That would do two things. It would
29 maintain the trapping season, which we think is
30 important. But it would also allow us some time to get
31 additional information through the work that we're
32 doing with the cooperation with the Forest Service to
33 figure out these estimates. Get a little broader
34 estimate because we're going to expand the study area.
35 And it would I think help us all collectively
36 demonstrate that we can in fact maintain sustainable
37 harvest levels.

38

39 So at this point that's what we are
40 planning to do. We are going to have a harvest cap, is
41 our intent, of 25 wolves. And so like we did in the
42 past, if and when we get up to that 25 wolves reported,
43 then we will do an emergency closure to close it. If
44 we go through the whole season and we don't reach 25,
45 then of course it would just go through the season's
46 process.

47

48 Last year we had a harvest quota of 60.
49 We ended up closing it as it started to approach 60.
50 And in the end we had 57 reported wolves. So we were

1 pretty close to what our target was. Of course that
2 doesn't account for what is unreported.

3
4 And that's the other part of the
5 proposal that the department put together, which was to
6 include any animals that were wounded or unaccounted
7 for in traps would go against that harvest guideline.
8 And frankly that wasn't something that we thought up or
9 that the Forest Service or Federal system thought up.
10 That was really something that the trappers brought to
11 the table themselves, showing in good faith that they
12 saw the value in making sure that we stayed within
13 sustainable levels. And they were willing to offer
14 that up, so we included it. Now, it's an honor system
15 thing. It's going to be tough to enforce that per se.
16 But again I think, as I mentioned earlier, having the
17 buy in of the users is going to be huge ultimately in
18 how we manage wolves successfully.

19
20 So Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to be as
21 quick as possible on that update. That's where we are
22 at this point. I would be happy to answer questions,
23 if you have any. And then we can turn it over to Ryan
24 to talk about Berners Bay.

25
26 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. Don
27 and then Mr. Isaacs.

28
29 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Thank you, Doug.
30 How about the State's efforts there on the wolf control
31 in Unit 3 and on Gravina Island. What's the status of
32 that.

33
34 MR. LARSEN: Thank you, Mr. Hernandez.
35 Mr. Chairman. Yes. So a quick update on that. So as
36 I mentioned at an earlier meeting, we feel somewhat --
37 or perhaps were received as being somewhat
38 schizophrenic when it comes to wolf management in
39 Southeast Alaska. Here we have an area, Unit 2, where
40 we've got some concerns about where the wolf levels
41 are. Maybe on the low side. We don't want to go too
42 low. And on the other hand, we have places like Unit
43 1A and Unit 3 where we appear to have quite a few
44 wolves and perhaps higher levels than we want to
45 maintain in order to maintain deer populations.

46
47 To get a handle on that, in the last
48 year we've actually done several things. On Gravina,
49 we've used remote cameras to get a sense for wolf
50 abundance on that island. We think at this point,

1 there's -- there were as many as six. We think there
2 are three on the island now. We don't have any
3 intentions at least immediately to do anything with
4 those three wolves. And that's in part because one of
5 the things we also did was vegetative sampling on
6 Gravina Island, where we looked at the amount of shrubs
7 and forbs available for deer. And what we find is
8 that, you know, the habitat on Gravina is not highly
9 conducive to supporting high numbers of deer -- is our
10 sense.

11
12 On top of that we've had quite a bit of
13 habitat modified through State harvesting systems
14 there. So a lot of the remaining high quality,
15 productive, old grown forest that's important for deer
16 has been removed. And so taking out wolves in order to
17 grow more deer may not actually be all that effective
18 at this point.

19
20 In Unit 3 we just recently completed a
21 couple of things. As I mentioned with the wolf DNA,
22 we're also doing similar work now with deer DNA where
23 we look at fecal pellets and we can actually identify
24 individual deer from those pellets, if we can get them
25 -- get fresh pellets. Which we've been able to do to
26 some degree. That information is going to help us get
27 population estimates, which to us is important.
28 Because the intensive management law requires that we
29 manage for objectives that are based on population
30 numbers. So we have to get that.

31
32 So we're doing that work. And we just
33 finished that this last spring. Also, we did similar
34 vegetative work in Unit 3 on Mitkof and Kupreanof this
35 last spring and summer to look at shrubs and forbs.
36 Preliminary information or results on that indicates or
37 suggest at least that we may be able to support more
38 deer in Unit 3 in those areas. If so, then what that
39 would beg is the whole idea of bringing in some sort of
40 method for reducing wolf numbers.

41
42 One of the challenges there of course
43 is that we know wolves take deer. But we also know
44 black bears take deer. And we know that there's a
45 healthy population of black bears in Unit 3 as well.
46 So trying to tease out how exactly to approach that in
47 a way that will indeed if possible increase deer
48 numbers, while at the same time not inappropriately
49 affecting predator numbers, still is something we're
50 looking more closely at.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Anyone else.

2

3 Mr. Isaacs.

4

5 MR. ISAACS: I didn't hear one word
6 about subsistence. You realize though that wolves kill
7 deer and deer is one of our subsistence foods. Some
8 bear. But I don't know too many people that eat bear
9 or wolves. And I'm just wondering, you know, with all
10 your studies, how that affects the deer population.

11

12 MR. LARSEN: Through the Chair. Mr.
13 Isaacs, thank you. So subsistence is indeed very
14 important. And one of the things that we've recognized
15 is as we study wolves and we come up with population
16 estimates for wolves, our body line and our
17 constitutional mandate is that we maintain sustainable
18 populations of all wildlife. Wolves, deer, everything.
19 So what that means in terms of say Unit 2 is we have to
20 maintain a sustainable wolf population. That's not to
21 say we have to maintain a high number of wolves. It
22 could be a low level of wolves, as long as it's
23 sustainable.

24

25 So even though we recognize that
26 certainly wolves take deer -- and it's important to
27 recognize that. At the same time we have to maintain
28 wolves at a level that can be shown to be sustainable
29 over time. And so -- and we had this discussion with
30 Mr. Douville and others in Unit 2 where, you know, it
31 may be more appropriate to have levels of wolves closer
32 to what we have today than what we had back in the '90s
33 or early to mid-2000s. You know, if in fact our
34 estimates at 200-ish is accurate versus 300 to 350, and
35 as long as we can maintain sustainable levels at 200,
36 that might be more appropriate.

37

38 And for the reasons that you've just
39 indicated, that would then provide -- and I think one
40 of the things we're hearing is as those wolf numbers
41 have been reduced, we are seeing more deer. Makes
42 sense. And so to the extent that wolves and bears can
43 be at lower levels, yet sustainable and maintain deer
44 populations that are sustainable and provide for uses,
45 then it's a win-win.

46

47 So that one of our challenges is
48 figuring out, you know, well, where is that tipping
49 point. Make sure that we don't go over that tipping
50 point with wolves in this case, so that we don't end up

1 in a situation where the Fish and Wildlife Service
2 through their process says look, we've got to maintain
3 sustainable levels. And in order to do that, we need
4 to take over. We don't want to see that. And we don't
5 think anybody else does either.

6

7 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Patty.

8

9 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
10 How do you determine unreported. Is it a percentage of
11 wolves.

12

13 MR. LARSEN: Thank you, Ms. Phillips.
14 Mr. Chairman. In the past, when Dave Person was doing
15 his work as I mentioned, he had a fair number of
16 animals radio collared. And so he could determine what
17 happened with those radio collared animals. There were
18 instances where those collared animals died and were
19 found. And it was determined that they were killed
20 through human means and not brought in and reported.
21 That's how we came up with an estimate back in those
22 days.

23

24 Now, that was done back in the '90s.
25 So whether those estimates from back then are similar
26 today, we don't know. One of the things we heard at
27 the meeting in Craig -- and by the way, we had follow-
28 up meetings just last week in Craig, Thorne Bay, and
29 Coffman Cove to talk with people in those communities
30 about all of this. One of the things that we found at
31 that meeting in Craig was that the users were saying
32 you know what? We think that the percentage -- which I
33 think was 25-ish or 29 percent unreported. They said
34 we don't think that's accurate. We don't think that's
35 true. You know what? I don't know if it's accurate or
36 true.

37

38 But I like to think that the users are
39 -- I like to give them the benefit of the doubt. And
40 listen to them and say okay. What's more realistic.
41 And they say it's lower. So how much lower, we don't
42 know. The only empirical quantitative information I
43 guess is what we have from the work that Dave did years
44 ago.

45

46 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

47

48 Anyone have any more questions.

49

50 Mr. Douville.

1 MR. DOUVILLE: I'll just make a
2 comment. And I agree with them. It is lower. But I
3 don't disagree that it was higher during the '90s when
4 you had all these logging operations going on and many
5 more people. I mean Craig had like 2,500 people. And
6 I feel that may be accurate. But today I don't believe
7 that the unreported harvest is that high.

8
9 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
10 Douville.

11
12 Anyone else.

13
14 Mr. Larson.

15
16 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair, there is a
17 recent document that has been released by the
18 Department of Fish and Game. It's called the Status
19 and Outlook of Southeast Alaska's Unit 2 Wolves. And I
20 will share that electronically with Council members. I
21 also have a copy here if you'd like to look at it. So
22 very, very informative publication.

23
24 Thank you.

25
26 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
27 Larson.

28
29 Mr. Isaacs.

30
31 MR. ISAACS: Isn't there a meeting of
32 -- wolf control meeting in Klawock sometime October?

33
34 MR. LARSEN: Through the chair. Mr.
35 Isaacs, not that I'm aware of. That's not to say we
36 couldn't have a meeting if there was an interest in
37 that. You know, like I said, we had meetings in --
38 we've had two meetings in Craig, a meeting in Thorne
39 Bay, and a meeting in Coffman Cove. We assumed at
40 Craig that we would see people from Klawock and we did
41 actually have people from Klawock at that meeting.

42
43 But if there was interest in further
44 discussions and stuff, by all means we could make staff
45 available for that.

46
47 MR. ISAACS: I saw some posters at the
48 shopping market indicating that there was a wolf
49 control meeting of some sort in Klawock in October --
50 first part of October.

1 MR. LARSEN: Through the Chair. Mr.
2 Isaacs. It may be that we -- we did have meetings.
3 Like I said, last week we had meetings. But they
4 weren't in Klawock. And to my knowledge, we never had
5 any planned specifically to have them in Klawock. But
6 to have them in Craig, at Thorne Bay, and Coffman Cove.
7 And we did have pretty good turnouts at all three of
8 those meetings.

9
10 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

11
12 Mr. Douville.

13
14 MR. DOUVILLE: Just one more comment
15 that adds to what you said. For the last 15 years,
16 most of the local boys would not talk to a biologist.
17 And you're seeing the first cautious, tentative steps
18 of the local knowledge actually having conversation
19 with the biologists. And we'll see where that goes,
20 but it could bear fruit. Because those people are the
21 ones that really know what's going on.

22
23 They live there.

24
25 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

26
27 Well, can you wrap it up, we're going
28 to have to give Ryan some time to make sure that he can
29 make his travel plans.

30
31 But thank you.

32
33 MR. LARSEN: Absolutely. Thank you all
34 again. I just wanted to re-highlight how appreciate I
35 am of Mike Douville and his involvement in this. It's
36 been huge. I mean we couldn't have done this without
37 his involvement. And his knowledge of the people --
38 his connections with the people have been huge. And I
39 think that thanks to him, we're going to be able to
40 maintain a sustainable population of wolves. So I just
41 want to publicly thank Mike for that.

42
43 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you very
44 much. Thank you for your presentation and update.

45
46 Okay. We'll turn the.....

47
48 MR. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For
49 the record, my name is Ryan Scott. I'm the Region I
50 Management Coordinator in Southeast Alaska for the

1 Wildlife Division. You're going to get about a three
2 minute crash course on Berners Bay moose biology.

3
4 Just to refresh everybody's memory
5 where Berners Bay is -- most of you I'm sure are
6 familiar with it. Just about 40 miles north of Juneau.
7 It's a mainland system. It's fed by four glacially fed
8 rivers -- the Berners River, Lace River, Antler River,
9 and the Gilkey River.

10
11 Moose were introduced there. They
12 didn't occur naturally. It was based on 15 calves
13 between 1958 and 1960. They showed up there and boy,
14 things looked good. They exploded. And within a
15 couple of years, we were harvesting moose there. Since
16 the 1970s that hunt's been managed by a lottery drawing
17 system.

18
19 Within the last ten years -- and I'm
20 going to cover a time span of 1998 to 2006. And that's
21 because there hasn't been a hunt there for quite a
22 while, till just recently. We would harvest anywhere
23 from, you know, upwards of ten animals. And oftentimes
24 it would be a mixed bag of bulls and antler-less
25 permits as well. All allocated by a drawing.

26
27 Come winter 2006, 2007, just as in many
28 places in Southeast Alaska, we had a hateful winter.
29 It was a very difficult time. Heavy duty snowfall.
30 And we estimate that we lost upwards of about 50
31 percent of the moose herd there. We cancelled the hunt
32 beginning in 2007.

33
34 Also coincided with a whole bunch of
35 funding that came down the pike from the Juneau Access
36 Project. The road out of Juneau, up Lynn Canal,
37 connecting to Haines and Skagway. We were able to go
38 in and do some work with Berners Bay moose specifically
39 and get data that we hadn't had prior to that. What
40 that involved was going in and radio collaring a whole
41 bunch of antler-less moose primarily. We wanted to
42 look at survival of adult females, calf production,
43 calf survival, things like that.

44
45 In addition, it allowed us to fly those
46 moose surveys, find radio collars, calculate a ratio of
47 the number of animals that we saw versus the number we
48 knew were there, and come up with a pretty good
49 population estimate. Where prior to that, roughly 30
50 years worth, we had been doing trend survey datas. And

1 we had a -- you know, we have a fairly good
2 understanding of how to relate the number of animals we
3 saw to the number of animals we thought were there.

4
5 Beginning in about 2010, 2011, we
6 detected an up tick in the moose population. Our
7 management plan calls for a 90 moose count post hunt
8 before we really do anything with it. And that's what
9 we were shooting for. Lo and behold, 2012 shows up.
10 2013 and we're there. We estimate roughly about 100
11 moose, give or take a few here and there.

12
13 So beginning in this fall -- fall of
14 2014 -- we offered the first drawing permits since the
15 fall of 2006. We issued five permits and four of the
16 hunters harvested bulls. They are limited to bulls
17 only at this point. I frankly don't anticipate seeing
18 an antler-less harvest there for a long time. And
19 previously cow hunts had been used to remove two,
20 three, four animals just to maintain the stability of
21 the herd. We didn't want them to outgrow their home.
22 But at this point I think we've got plenty of room to
23 grow.

24
25 A couple of things that really led us
26 to open the hunt. And I was on the fence to be sure of
27 whether or not we should go for it or not. We had met
28 the 90 moose post -- you know, the 90 moose count, if
29 you will. So that was one indication that we were
30 potentially ready to go back at it. We were carrying a
31 fair number of bull moose. The bull to cow ratios were
32 fairly high. We were shooting for 20 to 25 bulls for
33 every 100 cows. We only had 100 moose, so keep that in
34 mind. You know, the ratios are great. But when you're
35 talking about a small number of moose, you know, you do
36 have to factor that in. But we had excess bulls. We
37 could offer them. We didn't necessarily need them to
38 do their jobs. We didn't need all of them.

39
40 So that's where we are today. We're
41 back in it. You'll see that the State's drawing hunt
42 supplements will hit the streets. If they haven't hit
43 the streets already, it should be this week. They're
44 certainly online. We do intend to issue permits again
45 for Berners Bay. Bull only. I haven't made a
46 determination on how many permits will go out the door.
47 I won't make that call until I fly it in November,
48 December time frame and we get a good indication of how
49 many moose again we have and the bull to cow ratios.

50

1 So I thank you for your time. I echo
2 Doug's appreciation for the RAC. And certainly this is
3 my first opportunity to talk to you.

4
5 And look forward to many years of
6 working with you.

7
8 And I can answer any questions.

9
10 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you very
11 much.

12
13 Mr. Yeager.

14
15 MR. YEAGER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Was
16 there any antler restriction on your permits.

17
18 MR. SCOTT: Through the chair. Mr.
19 Yeager. There is not. These are any bulls.

20
21 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. Any
22 other questions.

23
24 Mr. Kitka.

25
26 MR. KITKA: Just for the record, where
27 can you put in for the drawing.

28
29 (Laughter)

30
31 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Kitka, give me a call.
32 They will be available online. That's predominantly --
33 I think that's the only way that you can do it at this
34 point -- through the Department's website.

35
36 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

37
38 Anyone else.

39
40 You're done.

41
42 Thank you both.

43
44 MR. LARSEN: Thank you.

45
46 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: I think we should
47 take a short break. Very short. Ten minutes.

48
49 MR. LARSON: And Mr. Chairman, I have
50 printed a wolf briefing paper that's been provided by

1 Bryan Logan, our forest wildlife biologist. So when
2 you come back, you'll have one of those at your place.

3

4

5 (Off record)

6

7 (On record)

8

9 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. We'll be
10 back in session. And we're going to go back to
11 Proposal FP15-15. And we went through the presentation
12 by the Federal side and the Alaska Department of Fish
13 and Game. And now we're going to look and see if
14 there's any other Federal agencies that have any
15 comments.

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any Native,
20 tribal or village comments.

21

22 (No comments)

23

24 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Interagency
25 staff, which -- no.

26

27 (No comments)

28

29 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any advisory
30 groups.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Fish and Game
35 Advisory Committee comments.

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Park Service.

40

41 (No comments)

42

43 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Summary of
44 written comments.

45

46 Mr. Larson.

47

48 (No comments)

49

50 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. We're down

1 to.....

2

3

MR. LARSON: We're right there.

4

5

6

VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. And then we'll get to public testimony after Mr. Larson.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. LARSON: Thank you for your patience, Mr. Chair. I was just in an avalanche of paper here. There is one public comment. That is from the Southeast Alaska Fisherman's Alliance in support of 15-15. And it says that preventing the use of seines and gillnets within the Klawock River for the harvest of sockeye salmon during July and August would benefit sockeye conservation.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Larson.

Is there any public testimony.

MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair, we have no one signed up to provide public testimony.

VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Did -- okay. There was someone who raised their hand. But they didn't fill out a thing, so I guess he declines.

Okay. So now we're down to Council deliberations.

Entertain a motion.

Mr. Adams.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I make a motion that we adopt Proposal -- what is it, 15?

VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yeah. 15-15.

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Oh, yes. 15-15. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MR. DOUVILLE: Second.

VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: It's been moved and seconded to adopt Proposal FP15-15. Discussion.

1 Mr. Kitka.

2

3 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
4 would agree with this proposal. But I would also like
5 to see the State do something similar. I really would
6 think that the commercial fisheries almost shouldn't
7 take place until they reach their escapement goals. I
8 don't know if they'll ever get to escapement goals, but
9 to restrict just the seine and the drainage -- I think
10 that would be okay, as long as they didn't close it to
11 subsistence.

12

13 Thank you.

14

15 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
16 Kitka.

17

18 Any other comments or discussion.

19

20 Mr. Douville.

21

22 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Chairman.
23 I'm going to support the proposal because I believe
24 while it is not adequate to accomplish what we'd really
25 like to see, it will protect the portion of the mouth
26 of the river where the fish pool and are more or less
27 sitting ducks.

28

29 We still need the State to get onboard
30 in order for something like this to be effective and
31 conserve for escapement the sockeyes that are ready to
32 move upstream.

33

34 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
35 Douville.

36

37 Mr. Isaacs.

38

39 MR. ISAACS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I also
40 support, again for the same reasons that Mike
41 expressed. I'm very aware that the sockeye do school
42 in that particular area and they cannot go any further
43 up the river. Last spring, one of the fishermen --
44 very renowned person -- including the Sitka
45 administrator, my son. They went out and made a set
46 and cleaned out all the sockeye coming out of there.

47

48 Later on, when I found out about it, I
49 had two thoughts about it. One, they got the sockeye
50 that should have been closed area. But on the other

1 hand, if the weather continued the way it was, those
2 sockeye would have died there. So again we're dealing
3 with the -- wearing two hats with the thought of trying
4 to figure out what's the best solution.

5
6 At the moment I will support it though.

7
8 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
9 Isaacs.

10
11 Anyone else.

12
13 Mr. Schroeder.

14
15 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I too
16 support the proposal for the reasons stated. However,
17 I am distressed that -- as probably other Council
18 members are -- that what we'd really like to see happen
19 is adjustments to the commercial fishery, which would
20 result in more fish getting into this area where
21 subsistence harvests occur.

22
23 You'll note that the overall harvest of
24 sockeye salmon in Districts 3 and 4 are way, way higher
25 by a factor of ten or more. The subsistence harvests
26 at the mouth.

27
28 Thank you.

29
30 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
31 Schroeder.

32
33 Anyone else.

34
35 Mr. Isaacs.

36
37 MR. ISAACS: Just to be sure, is this
38 -- without any map coordinates, are they talking about
39 everything east of the Klawock River -- Klawock Bridge.
40 Does anybody know.

41
42 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: I think Mr.
43 Reeves would be the person to answer that question.
44 Where the commercial fishery takes place. Is that what
45 you're getting at.

46
47 MR. ISAACS: Well.....

48
49 MR. REEVES: Mr. Isaacs. Yeah.

50

1 MR. ISAACS: It gave some good
2 coordinates before. And very few people would
3 understand those coordinates.

4
5 MR. REEVES: Okay. And the coordinates
6 you're referring to would be -- those are definitely
7 relevant to the Council driven proposal to the Board of
8 Fisheries. And those two coordinates basically would
9 reflect -- if you look on your map, you'll see there's
10 kind of the Klawock Estuary that's identified. And
11 where the river comes into it, you'll see that on the
12 map it's really thin and then it expands out into the
13 estuary. The coordinates would be probably the closest
14 proximity to where that little tight -- where the river
15 enters into the estuary.

16
17 And which was -- at least when the
18 Council met in the spring was the best description they
19 had for what they believed was Federal waters. And so
20 this proposal would only kind of apply -- you could say
21 where the river's tight there. Upstream. Up through
22 the lake.

23
24 MR. ISAACS: I was hoping that the
25 resolution referred to everything east of Klawock
26 River. I don't know the coordinates of that. But to a
27 lot of us local fishermen there, once they pass the
28 Klawock River -- Klawock Bridge -- excuse me. Once
29 they pass Klawock Bridge, they're home free. Leave
30 them alone.

31
32 MR. REEVES: And in that case, Mr.
33 Chairman, Mr. Isaacs, the bridge is the defining point
34 that the Craig Fish and Game Advisory Committee used.
35 Because the interpretation on their standpoint was from
36 the bridge up to the actual mouth of the river itself.
37 The estuary in their opinion was State waters.

38
39 MR. ISAACS: So that will be closed.

40
41 MR. REEVES: And that's what they've
42 asked the Board of Fish to take some form of action on.

43
44 MR. ISAACS: So that will be closed.

45
46 MR. REEVES: If the State Board of Fish
47 acts on the Craig Fish and Game Advisory Proposal.

48
49 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
50 Reeves.

1 Any other discussion.

2

3 Mr. Hernandez.

4

5 MR. HERNANDEZ: Just one thing I'd like
6 to point out. I mean we are dealing with a
7 conservation concern here. And there is probably a
8 little bit of blame to be passed around amongst a lot
9 of different groups. One thing in the biological
10 background section there on 114 wasn't really brought
11 out is there has been -- statement in paragraph two --
12 there has been recent concern over habitat issues in
13 these streams due to effects from past timber harvest
14 practices. And those past timber harvest practices are
15 pretty extreme. You know, that entire drainage has
16 been cut. And that's probably a significant
17 contributing factor.

18

19 And I think it should be pointed out
20 that, you know, that logging that took place there was
21 on private lands, which all happened, you know, within
22 compliance of the State Forest Practices Act, which I
23 think just kind of points out that, you know, many
24 instances the State may express a lot of intent to
25 protect our salmon resources, but when it comes right
26 down to it, their laws don't actually do that.

27

28 So I just want to put that in the
29 record.

30

31 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Don.
32 That's a very good point.

33

34 Anyone else. Entertain a question.

35

36 MR. KITKA: Question.

37

38 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: The question's
39 been called on Proposal FP15-15. All those in favor,
40 say aye.

41

42 IN UNISON: Aye.

43

44 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: All those
45 opposed, nay.

46

47 (No opposing votes)

48

49 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Proposal passes.

50

1 Okay. We'll go to the next proposal.
2 FP15-16, recording steelhead harvests on the Prince of
3 Wales, Kosciusko Islands.

4
5 Mr. Reeves.

6
7 MR. REEVES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
8 Again for the record my name is Jeff Reeves. I will be
9 presenting the analysis of 15-16. The materials you'll
10 find begin on Page 123, with the analysis itself on
11 Page 125.

12
13 This proposal was also submitted by
14 this Council. And it's requesting that steelhead
15 harvests at the Prince of Wales, Kosciusko Islands
16 subsistence steelhead fisheries be immediately recorded
17 upon the subsistence fishing permit.

18
19 The proposal was submitted in response
20 to concern brought forth from both State and Federal
21 law enforcement. General provisions require validation
22 of harvest, tickets, tags, permits, and other required
23 documents before removing your kill from the harvest
24 site. Law enforcement has indicated that they've had
25 numerous contacts with active fishers in possession of
26 steelhead, where the fish had not yet been recorded on
27 the subsistence fishing permit and the fisher had not
28 left the fishing site.

29
30 There is some belief that after contact
31 that some of these harvesters are not recording the
32 fish prior to leaving the fishing site. Both law
33 enforcement and the proponent believe that changing to
34 an immediately up harvest recording requirement should
35 not cause any undue burden to the subsistence user as
36 steelhead are harvested individually, that the harvest
37 limits for each drainage are very low, and that a
38 similar requirement exists for steelhead taken within
39 the sport fishery.

40
41 Steelhead return to approximately 76
42 drainages on Prince of Wales and Kosciusko, with spring
43 run fish being most abundant in Southeast Alaska. But
44 it is also not uncommon for some of these streams to
45 also contain a small number of fall run fish.

46
47 Steelhead returns are typically
48 comprised of multiple age classes and they return in
49 far lower numbers in salmon, which has resulted in more
50 conservative management. Although many of the

1 steelhead stocks on Prince of Wales and Kosciusko have
2 returns numbering in the hundreds, managers have
3 currently considered these stocks to be healthy.

4
5 The spring fishery began in 2003. And
6 since 2008 effort has increased. Harvest during the
7 period of 2003 through 2014 has averaged 29 steelhead
8 per season. And of the total of 780 permits issued
9 throughout the history of the fishery, only 323 of the
10 permits reported any fishing effort.

11
12 Average harvest for permits reporting
13 steelhead is about 1.8 steelhead per permit. And you
14 may find a summary for the spring fishery displayed in
15 Table 1, which is Page 130.

16
17 The winter fishery is managed
18 separately. It began in December of 2003 and typical
19 harvest and effort in this fishery is usually low.
20 Since 2009, however, the effort in the fishery has been
21 on the increase as the number of permits issued since
22 then has ranged from 36 to 41. Recent report harvest
23 has been as high as 13. This fishery is definitely --
24 can be greatly affected by weather.

25
26 In 2006, 2007, and 2010, fishing effort
27 was very minimal, with zero to one steelhead being
28 reported during these seasons. And this was most
29 likely due to heavy snowfall preventing access to
30 fishing sites. A summary of harvest for the winter
31 fishery is also found in that same table.

32
33 There are no directed State subsistence
34 fisheries for steelhead in the Southeast Alaska area.
35 However, steelhead incidentally harvest while
36 subsistence fishing for salmon may be retained and must
37 be reported on the State subsistence or personal use
38 permit prior to leaving the fishing site.

39
40 In the sports fishery from 1989 to
41 1994, average reported steelhead harvest was about 812
42 per year on Prince of Wales, with no required harvest
43 reporting. Since the more restrictive sport fish
44 regulations went into effect in 1994, harvest of the
45 steelhead in the sport fishery has averaged around 34
46 steelhead a year. And sports harvested steelhead now
47 must be immediately recorded in ink on the back of the
48 sport fisherman's license.

49
50 If this proposal were adopted, it will

1 add the requirement and regulation to immediately
2 record harvest of steelhead on the Federal subsistence
3 fishing permit for both the spring and winter fisheries
4 on Prince Wales and Kosciusko Island. Although some
5 subsistence users may feel that immediate recording is
6 an undue burden, this action should provide for
7 increased accountability of steelhead harvest within
8 the fisheries and will ease the concern brought forth
9 by law enforcement.

10

11 The conclusion at this point is to
12 support with a modification changing the terminology of
13 the regulatory language from take and changing that
14 word to harvest. And it will clarify that the harvest
15 recording must occur immediately following the harvest
16 of a steelhead. The modified regulation can be found
17 on Page 124. The definition of take under the Federal
18 regulation includes attempting to pursue, capture,
19 kill, et cetera. And so modifying the proposed
20 language is necessary.

21

22 The intent of the proponent was to
23 require immediate record of steelhead harvest rather
24 than the active engaging in subsistence steelhead
25 fishing. So modifying take the harvest should meet the
26 proponent's intent.

27

28 Requiring immediate harvest on the
29 Federal subsistence fishing permit provides
30 accountability of the steelhead harvest within both
31 fisheries and would ease the concerns that law
32 enforcement has of non-reporting. Although current
33 provisions require a record of harvest before leaving
34 the harvest site, a change to immediate record of
35 harvest of steelhead should not cause undue burden to
36 the subsistence users.

37

38 Again, as I mentioned earlier, that
39 they are harvested individually and the household
40 harvest limits within the fisheries and by individual
41 streams are low. Modification of the proposed language
42 will clarify any ambiguity about this requirement
43 regarding the non-reporting.

44

45 Although current provisions require a
46 record of harvest before leaving the harvest site,
47 changing to immediately recording the harvest of
48 steelhead -- oops. Sorry. I had that double. Sorry
49 for that repeat there. That was an edit on my part.
50 So that concludes my proposal and I'll answer any

1 questions.

2

3 Thank you.

4

5 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.

6 Reeves.

7

8 Cathy.

9

10 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

11 Mr. Reeves, would immediately be interpreted as soon as

12 the fish comes out of the water, rather than allowing

13 the leeway for like what's under State regulation that

14 says you have to record your fish before you leave the

15 site.

16

17 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman. Ms.

18 Needham. What this would require as past means fish

19 gets landed. Fish gets bonked. Fish is now dead.

20 Fish must be reported on the Federal subsistence

21 permit. And yes. I guess you could say that is

22 different than the sportfishing requirement before

23 leaving the harvest site.

24

25 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

26

27 Cathy, follow up.

28

29 MS. NEEDHAM: Well, in follow up to

30 that, it seems like recently -- or in recent years on

31 Prince of Wales, interpretation by law enforcement for

32 immediately clipping fins got a number of individuals

33 in trouble and were cited because it wasn't -- you

34 know, they'd put fish in the boat and then clip fins.

35 But they didn't clip the fin when it immediately came

36 out of the water. And so I'm wondering if OSM

37 considered in their analysis changing the language to

38 have it match more what the State's requiring in terms

39 of leaving -- having them record it before leaving the

40 site.

41

42 And then as a follow up question to

43 that, is this something that can just be specified on a

44 permit rather than setting a regulation for the

45 recording of steelhead.

46

47 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman. Ms.

48 Needham, the reason that law enforcement came forth

49 with it is like what was mentioned, was they've

50 contacted individuals with the fish. But where the

1 vehicle is in relation to where they were with the
2 fish, there was they believe some gray as to when have
3 they officially left the harvest site. So that's where
4 the question got brought forth, saying can this be done
5 and this is what we'd like. That's why the Council was
6 approached at the spring meeting and they came forward.

7
8 So their concern was that there were
9 some people that because they got checked at the
10 fishing site and they hadn't recorded it yet, that when
11 they got back to the vehicle after law enforcement
12 left, that they just went ahead and went back with the
13 fish and it never got recorded. Now, that we don't
14 know. But what my colleague here just underlined is
15 that in the sportfishing existing regulation on Page
16 126, that the 5AAC47... -- which is right on the bottom
17 of the page. It says immediately upon landing a
18 steelhead.

19
20 MS. NEEDHAM: On Page 130, under the
21 State subsistence fishery, it says that recording prior
22 to leaving the fishing site. And maybe that's just a
23 misinterpretation then of the reg.

24
25 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman. Ms.
26 Needham, what that is is -- yes. The State's
27 subsistence permit says before leaving the fishing
28 site. And that's just referring to any incidental
29 harvest of steelhead. What Terry mentioned, too, was
30 for the sports fisherman physically targeting steelhead
31 -- when they harvest one, they have to be immediately
32 recorded.

33
34 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Cathy.

35
36 MS. NEEDHAM: I appreciate that. I
37 just want to clarify this immediately. Because I want
38 to know what that does to the fisherman and how broad
39 that interpretation can be. Can you follow up with
40 whether or not -- that this is something requiring them
41 to report steelhead caught -- can that be put on a
42 permit rather than building a regulation to require it?

43
44 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman and Ms.
45 Needham, my apologies. That was part of your original
46 question and I forgot to answer that. I believe yes,
47 that the in-season manager, if they so chose, could
48 establish that as a term and condition of the permit.
49 The difference as to whether you -- if the Council and
50 the Board acts, it puts it into regulation. And so

1 that's where I guess we need to know how important is
2 this. Should this be a condition that just the in-
3 season manager does or is this something that we want
4 in regulation.

5
6 Currently, obviously the conclusion is
7 that -- let's just support this and get it into
8 regulation as it clarifies and there's no question to
9 it -- at least for Prince of Wales and Kosciusko
10 Islands. That if a steelhead is harvested, it needs to
11 be immediately recorded.

12
13 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

14
15 Mr. Schroeder.

16
17 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman. This
18 seems like a lot of regulatory effort chasing a very
19 small number of fish. I mean we're talking about 23,
20 25 fish according to Table 1. And I haven't heard that
21 there's some significant problem with the small number
22 of people who are catching these really small number of
23 fish, so I'd suggest that in the interest of regulatory
24 parsimony it is possible for this to be a permit
25 condition. That would be way desirable from my point
26 of view than to go through a really hard regulation for
27 this extremely small, but very important fishery on
28 Prince of Wales.

29
30 Since I was involved in earlier
31 discussions in establishing a directed harvest on
32 steelhead, I realized that there are a lot of
33 sensitivities about steelhead. I've even heard of -- I
34 won't mention that. But in any case, that's my
35 opinion. So I wouldn't support this proposal without
36 further justification.

37
38 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: So are there any
39 questions.

40
41 Thank you, Mr. Reeves.

42
43 Mr. Yuhas.

44
45 MS. YUHAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
46 For the record, Jennifer Yuhas with the Alaska
47 Department of Fish and Game. And the Department always
48 supports recording. It helps us answer hard questions.
49 But it's up to the RAC whether you want to put this on
50 a permit or put this in regulation. We've got support

1 for the proposal, but that really just means the
2 recording. If you want to write a letter to the
3 manager and say you want it on the permit, I don't
4 think we have a problem with that.

5
6 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Are there any
7 questions for Ms. Yuhas.

8
9 (No comments)

10
11 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: I have one
12 question. Is there any recording of steelhead caught
13 in any of the other fisheries besides sport and
14 subsistence on the State side.

15
16 MS. YUHAS: I am not aware of a
17 commercial steelhead fishery.

18
19 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: I'm just saying
20 reporting steelhead.....

21
22 MS. YUHAS: Yeah. Reporting for -- for
23 both of those.

24
25 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS:taken
26 incidentally.

27
28 MS. YUHAS: Oh. Incidentally.

29
30 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: In the commercial
31 fishery, is there any recording of that.

32
33 MS. YUHAS: I have to send an email and
34 get an answer. And I don't have that off the top of my
35 head.

36
37 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. I was just
38 curious. Thank you.

39
40 Any other questions.

41
42 MS. YUHAS: Mr. Chairman, if it had
43 ever been proposed, we'd support having that happen.
44 I'm not sure if it's come before the Board of Fish and
45 been past and rejected, but we support the recording of
46 all of that from the Department.

47
48 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

49
50 Any other questions.

1 Mr. Adams.
2
3 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Just a comment, Mr.
4 Chairman. In Yakutat we occasionally catch a steelhead
5 when we're subsistence fishing. And we put that on our
6 permit. So just a matter of information.
7
8 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
9 Adams.
10
11 Anyone else.
12
13 (No comments)
14
15 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Hearing none.
16 Thank you, Ms. Yuhas.
17
18 Okay. Are there any tribal, village
19 comments.
20
21 (No comments)
22
23 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Interagency
24 staff.
25
26 (No comments)
27
28 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Advisory group
29 comments.
30
31 (No comments)
32
33 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Fish and Game
34 Advisory Committee.
35
36 (No comments)
37
38 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Park Service.
39
40 (No comments)
41
42 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any written
43 comments.
44
45 Mr. Larson.
46
47 MR. LARSON: Yeah, Mr. Chair. There
48 are no written public comments.
49
50 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. Any

1 public testimony. I don't have any public testimony
2 slips for this proposal.

3

4 (No comments)

5

6 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: So the Council
7 goes into deliberation. What is the Council's
8 pleasure.

9

10 Ms. Phillips.

11

12 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Chairman
13 Bangs. I move to adopt FP16, the modified regulation
14 on Page 124.

15

16 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Do I have a
17 second.

18

19 MR. HERNANDEZ: Second.

20

21 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: It's been moved
22 and seconded to adopt FP15-16 as modified on Page 124.
23 Discussion.

24

25 Ms. Needham.

26

27 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Bangs. I
28 think I would oppose this proposal. I think it adds
29 regulatory language that could be restricted and
30 misinterpreted. It's got some broad interpretation to
31 it. I also think that it's something that could be
32 specified specifically on a permit without having to
33 put this regulatory language in place. And I would
34 recommend that they do so.

35

36 And so at this time I don't think it's
37 necessary to approve the regulation as it's written.
38 Thanks.

39

40 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Cathy.

41

42

43 Anyone else.

44

45 Patty.

46

47 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Chairman
48 Bangs. This was a proposal of the RAC. Can you remind
49 me why we put it forward.

50

1 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Douville.
2
3 MR. DOUVILLE: I don't know who can
4 answer that, but I'm under the impression at this point
5 that we weren't aware that that could be a condition
6 when we made the proposal.
7
8 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
9 Douville.
10
11 Any other questions or discussion.
12
13 (No comments)
14
15 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: What's the will
16 of the Council.
17
18 MR. HERNANDEZ: Question.
19
20 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: The question's been
21 called.
22
23 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: The question's
24 been called. All those in favor of adopting FP15-16 as
25 modified on Page 124 by the OSM, signify it by saying
26 aye.
27
28 MS. PHILLIPS: Aye.
29
30 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Those opposed,
31 nay.
32
33 IN UNISON: Nay.
34
35 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: I think there was
36 one positive vote. And so the motion fails.
37
38 Okay. Now we go to Proposal -- the
39 next proposal is FP15-17, the closing if Makhnati
40 Island area to non-subsistence herring fishing.
41
42 Mr. Koller.
43
44 MR. KOLLER: Good morning, Mr. Chair
45 and Council. For the record, my name is Justin Koller.
46 I'm a subsistence biologist for Sitka and Hoonah Ranger
47 Districts with the Forest Service.
48
49 I'm going to present a short summary of
50 FP15-17. And the materials and the executive summary

1 can be found beginning on Page 133 in your books.

2

3 Proposal FP15-17, submitted by the
4 Sitka Tribe of Alaska, requests the closure of Federal
5 public waters in the Makhnati Island area near Sitka to
6 the harvest of herring and herring spawn to all but
7 Federally-qualified subsistence users. The proponent
8 believes closure of these waters is necessary to
9 provide more reasonable opportunity for Federally-
10 qualified subsistence users to meet their needs.

11

12 The proponent states that for more than
13 half the year since 2002, subsistence users were unable
14 to harvest the amounts necessary for subsistence as set
15 by the Alaska Board of Fisheries. The proponent
16 believes that the Sitka Sound herring stock is depleted
17 and the proposed closure would help protect the stock.

18

19 The proponent also believes that
20 traditional ecological knowledge and local observation
21 support that the commercial harvest of herring has the
22 following effects. Number one, it displaces
23 subsistence users from traditional harvesting sites.
24 Number two, it disrupts herring spawning, leading to
25 poor quality deposition of herring eggs at traditional
26 sites. Number three, causes herring to spawn away from
27 subsistence sites. And number four, may seriously
28 reduce the bio-mass of spawning herring upon which
29 subsistence users depend.

30

31 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
32 oppose FP15-17. This proposal is similar to proposals
33 considered by the Board in 2007 and 2013. At both
34 times the Board determined there was no conservation
35 concern in this area for herring and that closing
36 Federal public waters to non-Federally-qualified users
37 would not benefit subsistence users.

38

39 The bio-mass in Sitka Sound has been
40 trending higher since 1971. The greatest estimated
41 bio-mass occurred in 2009. Since 2009, the annual bio-
42 mass returning to Sitka Sound has remained about 80,000
43 tons or over three times the 25,000 threshold required
44 to conduct a commercial fishery.

45

46 Federal public waters have not been
47 included in commercial openings from 2007 through 2010
48 or in 2012 and 2013. Most of the commercial harvest
49 has been taken well away from Federal public waters and
50 there have been no restrictions on subsistence uses.

1 In years when subsistence harvests were not adequate,
2 it is unlikely that a closure to other users in the
3 Makhnati Federal public waters would have made a
4 difference in the amount of Roe harvested for
5 subsistence use.

6
7 Furthermore, recent actions by the
8 Alaska Board of Fisheries have already closed the
9 northern portion of the Makhnati Federal public waters
10 to commercial Sac Roe Herring fishing. Adoption of
11 this proposal would result in further area closures to
12 non-Federally-qualified subsistence users, which did
13 not appear to be needed for either conservation
14 purposes or to protect Federally-qualified subsistence
15 users.

16
17 And that concludes my summary.

18
19 And I'll open it up to questions.

20
21 Thank you.

22
23 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
24 Koller. Questions.

25
26 Mr. Yeager.

27
28 MR. YEAGER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
29 Just not knowing much about the fishery here, what is
30 the amount necessary for subsistence when it comes to
31 this.

32
33 MR. KOLLER: Through the Chair. Mr.
34 Yeager, it is a range set by the Alaska Board of
35 Fisheries. And I will find that for you shortly here,
36 but it's in the analysis.

37
38 MR. YEAGER: Okay. I've got that.
39 Thanks.

40
41 MR. KOLLER: Okay. Thank you.

42
43 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other
44 questions.

45
46 Mr. Schroeder.

47
48 MR. SCHROEDER: Through the Chair.
49 Justin, do you have any update -- any pending figures
50 for 2014 that may have come in since the analysis was

1 written.

2

3 MR. KOLLER: I did not have any updated
4 figures of either the subsistence fishery or the post-
5 fishery, pre-fishery bio-mass assessment in Sitka
6 Sound. And I'd defer to Fish and Game for that
7 question.

8

9 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Schroeder, a
10 follow up.

11

12 MR. SCHROEDER: And just second
13 question, Justin. It appears that the State closure
14 covers a good deal of the area that is requested by
15 this proposal to be closed and that the Board of
16 Fisheries felt there was sufficient evidence to justify
17 the closure as shown on Map 4, on Page 140. If you or
18 the State could fill us in on the logic behind that
19 closure and the difference between the closure put into
20 effect by the Board of Fisheries for commercial
21 harvesting and the closure requested by the Sitka Tribe
22 shown on Map 3. They're pretty close. The closure on
23 Map 3 is obviously slightly larger than the existing
24 commercial closure area, but would include more
25 subsistence harvest areas that have been documented.

26

27 I will also note that -- just as a note
28 which is part of this question, that the openings for
29 commercial harvest shown in Figure 2, on Page 144, did
30 not take place in the area requested by the Sitka
31 Tribe.

32

33 Thank you.

34

35 MR. KOLLER: Through the Chair. As far
36 as the rationale for closing the area that ADF&G has
37 closed, I defer to ADF&G on that question.

38

39 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other
40 questions for Mr. Koller before we speak to the
41 Department of Fish and Game. And she could answer that
42 question at that point.

43

44 Mr. Hernandez.

45

46 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Thank you. In
47 the Federal waters, if there's anybody subsistence --
48 doing subsistence harvest in the Federal waters, do
49 they have any kind of a permit requirement other than
50 what is required for the State. And I'm looking to see

1 if you have any specific information as to whether or
2 not there is Federally-qualified and non-Federally-
3 qualified subsistence fishing happening within the
4 Federal waters.

5
6 MR. KOLLER: Through the Chair. This
7 is a State-run fishery. And it's open to all Alaskans.
8 And I'm not sure what the amount of effort is between
9 Federally-qualified and non-Federally qualified.

10
11 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other
12 questions for Mr. Koller.

13
14 Ms. Phillips.

15
16 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. On Page 144,
17 the last sentence, it says in recent years there has
18 been a decline in participation that may have
19 contributed to the decline in total annual Roe harvest.
20 And then you look at Table 1 and it shows the number of
21 households harvesting. Are the super -- super whatever
22 you -- harvesters part of the household numbers?

23
24 MR. KOLLER: Through the Chair. This
25 is the total number of households harvesting, so yes.
26 You would also include the super households.

27
28 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you.

29
30 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Schroeder.

31
32 MR. SCHROEDER: Through the Chair.
33 Justin, in recent years I believe there's been a
34 community harvest. And I'm not sure. Perhaps you
35 could describe how that takes place.

36
37 MR. KOLLER: Through the Chair. The
38 only community harvest that I'm aware of since it's not
39 a Federally run fishery is these super households that
40 will harvest large amounts of Roe at a time for
41 distribution to others who wish to have that Roe.

42
43 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Anyone else.

44
45 Yes, Ken.

46
47 MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman. So the
48 people that come in on boats and take them to different
49 communities, those are also counted. They distribute
50 them to as far as Ketchikan and further up past Juneau.

1 And, you know, they fly stuff up. And all that stuff's
2 been accounted for? All that Roe?

3

4 MR. KOLLER: I am not sure to the
5 extent of the completeness of the data. So if there
6 are harvesters that come in and for one reason or
7 another don't get their harvest reported, then of
8 course that's not included in here. But these are the
9 numbers that came directly from Fish and Game.

10

11 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other
12 questions for Mr. Koller.

13

14 Mr. Isaacs.

15

16 MR. ISAACS: When you use the term
17 harvester, there is a difference between the herring
18 spawn on kelp versus herring spawn on spruce branches;
19 is that correct?

20

21 MR. KOLLER: Through the Chair. Yes,
22 that is correct. There's different types of substrate
23 that they use to harvest herring roe.

24

25 MR. ISAACS: I'm aware of that. We do
26 not need permits to harvest the herring spawn off
27 hemlock spruce -- hemlock branches.

28

29 MR. KOLLER: I'm sorry. Was that a
30 question for me or was that a comment.

31

32 MR. ISAACS: I'm concerned that if --
33 when you're figuring the amounts harvested, realizing
34 that we do not need permits for the harvesting of
35 herring spawn on hemlock branches, no matter how many
36 pounds we harvest.

37

38 MR. KOLLER: Through the Chair. These
39 figures are from harvest surveys from ADF&G. So I
40 think what you're getting is there may be some
41 unreported harvest and that these numbers may be low.
42 Am I understanding that correctly?

43

44 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: I believe so.

45

46 Is that true? You're wondering if
47 they're under reporting. That those aren't being
48 counted in the amounts that are harvested.

49

50 MR. ISAACS: I don't believe they are.

1 No.
2
3 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Thank you.
4
5 Any other questions for Mr. Koller.
6
7 (No comments)
8
9 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you,
10 Justin.
11
12 Ms. Yuhas.
13
14 MS. YUHAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
15 For the record, my name is Jennifer Yuhas with the
16 Alaska Department of Fish and Game. Regarding the 2014
17 harvest, our last update for the close of the season
18 said that there was 16,976 tons harvested total in that
19 fishery after two spawning events. And I believe --
20 hopefully Dave Harris has called in online to help with
21 some of the boundary issue questions that came up. Can
22 we check on that?
23
24 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Is that online?
25 Yes. Yeah. That would be fine.
26
27 MS. YUHAS: He hasn't called in yet?
28 Dave?
29
30 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Is there someone
31 online that could answer that?
32
33 MS. YUHAS: Apparently not, Mr.
34 Chairman. I apologize for that. Playing catch up at
35 these meetings. I know it's difficult for you. A few
36 of us have been discussing the need for either cloning
37 or teleporters to attend three meetings at the same
38 time. And I'm not trying to be too funny, but
39 it's.....
40
41 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Understandable.
42
43 MS. YUHAS: So the Department is
44 neutral on the allocation implications to this
45 proposal. We have to be. Board of Fish decides that.
46 And as you can see, they've made other closures that
47 have already been reported in the analysis.
48
49 We're opposed to the proposal for the
50 same reason that the RAC was opposed to the proposal

1 you just heard. So we don't think it provides enough
2 flexibility and that it's not necessary to stipulate in
3 regulation. The Department's had the commercial
4 fishery closed in this area. And if there's enough
5 fish to come back, we expect the manager to use the
6 same good judgment they've been using in the last few
7 years.

8

9 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. Any
10 questions.

11

12 Mr. Hernandez.

13

14 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes. Do you have any
15 updated household harvesting numbers for 2014 yet.

16

17 MS. YUHAS: If I could stall for just a
18 minute, the -- it provided the wrong pass code to Mr.
19 Harris to dial in. And he probably does have that
20 information.

21

22 (Pause)

23

24 MS. YUHAS: I am stalling, Mr.
25 Chairman. Waiting for Dave to call. It's my fault. I
26 gave him the wrong pass code. My fingers were trying
27 to fly between web pages here to answer questions.

28

29 (Pause)

30

31 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Do we have
32 someone online now?

33

34 MR. HARRIS: Yeah. Hello. This is
35 Dave Harris, the Juneau area management biologist,
36 calling in.

37

38 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Hello, Dave. We
39 have a few questions for you. We're glad to have you
40 onboard here. Welcome.

41

42 Okay. I think we had a question. Ms.
43 Yuhas.

44

45 MS. YUHAS: Through the Chair. Dave,
46 there was a couple of questions about whether or not we
47 have the household breakdown on the harvest for the
48 Makhnati sac roe. And the boundary issue -- there's a
49 question that Mr. Hernandez might need to restate if I
50 don't get it accurate. But the question was the

1 discrepancy between the proposal before the RAC right
2 now submitted by Sitka Tribe versus what might be
3 different. And why the Board of Fish made their
4 closures a little bit different. And I don't have the
5 map in front of me for that question.

6

7 MR. HARRIS: You know, unfortunately,
8 Jennifer, that falls under the Sitka area management
9 and I'm afraid I don't have good information on that.
10 Dave Gordon, who's the area manager in Sitka, would be
11 much more familiar with that particular set of
12 information.

13

14 MS. YUHAS: Can you.....

15

16 MR. HARRIS: I can certainly try to
17 raise him up here as well.

18

19 MS. YUHAS: Can you answer the question
20 on whether or not we have the household breakdown for
21 the harvest.

22

23 MR. HARRIS: I'm afraid I do not have
24 that information. That is from the Sitka management
25 area that is around Sitka. I'm here in the Juneau
26 area. We don't handle the Sitka-related, you know,
27 harvests and things.

28

29 MS. YUHAS: It wasn't up on the web
30 page as I was searching here while the RAC was asking.
31 It wasn't in the final report.

32

33 MR. HARRIS: Again, I'm sorry,
34 Jennifer. I don't have that information. I can
35 attempt to get a hold of Mr. Gordon in Sitka and have
36 him get in touch with you.

37

38 MS. YUHAS: If the Chair's willing to
39 wait. We seem to be over running the meeting with our
40 dialogue back and forth between the agencies, so I'm
41 just going to defer to the Chair.

42

43 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. Are
44 there any questions that we -- other questions we have
45 that he may be able to answer -- or Ms. Yuhas.

46

47 Harvey.

48

49 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
50 don't know whether you can answer this or Dave can

1 answer this. But in the 2012 fishery, where they had
2 an awful lot of trouble trying to find their quota in
3 the commercial fisheries -- and I'm asking this because
4 I know it's a conservation concern on my part. But
5 when they were trying to find a portion of their fish
6 and they finally ended up dropping their gillnet down
7 into the depth to find what was the make up of the bio-
8 mass that was down there, could you tell me what
9 percentage of them were herring and what were other
10 fish.

11
12 MR. HARRIS: Again, I'm afraid I'm the
13 wrong person to answer this question. Dave Gordon, the
14 area manager of Sitka, manages the herring fishery
15 there. And I was not present at the time and I'm
16 afraid I cannot help here. We can certainly attempt to
17 contact Mr. Gordon and get him involved. He would be
18 the best source of information regarding Sitka herring.

19
20 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Dave.
21 Is there any that we -- other questions we have.

22
23 Mr. Schroeder.

24
25 MR. SCHROEDER: Through the Chair.
26 This is a question for Ms. Yuhas. Is that okay? Just
27 looking at Tables 1 and 3 in the report, on Page 145, a
28 couple of things, you know, clearly stand out. One,
29 looking at Table -- Figure 3, that the regression line
30 there shows that the total harvest has a real strong
31 relationship to the number of people who are
32 harvesting. But that's not too surprising.

33
34 And then Table 1 shows a really
35 dramatic decline in participation. If we're looking at
36 years 2003 and 2004 and -- gosh -- in 2013 we're down
37 to just a third of the people. And I really would have
38 liked some presentation by Division of Subsistence or
39 whoever gathers this data to explain what's going on
40 and to explain the data gathering methods so we could
41 have some level of confidence in these.

42
43 Obviously, I'm a little involved in
44 this because in a previous life I did the first
45 estimation of harvest for Sitka in a report that was
46 published in 1990.

47
48 Thank you.

49
50 MS. YUHAS: To the Chair. Anytime a

1 presentation is requested, we are happy to make a
2 presentation. We had no knowledge of that before this
3 meeting. I know it probably looks like I'm tap dancing
4 a little bit on these particular proposals. It's a
5 Federal meeting and the information wasn't requested of
6 us by the Federal folks who put on the meeting prior to
7 the meeting and so we are unprepared to do that.

8

9 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yes, Ms.
10 Phillips.

11

12 MS. PHILLIPS: I'd like to see that tap
13 dancing. Oh, excuse me. Mr. Chairman. So in order to
14 be a subsistence harvester, is there a special permit
15 or how are you calculating the number of harvesters.

16

17 MS. YUHAS: If I could have the RAC's
18 permission to brief the appropriate manager who is
19 standing by on my cell phone confused about why I
20 called him. His question to me was who would I be
21 talking to -- right as Mr. Schroeder initiated his
22 question that I couldn't answer. And if I could just
23 have a leeway of 30 seconds to -- thank you.

24

25 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Go ahead.

26

27 (Pause)

28

29 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Who do we
30 have on the phone?

31

32 MS. YUHAS: Mr. Chairman, we have Dave
33 Gordon, who Dave Harris referred to as the Sitka sac
34 roe herring manager, to answer the specific questions
35 regarding the boundary issues and the household
36 reporting on my speaker phone -- on the cell phone. He
37 is there with his supervisor, Dan Gray.

38

39 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Before we
40 go any further, I just want to make note that whoever
41 is online, please push star six or your mute button so
42 that we don't have interference.

43

44 Thank you.

45

46 Okay.

47

48 MS. YUHAS: Unless you're Dave, who
49 needs to testify, don't push star six.

50

1 MR. GORDON: Okay.

2

3 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. So the
4 question. Mr. Schroeder.

5

6 MR. SCHROEDER: Dave, this is Bob
7 Schroeder at the RAC. Thanks for being available. And
8 I just had some questions on how the estimation work
9 was done to document the subsistence harvest of herring
10 roe in the Sitka area. And we have before us a couple
11 of tables. You may or may not have those, but they
12 show the number of households harvesting from 2002
13 through 2013. And then there's also a plot showing the
14 regression between the number of people harvesting and
15 the harvest amounts.

16

17 What we see in the table and in the
18 graph is that overall the number of people harvesting
19 Roe has gone down over this 11 year, 12 year period.
20 And also Figure 3 shows that there's a strong
21 relationship between the number of people harvesting
22 and how much is harvested. So that not only the number
23 of people have gone down, but the total harvest level
24 has gone down. So if you could fill us in on how these
25 data are obtained, that would be helpful for our
26 deliberations.

27

28 MR. GORDON: Hello?

29

30 MR. SCHROEDER: Yes. We're here.

31

32 MR. GORDON: Yeah. I really had a hard
33 time hearing all the words that were just spoken. I
34 think if Jennifer could maybe repeat that so I could
35 understand the question better.

36

37 MS. YUHAS: Can you explain the decline
38 in participation and its effect.

39

40 MR. GORDON: You know, Subsistence
41 Division are the ones that are conducting the
42 monitoring survey of the subsistence fishery and they
43 would be able to provide you with any reports or
44 information you may need to show what is happening in
45 the subsistence fishery as far as harvest and
46 participation in that fishery.

47

48 MS. YUHAS: And those aren't available
49 for today and they need to deliberate the proposal
50 today. There were two other questions related

1 specifically to this fishery. One was whether or not
2 we had calculated the household reporting and the other
3 had to do with the boundary and how it was set at the
4 Board of Fish for closing the commercial fishery.

5
6 MR. GORDON: Well, we certainly could
7 get you the most recent published information on the
8 subsistence monitoring -- to you today. We should be
9 able to get that information fairly quickly. What's
10 the question regarding the boundary or the closure area
11 on Sitka Sound.

12
13 MS. YUHAS: Could the member who asked
14 the question restate it so that I don't misinterpret
15 it.

16
17 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Hernandez,
18 was that your question? No? There was a question on
19 boundaries.

20
21 Mr. Schroeder.

22
23 MR. SCHROEDER: The question on
24 boundaries was noting that the map shown in our book
25 show the recent Board of Fisheries action, which
26 established a closed area for commercial harvest to
27 protect the subsistence harvest in a portion of the
28 Makhnati Island area. And I was requesting what the
29 rationale was behind that. Perhaps we shouldn't
30 belabor this point if that information is not readily
31 available.

32
33 MS. YUHAS: Did you hear the question,
34 Dave?

35
36 MR. GORDON: I'm going to need that
37 question repeated.

38
39 MS. YUHAS: What was the deliberation
40 behind the existing boundary that the Board of Fish
41 closed commercial to protect subsistence.

42
43 MR. GORDON: There was -- I guess the
44 question is regarding specific deliberations by the
45 Board of Fish or what the proposal initially was and
46 what ultimately was adopted by the Board of Fish?

47
48 MS. YUHAS: Rationale behind the final
49 closure. Why it was adopted the way that it is.
50

1 MR. GORDON: Well, specifically the
2 Board -- for drawing the lines like they did. There
3 was a proposal in to -- actually, the area was larger
4 than what ultimately was adopted by the Board. I think
5 it was based on protecting the high use areas for
6 subsistence. The south middle Island and Kasiana
7 Island area specifically and the closure area included
8 that. That was ultimately passed by the Board of Fish.
9 And I think the Board of Fish must have thought that
10 the initial proposed area was a little bit more than
11 necessary to protect subsistence.

12
13 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. Are
14 there any questions that we want to ask the area
15 manager.

16
17 (No comments)

18
19 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Hearing none.
20 Thank you. If you put the microphone -- I think it
21 would work -- if you turn your button off and put the
22 phone down by the speaker he could hear better. But I
23 think there isn't any more questions.

24
25 So any questions for -- yeah. Ms.
26 Phillips.

27
28 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. My question
29 was if you are a subsistence harvester, do you need a
30 special permit. And how are you counted as a
31 harvester.

32
33 MS. YUHAS: The subsistence permit is
34 different than the commercial permit in the areas
35 closed for commercial, so you'd be counted as a
36 harvester on a subsistence permit.

37
38 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Schroeder.

39
40 MR. SCHROEDER: Through the Chair. Ms.
41 Yuhas, it appears that the -- just based on the
42 information provided in our analysis, that the Board of
43 Fish wished to address a perceived or a real problem
44 for subsistence harvesters in getting herring roe on
45 kelp. Their action was in February 2012. When would
46 this item be possibly -- be before the Board of Fish
47 once again in the regulatory cycle.

48
49 MS. YUHAS: Through the Chair. Through
50 the regulatory cycle, it would be at the upcoming

1 Southeast Fin Fish meeting. If a proposal has not been
2 submitted for this meeting, it would be three years
3 from now.

4

5 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other
6 questions for Department of Fish and Game.

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you,
11 Jennifer.

12

13 Okay. Next we have -- any Native
14 tribal or village comments.

15

16 (No comments)

17

18 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Advisory
19 groups.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Fish and Game
24 Advisory Committees.

25

26 (No comments)

27

28 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any written
29 comments, Mr. Larson.

30

31 MR. LARSON: Yes, Mr. Chair. There are
32 two written comments. The first is from the Petersburg
33 Vessel Owners Association. And the other is from the
34 Southeast Alaska Fisherman Alliance. Those are both in
35 opposition to this proposal. Both very similar points
36 in that there's no conservation issue that's been
37 identified. And there's a sufficient opportunity under
38 current regulations to harvest herring eggs.

39

40 Thank you.

41

42 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
43 Larson.

44

45 Okay. Public testimony. Mr. Harvey
46 Kitka.

47

48 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
49 would request that our subsistence guy from the tribe
50 come.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: And that would be
2 very appropriate. Thank you, Harvey.

3
4 MR. KITKA: Mr. Chair, I'm Harvey
5 Kitka. And I'm also the chair of the Sitka Herring
6 Committee for the tribe. This proposal that we put in
7 -- it's probably the third time we're coming toward you
8 with this proposal.

9
10 The first time the conservation
11 concerns were in the looming, they were starting to see
12 seasons where we couldn't reach our harvest level for
13 the families that we support. And since then the
14 herring spawn has decreased considerably. The area and
15 the miles of spawn are still going down even though
16 they say that the fishery is healthy. I know in 2012,
17 when the commercial fishing industry had a hard time
18 finding their quota, and the spawn -- they said it
19 happened real fast. Usually it does happen fast, but
20 it used to sustain itself and used to cover the whole
21 Sound.

22
23 The Makhnati Island area in that part
24 of the place used to be a place that -- it spawned the
25 heaviest. And it was usually at the end of the spawn,
26 but it was usually sustained there for about almost a
27 week to ten days in that area. The harvest we harvest
28 in that area probably wasn't really so much the trees,
29 but it was the spawn on kelp. We have two different
30 types of kelp. We've got one off the west end of the
31 airport and it's called our (indiscernible) and the
32 kelp on the macrocystis is a little further out. But
33 we harvested those things in that area.

34
35 And when they started their test
36 fishing out in front of that, they kind of pushed the
37 herring away from that area. But I do believe that the
38 conservation concern is very there. And it's really
39 real. And we're noticing the duration of the spawn is
40 considerably less than what it used to be. We're down
41 to the spawn happening just in a couple of days
42 sometimes. The spawn along the road system as well as
43 in the Makhnati area this past year was basically just
44 the tide, in some places it was just barely a tide.
45 And it was very light spawn in some of those areas.
46 They were so light that there weren't -- it wasn't
47 enough spawn there to harvest because it was so light.

48
49 Thank you.
50

1 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
2 Kitka. Any questions for Harvey.

3
4 (No comments)

5
6 MR. FELDPAUSCH: Mr. Chairman, members
7 of the Council, my name is Jeff Feldpausch. I'm the
8 Resource Protection Director for the Sitka Tribe. On
9 behalf of the tribe and its 5,000-plus tribal citizens,
10 I'd like to thank you for the opportunity today to
11 provide testimony on this proposal.

12
13 The Sitka Sound herring stock is the
14 last stock in Alaska that can provide a significant
15 subsistence harvest. In our extensive work with the
16 Division of Subsistence, they have reported that
17 through their household harvest surveys around the
18 State of Alaska, that herring eggs are eaten as far
19 north as Bethel -- or as far north -- excuse me -- as
20 Barrow. As far west as Bethel and throughout interior
21 communities in between and extensively in Southeast
22 Alaska.

23
24 The North Pacific Fisheries Management
25 Council and to some extent the Board of Fish have led
26 the way in protecting herring and subsistence uses of
27 herring. The North Pacific Fisheries Management
28 Council has listed herring as a prohibited species.
29 There are no prosecuted herring fisheries in Federal
30 waters. And under the prohibited listing, any herring
31 caught as by-catch need to be enumerated and
32 immediately discharged overboard. If the amount of
33 herring by-catch exceeds one percent of that guideline
34 harvest level for that fishery, that fishery is shut
35 down.

36
37 Similarly, the Board of Fish as you
38 know in 2012 adopted a proposal to close -- or to
39 restrict a certain portion of the Sitka Sound from
40 commercial fishing of herring. And excuse me if I call
41 it subsistence zone. I kind of use that interactively.
42 In Sitka we call it the subsistence zone. That went
43 into effect in 2013. Unfortunately, that year the ANS
44 was not met. But I firmly believe that it did protect
45 what subsistence did occur.

46
47 You see in your packets -- or in the
48 report the first opening of 2013 occurred in the
49 southwest corner of that boundary line. Just before
50 the fishery started or as it began, that mass of

1 herring that they were sitting on ducked in under the
2 line. And within a couple of hours began to spawn.

3
4 Some of the nearest islands -- or one
5 of the nearest islands was Kasiana Island. And that
6 island recorded the most subsistence harvest that year
7 and the best quality of subsistence harvest. I believe
8 if that fleet was allowed to come within that boundary
9 and go after those herring, they would have scattered
10 and disbursed or spawned over a larger area and
11 provided poor quality of spawn, if any at all for the
12 subsistence harvesters.

13
14 Since this zone has been in effect the
15 last couple of years, we've seen a higher incidence of
16 commercial boats trafficking the area. I had a
17 personal experience last year. The CommFish went out
18 to do test fisheries to find a quantity of herring that
19 met the industry standards to prosecute a commercial
20 fishery. They were looking at test setting on the east
21 side of that boundary, just off of Middle Island. I
22 observed three seine boats go into the subsistence zone
23 -- right next to the core subsistence area -- and begin
24 pulling circles constantly the whole time there. When
25 I realized what they were doing I took the tribe's 14
26 -- or 24 foot aluminum cruiser and began running the
27 boundary line back and forth between the island, out a
28 couple hundred yards and back. They were attempting to
29 move herring out of this zone -- out into the
30 commercial waters where they could get a test sample on
31 it.

32
33 I was effective in disrupting those
34 herring from moving over. Finally, the area manage
35 biologist called the test fishery in the area because
36 the herring were scattered and they moved to the
37 southern end of the Sound. It's due to actions like
38 this that we are proposing the Board of Fish Proposal
39 121 to extend that subsistence zone back out to what we
40 originally requested in 2012. The zone that is in
41 place now is a portion of what we had originally
42 requested.

43
44 Also, as you're aware, that subsistence
45 zone that is in place is under attack by the Sitka
46 Herring Conservation Alliance, which is the industry.
47 With Proposal 120, they want to completely remove that
48 zone. They're also attacking subsistence by Proposal
49 117. They want to cut the ANS by more than half of
50 it's current level. And with Proposal 122, they want

1 to reduce the threshold level to begin to prosecute a
2 fishery.

3

4 Moving on, I'd like to address that
5 subsistence data that would have been brought up just
6 recently. This specifically -- on Page 145 of your
7 report, you'll be looking at the number of household
8 harvesting. Just as a correction, 2012 and 2013
9 numbers as far as household harvesting -- those numbers
10 are not what has been published in the ADF&G's Division
11 of Subsistence 2013 Subsistence Harvest Report. Those
12 numbers recorded here are 50 and 52 respectively.
13 Also, the 2013 subsistence harvest total Roe as quoted
14 in the report is 78,098 pounds versus the 91,936.

15

16 A couple of other things I'd like to
17 point out. In 2009, you see we were up at 91
18 harvesters. It was that year that the industry decided
19 to go out to begin harvesting to prove the ANS could be
20 met -- or to help meet the ANS. I guess they said they
21 were concerned about subsistence needs being met.

22

23 You'll see a big reduction -- you'll
24 see a reduction beyond that. And I think what you're
25 seeing is a lot of folks are now getting their eggs
26 from the industry and are not out participating in the
27 harvest.

28

29 The other thing -- and again I should
30 clarify, we work with the Division of Subsistence with
31 these subsistence surveys and the methodology in
32 maintaining the survey universe, that kind of thing so
33 we work very closely with the Division of Subsistence
34 on these surveys. What we are seeing is fewer boats
35 going out. Sometimes households doubling on a boat.
36 Or somehow some individuals are harvesting for multiple
37 households. But part of this is due to cost, that kind
38 of thing.

39

40 So what we're focusing on now, instead
41 of using the households as the unit of effort, it would
42 be better to use the number of sets that are being
43 placed in the water and track that more closely as the
44 unit of effort. Because as you're seeing few people
45 harvesting, they're harvesting for the same number. So
46 to better track unit of effort, we're proposing
47 tracking -- and have kind of focused in that direction
48 in the last couple of years on tracking the number of
49 sets versus the number of households harvesting.

50

1 I would also like to address the
2 staff's review. One of our concerns is that herring
3 not only in Sitka Sound, but throughout Southeast
4 Alaska, are being managed under a shifted baseline.
5 And I guess just to define what a shifted baseline is,
6 you're looking at a shorter period of time and looking
7 at say population levels in a certain shorter period of
8 time. When if you step back -- and calling those the
9 norms, when if you step back and look back 100 years,
10 those populations were much larger. Right now
11 traditional ecological knowledge, archaeological
12 evidence, and historic data confirm that herring stocks
13 in Southeast were much, much larger before the onset of
14 commercial exploitation.

15
16 So our argument is that the Sitka Sound
17 herring stock may be large compared to other depleted
18 stocks in Southeast. Maybe large compared to when the
19 ADF&G began taking over management of this stock. But
20 in the historical context it's still at a depleted
21 state and being managed as such.

22
23 Let's see here. And again just on Page
24 151 I want to highlight a comment here by staff. It
25 says the size of the stock, the commercial harvest
26 levels, and the effective dispersion of the commercial
27 fishery necessitates identifying alternative factors
28 responsible for subsistence harvesting needs not being
29 met -- or not meeting their desired levels. I guess I
30 take offense to this because it implies that the
31 fishery has no impact on the subsistence harvest.
32 Again, I think using the -- pointing out the size of
33 the stock is an attempt to address the depleted state
34 that it's in. As far as the commercial levels,
35 currently they're harvesting under 12 to 20 percent
36 harvest rate, depending on the bio-mass.

37
38 If you look back between 2004 and 2013,
39 the cumulative harvest or removal from Sitka Sound was
40 nearly 260,000,000 pounds of herring being removed from
41 the Sound at that time. The largest removal occurred
42 in 2011 in season. And that was around 39,000,000
43 pounds of herring being removed. Now, these herring
44 for the most part are being removed prior to spawning
45 and prior to the subsistence harvest being met. So my
46 question is how can you remove this amount of bio-mass
47 and not have an effect on other users.

48
49 In the same respect, the hatchery
50 programs in Alaska are based on the fact that putting

1 more fish in the water creates a greater opportunity
2 for harvest to occur. That can be said about the
3 subsistence harvest. Leaving more fish in the water is
4 going to create a greater opportunity for subsistence
5 needs to be met. And it will help increase or build
6 those herring stocks back up to the true historic
7 levels.

8
9 The comment about the effective
10 disbursement of the commercial fishery is incorrect or
11 subjective. The State management for this fishery --
12 the management zone starts -- well, I guess I'll go
13 over the time factor. The State is required to manage
14 the fishery over space and time to ensure that a
15 reasonable opportunity exists for subsistence harvest
16 needs to be met. Reasonable opportunity is left up to
17 the fishery managers to decide. But when you're
18 looking at time, again the fishery occurs -- and most
19 of the fishery has taken place or is completed before
20 the subsistence harvest ever begins or before the spawn
21 ever begins.

22
23 If you're looking at space, the entire
24 management area extends from a latitude from Cackle
25 (ph) Point on the northern end to Aspid Cape on the
26 southern end. And that's roughly -- I'm estimating
27 between 70 to 100 miles. If you see on your map, most
28 of these fisheries occur right within Sitka Sound or
29 within 10 to 20 percent of this management area.

30
31 The actual disbursement of the fishery
32 that does occur isn't due to concern over the
33 subsistence area. It's due to meeting industry needs.
34 The industry wants -- the real content has to be above
35 10, 10 and a half percent. The industry only wants
36 5,000 pounds per opening because that's all they can
37 process in a short enough period of time before the
38 fish spoil.

39
40 The area management biologist then
41 looks for an area that's large enough that has -- that
42 meets those industry needs in an area large enough for
43 48 seine boats to undertake the fishery. So really the
44 disbursal that occurs is -- it's a dispersion under
45 industry needs and nothing else.

46
47 MR. KITKA: The dispersal of the
48 fishery which is very important in this context -- of
49 all these areas where they take the bio-mass and figure
50 it all into one big lump and they call it Sitka Sound

1 fishery; they take their bio-mass from the Salisbury
2 Sound -- from down in the crawfish area, yet they take
3 all their fish within the Sitka Sound area. Which
4 means that the bio-mass that they're looking at is not
5 -- they're taking it -- well, let me put it this way,
6 they're taking it all from Sitka Sound and not
7 utilizing the -- fully the Salisbury Sound or the
8 crawfish area.

9

10 It seems if they're going to disburse
11 the fishery, they need to disburse it to these other
12 areas and take an equal amount of the herring out of
13 these areas -- and not just from Sitka Sound.

14

15 Thank you.

16

17 MR. FELDPAUSCH: I'd like to continue
18 on to the previous review by the Federal Board. And
19 that's on Page 139. It states that although ADF&G
20 forecasts the herring bio-mass before the season
21 starts, the actual return and spawning success of
22 herring is not known until after the commercial and
23 subsistence fisheries are completed. Therefore,
24 Federal actions to close water on non-Federal uses
25 would only take place in years in which herring bio-
26 mass was forecasted to be below the threshold needed to
27 support commercial uses. Otherwise, since the
28 commercial fishery usually takes place well before the
29 subsistence fishery, managers would not know that
30 subsistence harvester's needs were poor until long
31 after the commercial fishery ended.

32

33 For me, this throws up a red flag. And
34 I hope it does for most of you. This statement
35 highlights the threat that the fishery poses to the
36 stock and subsistence users and reinforces the need to
37 preemptively close or restrict these waters to
38 commercial uses. It seems pretty strange that
39 basically what they're saying is we can't take action
40 until damage is done. It's like closing the barn door
41 after the livestock have gotten out.

42

43 To further I guess elaborate on the
44 risk that occurred is to go back and review the 2000
45 fishery. And I'll try to do that very quickly here.
46 In December 15th of 2011, ADF&G came out with the
47 forecasted bio-mass for the 2012 season. They
48 predicted 145,042 tons, which is the largest bio-mass,
49 as far as I know, they've ever predicted for the area.
50 That related into a guideline harvest level of just

1 over 29,000 tons.

2

3 As we get into the season, the area
4 management biologist goes out and does sonar surveys to
5 verify or estimate whether that 25,000 ton threshold is
6 actually present within the Sound. As they go through
7 the season they do test fisheries to monitor the Roe
8 maturity and Roe quality, Roe content, that kind of
9 thing. Again, they're looking for -- it's got to be 10
10 percent or higher before they'll prosecute a fishery.

11

12 In 2012 the first fishery occurred in
13 March 31st, I believe it was. And it was about 4,700
14 tons. Again, they take about three days -- two to
15 three days to process this fish, so they don't have any
16 fisheries in between.

17

18 The next fishery occurred on April 2nd
19 and it was 5,610 tons. And the news release said that
20 it leaves approximately 18,390 of the remaining
21 guideline harvest level to harvest yet.

22

23 What's happening in between here is
24 that the herring are coming in. They're spawning. I
25 think Harvey mentioned that they came in and spawned
26 rather quickly. When these herring were done spawning,
27 they began to move back off the beaches and mix in with
28 herring that hadn't spawned yet.

29

30 As these fisheries progress, we've got
31 through the first two fisheries and were able to meet
32 the quality that the industry was looking for. But as
33 we started into the third fishery, they're having a
34 difficult time finding a mass of herring to set in that
35 met industry standards as far as the Roe quality or Roe
36 content.

37

38 The extended the fishery over time and
39 the last fishery occurred on the northern end. And I
40 believe that looks like it was around on April 7th.
41 And that was for 3,688 tons. And I believe that
42 fishery was just over the -- just above the limit or
43 the required stuff for the industry.

44

45 So the fishery is over. The area
46 management biologist on a radio communication, VHF
47 radio communication closed the fishery. Well, I guess
48 I should take a step back. They officially closed the
49 fishery on April 12th. There was a fishery that hasn't
50 been reported. On April 11th, the area management

1 biologist opened up the entire management area from
2 Point Cackle down to Cape Aspid and told the boats if
3 you can find fish that meet the industry standards, go
4 get them. The boats went out after a day and I think
5 there were some anecdotal reports of a little over 100
6 tons coming back in. But I don't think it met the
7 industry standard.

8

9 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Excuse me, Jeff.
10 Could you summarize. We're really getting short on
11 time.

12

13 MR. FELDPAUSCH: Sure.

14

15 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: I'm sorry.

16

17 MR. FELDPAUSCH: Basically, what
18 happened was the pace of the fishery was slowed by the
19 industry. And that is the only thing that kept from
20 the State from over-harvesting the stock. When it came
21 out in December, they found out that they had -- they
22 overestimated the bio-mass by 43 and a half percent or
23 nearly 60,000 tons of herring didn't show.

24

25 My point is there's a great risk
26 involved the way the fishery is managed. They go in.
27 They assess the spawning -- or they assess the
28 thresholds have been met. And then proceed to manage
29 the fishery to catch the entire GHL. And at the end of
30 the season, back in December, they decide if they made
31 a mistake or not. That's a great risk. It puts the
32 subsistence harvester at risk and it puts the stock at
33 risk.

34

35 And I guess just in closing here, last
36 time this came in front of the Board, there was some
37 concerns that closing this area to non-Federally
38 qualified subsistence users would exclude Juneau and
39 Ketchikan. The proposals were put forth in the way
40 they were because that was the impression that the
41 tribe had that this is the only thing we could do to
42 close those waters. Looking back through CFR36 --
43 looking under the powers of the Board -- Section 6
44 under that says the Board has the power in restricting
45 the taking of fish and wildlife on public lands for
46 non-subsistence users or closure of public lands to the
47 taking of fish and wildlife for non-subsistence uses,
48 blah, blah, blah, blah, blah.

49

50 So it says that you can restrict non-

1 subsistence users. You don't have to close these
2 waters. I brought this to my Council and they gave me
3 the authority to bring this forward to the Council --
4 or to the Council here. If you choose so to amend the
5 proposal, to basically place a gear restriction, it
6 leaves it open to commercial fishing. I would
7 recommend that this closure -- or this restriction be
8 to prohibit the use of purse seines within the Makhnati
9 Federal waters for the purposes of harvesting herring.
10 That way it still leaves it open for Juneau and
11 Ketchikan and other users to come in.

12

13 I guess finally outside of exerting
14 extraterritorial jurisdiction over the entire Sound,
15 this is the only thing this Council and the Federal
16 Subsistence Board can do to help add an extra level of
17 security I guess for subsistence harvesters.

18

19 Thank you.

20

21 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Jeff.

22 Thank you, Harvey.

23

24 Any questions.

25

26 Mr. Schroeder.

27

28 MR. SCHROEDER: Through the Chair.

29 Jeff, do you have a proposal before the Board of
30 Fisheries in this cycle to include the rest of the
31 waters around Middle Island and Makhnati. The Board of
32 Fish closure at this present time includes about two-
33 thirds of that area.

34

35 MR. FELDPAUSCH: Through the Chair.

36 Yes. The current -- we're basically mirroring the
37 proposal we put in in 2012. It would include the
38 current waters we're requesting here at least that
39 aren't closed yet. And I think it runs a little bit
40 further north of Middle Island over to the mainland or
41 the shoreline.

42

43 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Follow up.

44

45 MR. SCHROEDER: Just clarifying, that
46 would be the Federal waters; is that correct?

47

48 MR. FELDPAUSCH: That would include the
49 Federal waters. Yes.

50

1 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Isaacs.

2

3 MR. ISAACS: Yes. How much longer do
4 they estimate this fishery will last.

5

6 MR. FELDPAUSCH: Through the Chair. I
7 don't have the -- you know, that would be a tough one
8 to answer. I guess our major concerns are, you know,
9 that we're experiencing a lot of climate change, ocean
10 acidification, warming water temps. We really don't --
11 we don't know what's coming.

12

13 And I think one of the biggest concerns
14 right now for us is the ADF&G has no idea of what's
15 happening out there right now in the juvenile herring
16 -- the one, two, and three-year olds. There's no data
17 there. There's nothing. They have -- they use a
18 RICKTER (ph) recruitment model that they call. And it
19 uses a series of data to project what that survival is.
20 But if we get an ocean condition that causes an abrupt
21 or precipitous decline in juvenile ocean survival, it
22 will be three to four years before you realize it and
23 it gets incorporated into the model. And we
24 potentially could be over-harvesting significantly just
25 because of that unknown.

26

27 MR. ISAACS: Yeah. I'm thinking of two
28 things. One, in the Klawock area -- Klawock, Craig
29 area, where there was so much commercial harvesting,
30 now we hardly have what we used to see. But I'm also
31 thinking about the east coast where they had the --
32 where they over-fished that cod fishery. And all the
33 old timers telling them -- they tried to tell them not
34 to over fish. Now no more codfish out there.

35

36 But the way it's going now with so many
37 tons being harvested, there won't be anything left for
38 subsistence.

39

40 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Adams.

41

42 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr.
43 Chairman. Jeff, thank you for that, you know, very
44 informative, lengthy report. But could you just kind
45 of summarize for me, you know, to help me with how I
46 make a decision here today. Why the closure of
47 Makhmati would cause a conservation concern. I think
48 that was -- you know, it's a pretty important part of
49 our decision-making.

50

1 MR. FELDPAUSCH: Through the Chair.
2 There was two reasons for requesting this closure. One
3 is for subsistence purpose. The other is conservation.
4 We believe that if those herring enter that area and
5 start spawning -- if they're left alone -- it'll help
6 conservation.

7
8 It also is one chip off the block as
9 far as providing that spawning area un-harassed by the
10 commercial fishery. You know, I guess we've been asked
11 at times, you know, will this proposal really help. I
12 can't see how it could hurt.

13
14 And I guess then you have to ask well,
15 what would closing this water hurt. What's at stake.
16 And I guess that's a question I'd have to kick back to
17 the Board or others.

18
19 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Jackson.

20
21 MR. JACKSON: Through the Chair. Jeff,
22 question. Has there been an increase in other
23 predators like whales, sea lions, seagulls since it's
24 being depleted around the Southeast. Does anybody have
25 any numbers. Because those things are coming through.

26
27 MR. FELDPAUSCH: Through the Chair. I
28 don't have those numbers offhand. I know within Sitka
29 Sound we have seen a significant increase in the whale
30 show up. I think the last couple of years we've had up
31 to 24 humpback whales in Sitka Sound. And I believe
32 the humpbacks are about to be de-listed. Their
33 populations have climbed significantly. At the same
34 time, we have several thousand sea lion showing up in
35 the area. And then on top of that, you know, the Sitka
36 Sound has about close to 100,000 hatchery fish being
37 released into it every year.

38
39 And that's one of our concerns. These
40 hatchery releases have built along with the growing
41 herring population. But what happens when that herring
42 population begins a downward cycle. Do we need the
43 increase of threshold levels is one of the things that
44 we'd be asking.

45
46 If you look at Lynn Canal and Auke Bay
47 right now, the threshold levels in place there didn't
48 seem to protect that stock. It's been depleted and the
49 fishery has been closed for the last 30 years.

50

1 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: I think we have a
2 little -- some of the microphones aren't working
3 correctly. But anyway, are there any other questions.

4
5 (No comments)

6
7 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you for
8 your testimony.

9
10 MR. FELDPAUSCH: Thank you.

11
12 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. So that's
13 the end of public testimony. And I don't know if the
14 Council would want a break before deliberations.

15
16 Oh, Ms. Yuhas.

17
18 MS. YUHAS: Apologies for the haphazard
19 disturbances here, Mr. Chair. You had requested the
20 subsistence information. I just wanted the RAC to know
21 that final report was provided to Robert Larson during
22 the previous testimony. And that Davin Holen, who is
23 the regional supervisor for the Subsistence Division is
24 also online to answer questions.

25
26 The distinction between the proposal
27 before you and the proposals before the Board of Fish
28 is the question was asked what's at stake and who does
29 it affect. The proposal before you is a closure to
30 others and what the State calls other subsistence users
31 because they're under the State system. But they are
32 subsistence fishing. The proposals before the Board of
33 Fish relate to the commercial fishing. And so that's
34 the distinction between the two.

35
36 It's another instance of do you want to
37 act now or do you want to defer until the Board of Fish
38 has already met to decide if they've made closures to
39 commercial that are agreeable to you, so that you don't
40 have to do this or not.

41
42 But Davin is online to answer the
43 subsistence questions that came up.

44
45 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Ms.
46 Yuhas. Are there questions or do you want to reiterate
47 the questions relating to that.

48
49 Davin, are you online?

50

1 MR. HOLEN: Yes. I'm here. And so
2 again for the record, my name is Davin Holen. I'm the
3 subsistence program manager for the Southern Alaska.
4 And over the past few years we've been working
5 collaboratively within the department and with the
6 Sitka Tribe to conduct harvest surveys for that area.
7 That also includes mapping. And I would just like to
8 point out to the RAC that we have a 2013 report that's
9 just been published. And we're also working on a 2014
10 report which will provide updated information. That
11 will be published before the Board of Fisheries
12 meeting. It should be out here in the next two months.

13
14 Those reports do have maps that can
15 show you where people are harvesting resources and what
16 areas are important for them to harvest.

17
18 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

19
20 MR. HOLEN: And if there's any other
21 questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

22
23 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Are there any
24 other questions.

25
26 (No comments)

27
28 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Seeing none.
29 Thank you for your time.

30
31 Thank you, Ms. Yuhas.

32
33 So we're at Council deliberations.
34 What's the wish of the Council. Do you want to break
35 for lunch or do you want to deliberate now. Any ideas.
36 It's ten minutes till noon.

37
38 Mr. Schroeder.

39
40 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chair, what's our
41 workload. Because some of us have to get on a plane
42 this afternoon. Maybe we should bring sandwiches back
43 or something if we have a whole lot to get done.

44
45 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: That's a good
46 idea. We still have quite a few proposals to go over.
47 The Board of Fish proposals and Board of Game
48 proposals. So it will probably be pressed for time.
49 So maybe we should.....

50

1 Mr. Hernandez.
2
3 MR. HERNANDEZ: What do you see for an
4 adjournment time. I know it sounded like last night in
5 our discussions we're going to lose a quorum here this
6 afternoon. So at what point do we have to end the
7 meeting by.
8
9 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: I think we were
10 talking 2:30 would be about as late as we could go.
11
12 MR. HERNANDEZ: In that case, I would
13 recommend that we take a -- maybe just a ten-minute
14 break. And we'll just have to have lunch maybe later
15 this afternoon, if that's agreeable to everybody. I
16 think an hour break for lunch now, we'd never get done.
17
18
19 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Anyone else.
20
21 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: We can eat after.
22
23 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yeah. I think
24 that's probably a real good idea.
25
26 MS. NEEDHAM: Maybe a 15-minute break.
27 And those that are really hungry can run to the grocery
28 store and get a sandwich -- which is just right there.
29
30 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yeah. Okay.
31 Fifteen minute break. We'll convene at 10 minutes
32 after 12.
33
34 (Off record)
35
36 (On record)
37
38 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. We'll try
39 to talk in between chews. We're beginning deliberation
40 on FP15-17.
41
42 MR. SCHROEDER: Just, Mr. Chair, I move
43 to adopt FP15-17.
44
45 MR. HERNANDEZ: Second.
46
47 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. It's been
48 moved and seconded. Adopt the Proposal 15-17.
49 Discussion.
50

1 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Did somebody second
2 it?
3
4 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yes.
5
6 It looks like everybody's still
7 chewing.
8
9 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yeah.
10
11 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Mr. Adams.
12
13
14 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Just for the record,
15 would somebody please read the proposal that we're
16 adopting just for the record.
17
18 Please.
19
20 Thank you.
21
22 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: I'll read the
23 executive summary. The general description is Proposal
24 FP15-17 seeks to close the Federal public waters in the
25 Makhnati Island area near Sitka to the harvest of
26 herring and herring spawn, except for sport and
27 subsistence herring harvest and subsistence harvest of
28 herring spawn. And it's submitted by the Sitka Tribe
29 of Alaska.
30
31 The proposed regulation has all the
32 dots and numbers and letters. The Federal public
33 waters in the Makhnati Island area as defined in are
34 closed to the harvest of herring and herring spawn,
35 except for the Federally-qualified subsistence users.
36 OSM preliminary conclusion says oppose. There was two
37 written public comments opposed. And we had public
38 testimony in favor.
39
40 There's a map of the proposed closed
41 area. There's a map on Page 140 of the closed area as
42 it is now. And the proposed closed area requested by
43 the Sitka Tribe is Map 3 on Page 137. So you can --
44 they're quite a bit different in size, but you can
45 see.....
46
47 MR. BLOOM: No.
48
49 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: No?
50

1 MR. BLOOM: That's not correct. Not
2 for this proposal. This is only Federal waters.
3
4 MR. KITKA: We're talking about Federal
5 waters.
6
7 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Federal waters.
8 Where's the map that shows.....
9
10 MR. BLOOM: 135.
11
12 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: 135. Sorry.
13 That's the colored Map 135, Makhnati Island public
14 waters. So that's a description of what the intent of
15 the proposal is. Discussion.
16
17 Mr. Hernandez.
18
19 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.
20 Chairman. I'm inclined to vote in favor of this
21 proposal. In order to institute a closure we either
22 have to show a conservation concern or that subsistence
23 needs aren't being met. I guess I would be willing to
24 concede the point on the conservation concern. There's
25 a lot of controversy about that. My own viewpoint, I
26 tend to take the holistic view that the Sitka Tribe
27 takes, that herring stocks region-wide are depleted.
28 And Sitka Sound is an important component of that and,
29 you know, therefore should be considered a depleted
30 stock.
31
32 But I know there's, you know, a lot of
33 debate about that. However, the subsistence need has
34 been shown to have not been met for the good proportion
35 of the last several years. And I think if the, you
36 know, Federal program can take an action that would
37 help to increase the -- potentially increase the
38 harvest for subsistence users, I think we ought to do
39 that.
40
41 This proposal came before us before.
42 And we did take a vote on it. And we didn't approve
43 it. There's been a few changes since then. One of the
44 questions was a Federal closure would close it to all
45 users, including non-Federally-qualified subsistence
46 harvesters. And there was supposed to be a -- there
47 was going to be a study to, you know, determine how
48 many non-Federally-qualified people were engaged in
49 subsistence activities here. I don't think we have the
50 results of that yet.

1 But we also had a suggestion from the
2 Sitka Tribe that we could amend this proposal so that
3 the closure would only be for seine gear used in this
4 Federal public waters, which would not impact the non-
5 Federally-qualified people who might want to engage in
6 subsistence activities here. So I think I would, like
7 I say, tend to vote in favor the proposal. But I also
8 would be interested to hear what other Council members
9 would have to say about amending the proposal so that
10 it would only close waters to seining of herring in the
11 Federal waters.

12

13 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
14 Hernandez.

15

16 Mr. Schroeder.

17

18 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chair, this issue
19 has been before the Southeast Regional Advisory Council
20 in one form or another for numerous times. And so I
21 think most people have a pretty good understanding and
22 were almost by reference to other discussions tend to
23 support some aspects of the Sitka Tribe's request.

24

25 I'd focus on relatively new sources of
26 data saying well, what has changed in recent years.
27 Because previous proposals have not been successful,
28 whether or not they've been supported by the Council.

29

30 And just following on what Don says, we
31 do have more data available on harvest levels. And
32 those by reference are Table 1 and Figure 3 in the book
33 on Page 145. Table 1 does show a little bit of an up
34 and down trend. But overall the harvest levels are
35 going down. And in recent years subsistence needs have
36 not been met based on the State adopted ANS minimum, as
37 well as on the public testimony that we've received
38 from the Sitka Tribe and from other people who
39 participate in this fishery.

40

41 Secondly, the number of households
42 participating in this fishery has been going down. And
43 there's a strong relationship between the number of
44 households participating and harvest levels. So
45 something is happening that is reducing the
46 attractiveness of this fishery.

47

48 The other new piece of information is
49 the encouraging action by the Board of Fisheries to
50 recognize that there is a problem with this fishery and

1 that the Board of Fisheries did close a part of the
2 requested area in February 2012.

3

4 Now, the statement in the book on Page
5 141 says that the Board of Fisheries closed this to
6 "reduce perceived conflict between the commercial
7 fishery and the subsistence fishery." Those of us who
8 have been engaged in fisheries management know that
9 perceived conflict is rarely a reason for Board of
10 Fisheries action. And I think that this is an
11 acknowledgment that there is a problem with a
12 subsistence harvest being met without a closure.

13

14 So I think those are new pieces of
15 information. I'll tend to support this proposal. I
16 think that we may need to do some crafting on -- we may
17 need to amend the proposal or we may put some condition
18 on the proposal based on the Board of Fisheries action.
19 That's all for right now.

20

21 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
22 Schroeder.

23

24 Mr. Kitka.

25

26 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
27 intend to support this proposal. I also looked at it
28 is a conservation concern. I think that if you look at
29 the commercial catch for 2012 and 2013, where they
30 could not meet their projected quota and barely made
31 half the amount they were able to catch, it really
32 shows that the amount of herring that are out there is
33 considerably less than what they say.

34

35 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Jackson.

36

37 MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman, I, too,
38 will support this. And a lot of it's because of the
39 last sentence of Page 130. Otherwise, it says since
40 the commercial fishery usually takes place well before
41 the subsistence fishery, managers would not know that
42 subsistence harvests were poor until long after the
43 commercial fishery ended.

44

45 Thank you.

46

47 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
48 Jackson.

49

50 Mr. Adams.

1 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I intend to also
2 support this proposal. If somebody would go ahead and
3 make the amendments as referred to by, you know, Sitka
4 Tribes and brought out by Mr. Hernandez, I would do it
5 but I'm in between bites. So if somebody would like to
6 do that, I would be happy to support this proposal.

7
8 We have always supported Sitka on this
9 issue. If you remember several years ago when we first
10 started having hearings we listened to almost two days
11 of testimony, you know, from the Sitka people. And
12 these are testimonies that other people, you know, like
13 on the Federal subsistence board level have not heard.
14 And so we have a lot of data to support, you know, why
15 this should be a conservation concern for that area.
16 And I think that we would do well to continue to
17 support Sitka in their efforts to have that taken care
18 of.

19
20 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

21
22 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Bert.

23
24 Anyone else.

25
26 (No comments)

27
28 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Would someone
29 entertain the notion of amending it.

30
31 MR. ISAACS: Call for the question, Mr.
32 Chairman.

33
34 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Did you have an
35 amendment before we do a vote.

36
37 MR. SCHROEDER: I move to amend the
38 proposal to specify that the area would be closed to
39 commercial harvest of herring using purse seine gear.
40 And that other uses would be open in the closed area.

41
42 MR. HERNANDEZ: Second the amendment.

43
44 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: It's been moved
45 and seconded to amend the proposal.

46
47 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Question.

48
49 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Question's been
50 called. And the propos -- excuse me. I'm in between

1 bites, too.

2

3 (Laughter)

4

5 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: So everyone
6 understands what the amendment is.

7

8 MS. PHILLIPS: No.

9

10 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Would you
11 rephrase the amendment.

12

13 MR. SCHROEDER: There was a concern
14 expressed when we were speaking with staff that some
15 people who would be non-qualified subsistence
16 harvesters would be unnecessarily excluded from
17 harvesting in this area. In the absence of specific
18 information on that, we may have a stronger proposal by
19 focusing on simply excluding the commercial purse seine
20 fishery from this area and leave the area open to other
21 harvesting activities that may take place.

22

23 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Ms. Phillips.

24

25 MS. PHILLIPS: Chairman Bangs, what
26 does that do with the proposed regulation on Page 133.
27 Does the motion replace that language.

28

29 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: It amends it to
30 allow for non-Federally-qualified harvesters to
31 participate and harvest Roe out of that area. All it
32 does is keeps a commercial fishery from happening in
33 that place. And the amended language was offered from
34 the Sitka Tribe because they realized that maybe we --
35 we don't want to exclude other subsistence users just
36 because they're non-qualified Federal.

37

38 MS. PHILLIPS: Chairman, I understand
39 that -- the reasoning. But the motion was made to
40 approve proposed Regulation FP15-17.

41

42 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: That's correct.
43 And he amended it.

44

45 MS. PHILLIPS: So how does the -- if
46 it's approved, how would the main motion read.

47

48 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Schroeder.

49

50 MR. SCHROEDER: Let's see. Generally,

1 we rely on our Staff to put intelligent words on
2 something like this, following the intention of the
3 poor RAC member. But doing it on the spot, we'd say
4 seeks to close Federal public waters in the Makhnati
5 Island area near Sitka to the commercial harvest of
6 herring or herring roe by purse seine vessels, and the
7 rest would be excised.

8

9 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Larson.

10

11 MS. PHILLIPS: I still don't get what
12 the main motion would read.

13

14 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Larson, do
15 you have that verbiage for the change and how it should
16 read as our amended proposal?

17

18 MR. LARSON: I believe we have that.
19 We've got it in our transcripts and I think that the
20 intent is clear. We might even wordsmith it a little
21 bit, but it's to close Federal waters to commercial
22 purse seine fishing, and that's -- and that's pretty
23 clear.

24

25 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Thank you.
26 Does everyone understand what we're doing.

27

28 Ms. Phillips.

29

30 MS. PHILLIPS: So does that mean are
31 closed to the harvest of herring and herring spawn
32 except by Federally-qualified subsistence users is
33 deleted.

34

35 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: That's correct,
36 from what I understand.

37

38 MS. PHILLIPS: Well, that's what the
39 motion should say then.

40

41 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Well, the motion
42 given automatically excludes -- precludes that wording,
43 from what I can gather. So that's what would happen.

44

45 So Mr. Schroeder.

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other
50 discussion.

1 (No comments)
2
3 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: There was a
4 question called on the amended proposal. All those in
5 favor of the amended proposal as stated, respond by
6 saying aye.
7
8 IN UNISON: Aye.
9
10 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: All those
11 opposed, nay.
12
13 MS. PHILLIPS: Nay.
14
15 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Motion passes.
16 One dissenting vote.
17
18 Okay. That takes care of our
19 proposals.
20
21 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair.....
22
23 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Oh. That was
24 just the amended.
25
26 MR. LARSON: We have the main motion
27 back on the floor.
28
29 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. The main
30 motion back on the floor for the amended version of
31 Proposal FP15-17. Is there any other discussion.
32
33 Mr. Schroeder.
34
35 MR. SCHROEDER: I just -- I don't want
36 to make an amendment at this time. But I was somewhat
37 encouraged by the Board of Fisheries action to close
38 part of this area. And Jeff from the Sitka Tribe said
39 that there's a parallel proposal to this before the
40 Board of Fisheries. I'd like to encourage the Board of
41 Fisheries to pass that proposal.
42
43 I don't know if we could do something
44 with our proposal saying should the Board of Fisheries
45 act on the proposal to close this area, that the
46 Federal closure would not need to take place. I'd just
47 kind of like to put that out there as an idea and see
48 what Council members think of that.
49
50 Do you understand what I'm saying. No.

1
2 If the Board of Fisheries is going to
3 act on a proposal where the Sitka Tribe requested this
4 area is closed under State regulations, if the Board of
5 Fisheries passed that proposal, we may think that
6 having a Federal closure is not necessary at this time.
7

8
9 So I'm not sure if there's some way
10 that we could do something on that or if we even care
11 to.
12

13 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any comments.

14
15 Mr. Larson.

16
17 MR. LARSON: Oh. Mr. Chair, there's
18 final action due on Board of Fish comments from the
19 Council after we hear a report from their work group --
20 your work group.
21

22 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay.

23
24 Ms. Phillips.

25
26 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. I will be
27 voting against the motion -- the main motion. I am
28 supporting the OSM preliminary conclusion and its
29 justification. And I would say that Table 1, Page 145,
30 that talks about the number of households harvesting
31 and the total Roe harvest. And the ANS minimum doesn't
32 necessarily demonstrate not meeting their subsistence
33 needs.
34

35 On Page 144, final sentence, says in
36 recent years there's been a decline in participation.
37 You're correct. We do need to know why there is that
38 decline. But we're hearing there are super households
39 -- or super harvesters that are catching more than one
40 permit holder's herring -- amount of herring they'd
41 like. And that declining participation may have
42 contributed to the total decline and total annual Roe
43 harvest. It's not necessarily -- it's not a
44 presumption that subsistence needs are not being met.
45

46 Thank you.

47
48 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Patty.

49
50 Harvey.

1 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. As
2 far as I know, there's no permits required for the
3 harvest of herring eggs in our Sitka Sound herring
4 fishery. But besides that, the high harvesters and
5 that harvest these eggs and share with other people,
6 some of us are multiple boat harvesters. But industry
7 has hired several people to harvest for the community.
8 Last year they set out over 100 sets and still were
9 only able to gather I think only about 16,000 pounds of
10 herring eggs, which is not very much.

11
12 For that many set, they should have
13 been well within the quota that we require. Which only
14 shows that the herring spawn is considerably less than
15 what it was in past years. So I support this proposal.

16
17
18 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you,
19 Harvey.

20
21 Any other comments.

22
23 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Call for the question,
24 Mr. Chairman.

25
26 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: The question's
27 been called for on the amended Proposal FP15-17, as
28 amended.

29
30 Mr. Douville.

31
32 MR. DOUVILLE: So we're now just
33 closing it to use of purse seines in Federal water.
34 You're not affecting anything else.

35
36 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Larson, could
37 you read it, please.

38
39 MR. LARSON: Yes, Mr. Chair. The
40 proposed regulation as amended, which is the final
41 motion, is the Federal public waters in the Makhnati
42 Island area as defined in Section .3 are closed to the
43 harvest of herring by commercial purse seine gear.

44
45 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

46
47 Mr. Douville.

48
49 MR. DOUVILLE: Okay. Thank you. I'll
50 support the proposal. Because, you know, I'm not going

1 to argue that there isn't enough herring to produce the
2 spawn necessary to meet -- well, for Sitka's needs or
3 Southeast really because it's everybody they supply.

4
5 The biggest problem is the disruption I
6 think by the fishing fleet which makes the herring move
7 in an unpredictable manner. And you just flat cannot
8 get your trees in the right place at the right time.
9 And it makes it very difficult. So I think that
10 restricting purse seines in this little area might help
11 that situation. And I am in favor of it.

12
13 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other
14 comments.

15
16 (No comments)

17
18 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. The
19 question's been called for on the amended version of
20 this proposal. All those in favor, respond by saying
21 aye.

22
23 IN UNISON: Aye.

24
25 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: All those
26 opposed, nay.

27
28 MS. PHILLIPS: Nay.

29
30 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. There's a
31 -- motion passes -- and one nay vote.

32
33 Okay.

34
35 I'm going to turn the meeting back over
36 to the chairman.

37
38 Thank you.

39
40 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Bangs,
41 for doing a job well done. And I thought you did a
42 fantastic job, you know, taking care of the proposals.
43 You're right, I did leave the hardest part for you and
44 I thank you for that.

45
46 But I was allowed to, last evening, you
47 know, go and visit some of my family who live here and
48 that was a pretty good evening.

49
50 One of the things that -- well, I'll

1 share this with you now, with you all right now that --
2 if I can find it. Oh, yeah, there it is. That -- oh.
3 It's getting all wrinkled up. But I'll get another
4 one. Gary Stevens, the son of one of my cousins,
5 designed this Kadashan logo, okay, and so I asked him
6 to explain it to me. And he said that this is an
7 eagle. It's an eagle. And then the faces on there
8 represents three Kadashans. There's the one before
9 John Kadashan, my great grandfather, and then there was
10 my great grandfather and then I guess the third one is
11 me. So I just wanted to share that with you all.

12

13 And one of the things that I hope I can
14 get to do before we leave here today is go down to the
15 Chief Shakes Island because there's two Kadashan poles
16 there that I need to take photos of.

17

18 So I just want to thank you Mr. Bangs
19 for taking the time to take over the Chairmanship for a
20 while. And I think you did a good -- a great job.

21

22 Now back to business.

23

24 We do have, you know, the workshops --
25 two workshop that has to be, you know, heard. I know
26 that Mr. Bangs still has a little bit of work to do on
27 theirs. I don't know whether we will be able to get
28 that taken care of or not today, but what I want us to
29 do now is to go back to the Agenda. And we'll go
30 through, you know, the rest of it as quickly as we can.
31 And then maybe, you know, you'll have an opportunity to
32 have a little, short meeting with your people. And
33 then we'll come back and then go over those proposals.
34 Proposals takes a long time. So I would like to be
35 able to take care of business here that needs to be
36 taken care of right now.

37

38 Mr. Bangs, go ahead.

39

40 MR. BANGS: Yes. Thank you, Mr.
41 Chairman. There's only a few proposals that we had
42 left to go over. And we could do that as a whole
43 Council.

44

45 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. We can do it
46 that way.

47

48 MR. BANGS: That might be the best way
49 to do it.

50

1 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: We'll save that toward
2 the end though to make sure that we get through some of
3 the critical parts of the Agenda that has to be taken
4 care of.

5
6 So the thing that we want to take care
7 of right now is the Partners for Fisheries monitoring
8 program.

9
10 Cal and Steve, would you please come
11 forward and do your presentation.

12
13 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
14 For the record, my name is Cal Casipit. I'm the
15 subsistence staff biologist for the Forest Service in
16 Juneau. I'll call your attention to the write-up on
17 Page 175 in your book. It's entitled Partnership to
18 Build Capacity, A Vision Forward for the Partners in
19 the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program. And this is
20 your review draft.

21
22 I had the pleasure of working with this
23 strategic plan team early in the process.
24 Unfortunately, as some people know, early in the summer
25 I broke my wrist. And the final meeting where we
26 finalize this document, I was unable to attend because
27 I was in emergency surgery.

28
29 Anyway, so I think what the strategic
30 planning team is most interested in is those seven
31 bullets that appear right under the purpose. And I'll
32 just -- I'm going to try to make this fast. I'll just
33 read those into the record.

34
35 Are there changes that you would like
36 to see made to the partners program. Should the
37 program be involved in other activities. Are there
38 things that the program can do better. Should the
39 program work with issues pertaining to other
40 subsistence resources such as wildlife. Are there
41 other sources of funding that could help support the
42 program. Should there be a limit on the number of
43 years an organization can be funded through the
44 program. And how can the Partners Program help develop
45 a self-sustaining local program.

46
47 I do want to call your attention to the
48 fact that the Partners Program has been active
49 throughout the State other than Southeast Alaska. And
50 the reason that there wasn't a Partners Program for

1 Southeast Alaska was based on the Council
2 recommendation many years ago. I remember when John
3 Littlefield was chair. This was discussed at length.

4
5 I think if the Council members
6 remember, the reason that the Council did not want the
7 Forest Service to proceed into this Partners Program in
8 Southeast was that they felt the funding that would be
9 needed to fund that program would be taken from the
10 Fisheries Research Monitoring Program, which probably
11 it would have. And that would have diminished the
12 amount of money that we could put into the actual
13 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program projects that are
14 on the ground.

15
16 And as you know, all have cooperation
17 with tribal governments. In fact, there are some
18 projects out there under FRMP that the projects are run
19 totally by the tribal government.

20
21 So as far as -- you know, I think as
22 far as the Council thought at the time and as far as
23 the Forest Service thinks, we're developing capacity in
24 the tribes through our Fisheries Resource Monitoring
25 Program. And the Partnership Program, in our mind, was
26 unnecessary and would detract from that effort of
27 working with tribes on the ground on projects that make
28 a difference to the communities that rely on those
29 areas.

30
31 So with that, I will end this
32 presentation just for the sake of time. That document
33 is there for you to review and take a look at and see
34 what it says. If you would like to answer some of
35 those questions or reaffirm the Council's belief that
36 the way to build capacity in Southeast is through the
37 FRMP, that would be fine, too. With that I will answer
38 questions, if you would like or provide more
39 information if you need that as well.

40
41 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Cal.
42 Questions anyone.

43
44 (No comments)

45
46 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. I have a note
47 under here that says the Council may decide to make
48 this an action item, but it is not necessary. Would
49 you like to comment on that, Cal, please.
50

1 MR. CASIPIT: Yes. If you wanted to
2 make it an action item, you could. If you wanted to
3 answer those questions that I briefly went through, you
4 could. If you want to reaffirm the Council's belief
5 that the Partners Program isn't necessary because of
6 the Forest Service's efforts with local tribal
7 governments in involving them in the FRMP, then you
8 could do that as well.

9
10 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Thank you. I'm
11 still in between bites. And I'm reminded about my mom
12 -- to never speak when my mouth is full. But I'm
13 sticking my feet in it all the time, so I don't know
14 the difference.

15
16 What's the wish of the Council on that.
17 Is the report from Cal good enough for us now.

18
19 MR. BANGS: Mr. Chairman.

20
21 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Bangs.

22
23 MR. BANGS: I would like to make a
24 comment or maybe a question as well. That the six
25 bullet point there, should there be a limit on the
26 number of years an organization can be funded through
27 this program. And I'm wondering -- I'm thinking that
28 the more years that they do these projects, that they
29 become better at it. And I would think that that would
30 be a positive thing.

31
32 But what's your take on that, Cal.

33
34 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Bangs.
35 Through the Chair. That particular question deals with
36 how the Partners Program is implemented up north with
37 the Department of Interior agencies. They put out a
38 call for proposals to provide these partner positions
39 in these local organizations. And then those
40 agreements last for I believe five years. And then
41 they can be renewed for another five years or something
42 like that. So that question deals with whether or not
43 those agreements should be longer or shorter or
44 whatever.

45
46 Through FRMP in Southeast, we give
47 commitments for four years for our projects. So PI's
48 get four years of funding commitment for each project.
49 You guys all know that. This really wouldn't affect
50 that. You know, for instance, Hydaburg Cooperative

1 Association has been working with the Forest Service on
2 the Hetta Lake project for darn near 14 years now. So
3 -- but it's just commitment after commitment. So.....

4

5 MR. BANGS: Okay. Thank you.

6

7 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Any more
8 questions, comments.

9

10 (No comments)

11

12 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I saw nods from some
13 Council members when I asked the question if Cal's
14 report would be sufficient for now. What's the feeling
15 of the other Council members. We don't need to do an
16 action on this.

17

18 (Council nods affirmatively)

19

20 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Well, thank you, Cal.
21 Appreciate it.

22

23 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

24

25 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: So the next item would
26 be to identify issues for the annual report. This
27 might take a little time, so why don't we go ahead and
28 dive into that issue right now. The annual report.

29

30 Mr. Larson, do you want to kind of
31 start us off?

32

33 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair, the process for
34 annual reports of course are that you identify possible
35 topics at your fall meeting. That provides me with an
36 opportunity to develop those issues or concerns into a
37 draft report. And then you have a final opportunity to
38 actually write the annual report at your winter
39 meeting.

40

41 So the amount of detail that you
42 provide to me at this point is completely up to you.
43 It's in detail or a concept that you wish me to pursue.
44 And we'll have that back to you in the springtime.

45

46 Thank you.

47

48 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: And there were some --
49 one or two items that -- maybe even more that I thought
50 should be -- as went through the discussion throughout

1 this meeting that should be in the annual report. So
2 if any of you remember what those were, please bring
3 those up right now -- or even add some more.

4

5 Okay. Go ahead, Patty.

6

7 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair, so in 2012 we
8 had mentioned the Transboundary mining in our annual
9 letter as a bullet point. And then we had -- in 2013
10 we had written a letter to the Federal Subsistence
11 Board, asking the Board to support the Secretaries to
12 contact the Secretary of State about our concerns about
13 the Transboundary issue. And while I recognize the
14 improvement to our Council packet this meeting, I have
15 -- I wrote it down. I have a concern about the
16 inconsistent follow-up on Council recommendations from
17 the Federal Subsistence Board on particularly the
18 Transboundary issue.

19

20 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thanks for noting
21 that, Patty. So, you know, we get responses on our
22 annual report from the Federal Subsistence Board. And
23 I suppose, you know, that's kind of what you're
24 referring to, Patty. A little bit? Yeah.

25

26 So if any of you have issues that has
27 to do with their response or if you want to add new
28 stuff onto it, please feel free to do that right now.

29

30 Anyone else have anything to add.

31

32 Mr. Bangs.

33

34 MR. BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
35 I'm still concerned about the timeliness of the
36 progress we've been making on the ETJ petition. And I
37 don't think we've been getting the support we need to
38 get information and things done on that. So I just
39 thought maybe -- I don't know what the rest of the
40 Council feels, but I think it's something that we
41 should look at.

42

43 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.
44 Bangs. That is a real big concern for the Council.
45 Yeah. The State -- you know, I think maybe they might
46 be moving a little bit, but not very much at all.

47

48 Anything else, folks.

49

50 Mr. Wright.

1 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
2 was wondering about the last -- up in Anchorage we had
3 asked to get some kind of response from all the
4 Councils on the National Marine Fisheries Service
5 representative. So I was wondering if we could get
6 some kind of response of that.

7
8 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yeah. We can keep
9 that on the annual report. But is there anything that
10 we have gotten back on that, Mr. Larson, at all? I
11 know we talked quite a bit about it at the joint
12 meeting with Southcentral. Has anything new popped up
13 since then?

14
15 MR. LARSON: So, Mr. Chair, as far as I
16 know, that the Councils -- especially those Councils
17 that are coastal -- represent coastal communities have
18 had discussions and are aware of the Southeast
19 Council's position. And actually they don't need to be
20 aware of our position. They have their own concerns
21 over a lack of subsistence advocacy on the North
22 Pacific Fisheries Management Council. So that is a
23 concern by a number of other Councils and they are
24 aware of it.

25
26 I want to direct you to our annual
27 report from last year, where the Office of Subsistence
28 Management has replied directly to that concern.

29
30 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Larson.
31 Okay. So we need to push that in our annual report
32 then. We have to, you know, request, you know, that
33 somebody be put on that Council from here.

34
35 Anything else, folks.

36
37 (No comments)

38
39 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Kind of review
40 what we've done so far, Mr. Larson. What we have.

41
42 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair, we have four
43 items for me to develop into annual report topics. The
44 first is a discussion of the inconsistent follow-up on
45 Council annual report topics. The other is
46 Transboundary river mining issues. The other is the
47 Council would like to have more information and
48 involvement on the ETJ petition process. And finally
49 the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council needs to
50 have a subsistence advocate.

1 And we'll have a draft of those topics
2 and there will be, you know, further discussions with
3 you about what exactly that is and some option. So
4 that will be available at the winter meeting.

5
6 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: So this will be just
7 putting things in the form of ideas. And then an
8 annual report letter will be prepared for us during the
9 winter meeting.

10
11 So if there's anything that pops up by
12 the time this meeting ends -- do you have something.

13
14 Oh, Patty. Please feel free to go
15 ahead and add whatever, but at the end of the meeting
16 we won't take any more.

17
18 Yes, Patty.

19
20 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. I just
21 wanted to say the first two items were a combined item.
22 They weren't two separate items, as far as I was
23 concerned.

24
25 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Clarify that
26 for us, Robert, please. The first two items.

27
28 MR. LARSON: Okay. I have it.

29
30 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Please review
31 it with us again.

32
33 MR. LARSON: Well, there's actually
34 three annual report topics. One is concerning the
35 Transboundary river mining issues. And there's
36 inconsistent follow-up by the Federal Board on that
37 topic, as listed in last year's annual report. And the
38 ETJ petition -- the Council needs to be better informed
39 and have more involvement. And then the North Pacific
40 Fisheries Management Council subsistence advocacy
41 position. So.....

42
43 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Thank you.

44
45 Okay.

46
47 Let's move on then.

48
49 Changes to the Nomination Agreement.
50 Carl Johnson is not here, so.....

1 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair, I could address
2 that really quickly. There's been some concerns about
3 the whole nomination process in that there is Council
4 members whose terms have expired and there's been no
5 selections made for those. So those persons don't know
6 if they're on the Council or not. At the end of their
7 terms, they don't know if they need to reapply. The
8 process that we have now appears to be very cumbersome.
9 But it's not on our end. Most of it is coming from our
10 Washington, D.C. office and the process they go through
11 to make final selections.

12
13 There is a number of options that have
14 been put on the table to see if there's some consensus
15 in how to change that process. The questions are would
16 four-year terms, instead of three-year terms -- would
17 that be helpful at all. Is there a need for alternate
18 members. Does that serve any purpose. Or would we
19 benefit from changing our charters so that those
20 persons that are in the position remain in those
21 positions until a replacement is appointed.

22
23 I know that last week I was at the Nome
24 Council meeting -- at the Seward Peninsula Council
25 meeting in Nome. And that body suggested that if a
26 person could just remain in their positions as an
27 active council member until they're reappointed, that
28 some of those other aspects would just naturally be
29 dealt with over time. So that was their suggestion.

30
31 I know that that's not the only
32 suggestion possible. And I think that some of the
33 other Councils have made somewhat different
34 recommendations but at least that recommendation seems
35 to be constant between the Councils.

36
37 So if the Council would like to offer a
38 suggestion on how to make the process better or
39 different, then this is a good time to do it.

40
41 MR. BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
42 think something that might streamline it a little bit
43 -- if you're already in a position, you don't have to
44 go through all the same interviews and all that. I
45 mean they already know. You know that. And it just
46 seems like something to slow the process down.

47
48 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Bangs.
49 Good point. Do you think, Mr. Bangs, that this should
50 be put in our annual report as well? I think so.

1 MR. BANGS: If the Council thinks
2 that's a good idea, that would be fine.
3
4 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Council okay with
5 having it mentioned in our annual report? So done.
6
7 Okay. Anything else on that, Mr.
8 Larson.
9
10 MR. LARSON: No, Mr. Chair.
11
12 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. The next item
13 is -- what's that.
14
15 MR. LARSON: Next item.
16
17 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Chuck?
18
19 MR. LARSON: Correction. Next item.
20
21 MR. ARDIZZONE: Next item, I think
22 that's.....
23
24 MR. LARSON: Okay.
25
26 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Were you going to make
27 a comment on the next item -- all Council meeting.
28
29 MR. ARDIZZONE: I don't want to slow
30 the process down, Mr. Chair.
31
32 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Go ahead.
33
34 MR. ARDIZZONE: I wasn't -- where are
35 we now, sorry. All Council Meeting.
36
37 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)
38
39 MR. ARDIZZONE: So in the winter of
40 2016, we're looking at pulling all the Councils into
41 Anchorage possibly to have an All Council Meeting, so
42 there can be interaction between the different Councils
43 and Council members. And some people can meet each
44 other. There would be work sessions with other
45 Councils. You know, we'd have time for the Councils to
46 do their regular business as well. But we're just
47 looking for interest.
48
49 If the Council would be interested in
50 doing that, that's all we really need to know at this

1 time. We don't need topics or anything. We're just
2 trying to reach out to everybody and see if that could
3 be a possibility, if people are interested.

4
5 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. I for
6 one would think it would a real interesting process.
7 And probably very educational for all the Councils to
8 experience what's going on elsewhere in the State. I
9 don't know. How do you -- the rest of the Council --
10 Harvey.

11
12 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Chair. I really
13 think that an All Council Meeting would be really
14 helpful to all the Councils. Primarily they really
15 have some questions on the Southeast RAC and what we
16 were looking at on the customary and traditional. And
17 we might be able to give a face-to-face answer to them
18 a little better than second hand or third hand.

19
20 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you,
21 Harvey. Yeah.

22
23 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair, just so you
24 know, there's no guarantee it would happen. We're just
25 trying to see if there's interest and see if we can
26 pull it off. I don't want to set expectations that
27 we're definitely going to have it. We just want to see
28 if there's interest in it and see if we can accommodate
29 it.

30
31 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yes. Well, I
32 think there is a few pertinent topics that we've had to
33 send letters to other Councils about C&T and things
34 like that. And that may be very helpful to cover
35 issues like that in an All Council forum. Anyone else.

36
37
38 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.

39
40 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Ms.
41 Phillips.

42
43 MS. PHILLIPS: How about a field trip
44 while we're there.

45
46 (Laughter)

47
48 MR. ARDIZZONE: We'll see what we can
49 do, Ms. Phillips.

50

1 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Any other
2 comments. Thank you.

3
4 So the next one is All Chairs Meeting
5 before the Board in 2015.

6
7 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair, it's another
8 similar topic. We're looking for interest to see if
9 the chairs would like to get together before the Board
10 meeting in 2015, to have conversations, you know, about
11 their regions and things. It would be kind of limited.
12 You can't really talk about issues that would be
13 discussed during the Board meeting because, you know,
14 that could be pre-decisional. But, you know, there's
15 plenty of other topics that the chairs could discuss at
16 those meetings.

17
18 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: We'll have to
19 refer to the chair.

20
21 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Just what?

22
23 VICE CHAIRMAN BANGS: The All Chair
24 meetings in 2015.

25
26 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Oh. Yeah. There's --
27 I don't know. I wasn't here when you were talking
28 about it, Chuck.

29
30 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair, it's just a
31 question if you're interested in an All Chairs meeting
32 at the.....

33
34 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Oh, I am. Yeah.

35
36 MR. ARDIZZONE: Okay. I thought you
37 would be.

38
39 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: But I thought that it
40 was something that was going to occur, you know, at the
41 same time as the Board meeting. Maybe a day before
42 or.....

43
44 MR. ARDIZZONE: Yes, Mr. Chair. I
45 think it would be probably before the Board meeting met
46 -- or the Board met. And it would be so the Chairs can
47 interact.

48
49 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yeah. I think it
50 would be a good idea.

1 MR. ARDIZZONE: Okay.
2
3 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Chair.
4
5 MR. BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Has
6 there been interest by other Councils?
7
8 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Bangs, yes.
9 There's been interest in both meetings by other
10 Councils.
11
12 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: And we talked quite a
13 bit about it among ourselves. And we've always thought
14 it was a good idea, you know. There used to be these
15 meetings, you know, but for FACA reasons and other
16 reasons, you know, they kind of discontinued it.
17
18 Got anything else, Chuck.
19
20 MR. ARDIZZONE: Not at this time, Mr.
21 Chair.
22
23 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Any questions of
24 Chuck.
25
26 (No comments)
27
28 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Good. Thank
29 you.
30
31 So there's the Wrangell-St. Elias Park
32 Resource Commission appointment. I am presently
33 serving on that, appointed by this body.
34
35 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair, the
36 Southeast Council has an opportunity to appoint one
37 member of the Subsistence Resource Council for the
38 Wrangell-St. Elias Park and Reserve. That person by
39 regulation must be a resident of Yakutat. But Bert's
40 term is ending. And if we wanted to have a
41 representative from the Council on that body, then we
42 would need to reappoint him.
43
44 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Bangs.
45
46 MR. BANGS: I move that we reappoint
47 you.
48
49 MR. DOUVILLE: Second.
50

1 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Discussion.
2
3 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Adams.
4
5 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Patty.
6
7 MS. PHILLIPS: I thought you wanted to
8 find someone else who can serve in that position. Does
9 it have to be a member of the RAC.
10
11 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yeah.
12
13 MS. PHILLIPS: Oh, okay.
14
15 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Any more discussions
16 or questions on that issue.
17
18 (No comments)
19
20 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: It's been a pleasure
21 going up there, you know, every year and associating
22 with those people. And it's a great appointment for
23 someone.
24
25 MS. NEEDHAM: Call for the question.
26
27 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Question's been
28 called. All in favor, say aye.
29
30 IN UNISON: Aye.
31
32 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Opposed, same sign.
33
34 (No opposing votes)
35
36 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you.
37
38 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: So agency reports.
39 We're moving along, folks.
40
41 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.
42
43 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead, Patty.
44
45 MS. PHILLIPS: When are we going to do
46 the proposals, I mean our.....
47
48 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: We're going to do it
49 toward the end.
50

1 MS. PHILLIPS: Our game proposals are
2 ready, but okay.

3
4 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. I thought maybe
5 we'd get rid of all of this stuff here first. Okay.

6
7 Let's go into agency reports.
8
9 Forest Service.

10
11 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair, we have Jason
12 Anderson, who is both the district ranger. But he is
13 not the deputy of Forest Supervisor. And he has an
14 update that's on the Tongass Advisory Committee.

15
16 MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman
17 and Council members. For the record, my name is Jason
18 Anderson. I'm currently serving as a deputy forest
19 supervisor for the Tongass. And very specifically
20 working as a designated Federal official to a newly
21 established Tongass Advisory Committee.

22
23 The Committee's purpose is to provide
24 recommendations to the Forest Service on the transition
25 of the Tongass' timber program to one that would be
26 predominantly based upon young growth. Their charter
27 was born out of concerns over the old growth timber
28 harvest program of the Tongass and the longstanding
29 controversy that surrounds it, as well as a desire to
30 see and maintain a timber industry in Alaska.

31
32 So currently the forest is amending its
33 Forest Plan. The amendment to that Plan is very
34 narrowly focused on actions which would speed the
35 transition to a young growth program or one that was
36 based mostly on young growth. So the Committee is
37 working on a very aggressive timeline to provide its
38 recommendations consistent with that forest planning
39 process.

40
41 The plan process is begun through
42 notice of intent. There will be public meetings,
43 subsistence hearings, et cetera, associated with the
44 Forest Plan amendment process. And I'm available to
45 anyone who's curious or interested in either of those
46 two activities.

47
48 I don't know if the Council has any
49 questions, but.....

50

1 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, sir.
2 Questions, anyone.
3
4 (No comments)
5
6 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Where are you from,
7 Jason?
8
9 MR. ANDERSON: I spent several years on
10 Prince of Wales. Worked with a few folks around the
11 table.
12
13 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: So you know them guys,
14 huh.
15
16 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah. I know a few of
17 those guys.
18
19 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)
20
21 MR. ANDERSON: And then they let me
22 move to Petersburg, where I met a few more of you.
23
24 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. All right.
25
26 MR. ANDERSON: Thank you very much.
27
28 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)
29
30 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.
31
32 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes, Patty.
33
34 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. So how do we
35 find out what you guys are up to on the Tongass
36 Advisory Committee.
37
38 MR. ANDERSON: I know your time is
39 short, so I didn't want to spend too much time on it.
40 I could give you all the information you'd like. There
41 is actually a website where we're posting all of the
42 information available from the Committee. All of the
43 presentations they've received. All of their
44 deliberations are transcribed or captured in fairly
45 detailed notes. Those are all available on the web.
46
47 If you were to just Google Tongass
48 Advisory Committee, you should be able to find it very
49 easy. Yeah.
50

1 MR. LARSON: And for the record, I've
2 shared that website with the Council. But it was prior
3 of course to your presentation and it was fairly new in
4 the process. So.....

5
6 MR. ANDERSON: Yep. We've now had
7 three meetings. And have another one scheduled next
8 month. And they are moving -- the meetings are moving
9 around Southeast, so there will be eventually meetings
10 in most of the communities.

11
12 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Going to be up in our
13 area of course.

14
15 MR. ANDERSON: Yep.

16
17 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Got a question.

18
19 MR. ANDERSON: Oh, Yakutat. Sorry,
20 Bert. I'm not sure. Time will tell.

21
22 MR. KITKA: Just out of curiosity, are
23 they open to the public.

24
25 MR. ANDERSON: Yes. As are all your
26 meetings. Under Federal Advisory Committee Act, all of
27 them are open to the public and public comment period
28 is provided at each meeting.

29
30 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Donald.

31
32 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.
33 Chairman.

34
35 Jason, I guess I understand this a
36 stakeholder's type of forum. And I guess my question
37 is -- is there a designated subsistence representative
38 on the Advisory Council.

39
40 MR. ANDERSON: No. Not as a named
41 interest group on the charter. The charter for this
42 committee established five interest groups. State and
43 local government; Alaska Native organizations; the
44 timber industry; conservation interests; and then other
45 users at large.

46
47 So not an expressly named subsistence
48 role, but the Native Alaska organizations are
49 represented there. And the Charter is very clear about
50 ensuring that the objective and the task is considerate

1 of all other uses of the Tongass. Subsistence has
2 gotten quite a bit of name recognition as the Committee
3 deliberates over what its recommendation might look
4 like.

5
6 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Follow up there,
7 Donald.

8
9 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.
10 Chairman. The community of Port Protection -- they
11 expressed some concern about not having a designated
12 subsistence representative on the Advisory Council.
13 And they wrote a letter which was supposed to be
14 forwarded to the Council members and the Board. I'm
15 not sure if that letter ever got distributed.

16
17 But for the record, the community of
18 Port Protection did express concerns about the fact
19 that there was not designated seat. They didn't feel
20 that that perspective should be left up to a -- kind of
21 a varied group of other stakeholders. So I'd like to
22 state that for the record. And also -- I'd also like
23 to ask if that letter from Port Protection did get
24 distributed to the Council and the Board.

25
26 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Robert, do you have
27 any knowledge of that.

28
29 MR. LARSON: I could check. That
30 doesn't ring a bell to me right now.

31
32 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Donald, you do want
33 that distributed, don't you?

34
35 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I
36 forwarded -- at least I'm pretty sure I forwarded the
37 letter to Robert, our Council Coordinator. I'm not
38 sure if that ever got received or not actually. So
39 if.....

40
41 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Oh. He's taking
42 notes.

43
44 MR. HERNANDEZ:Bob can check on
45 that and see.

46
47 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: He's taking notes.
48 Thank you.

49
50 Were you going to say something.

1 MR. ANDERSON: Just that we had not
2 received the letter. Just to clarify.
3
4 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you.
5
6 Mr. Bangs.
7
8 MR. BANGS: I just wanted to say that I
9 know that at least two members of this Council applied
10 for a seat on that Committee.
11
12 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Oh, okay.
13
14 MR. BANGS: There was a discussion
15 about the legalities of being on one Federal committee.
16
17 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I remember that.
18
19 MR. BANGS: And it was found out that
20 it wasn't illegal in this case. And at least I was
21 told that. So there was -- yeah. I know Donald and I
22 both applied.
23
24 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: All right. Take note
25 of that.
26
27 Any more questions. Comments, anyone.
28
29 (No comments)
30
31 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, sir.
32 Appreciate it.
33
34 MR. ANDERSON: Thank you very much.
35
36 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: And I invite you up to
37 Yakutat.
38
39 Okay. OSM.
40
41 MR. KESSLER: Forest Service isn't
42 done?
43
44 (Laughter)
45
46 MR. KESSLER: Mr. Chairman, Members of
47 the Council, Steve Kessler with the Forest Service. We
48 just have a little bit more to go with the Forest
49 Service.
50

1 First of all, I wanted to correct
2 myself about the discussion on Transboundary mining and
3 the letter that was written from the Board that went to
4 the Secretaries. And in fact there was a response
5 provided by the Department of the Interior Secretary's
6 office. A copy of that I think was just mailed to each
7 of you by Robert this morning. And just acknowledging
8 receipt of the letter, but that nothing was actually
9 forwarded to the Secretary of State. So I did make an
10 error in that there was that communication.

11
12 I also wanted to let you know that
13 today at AFN both Secretary Vilsack of the Department
14 of Agriculture and Deputy Secretary Mike Conner both
15 spoke in front of AFN. As far as subsistence issues,
16 Secretary Vilsack left those comments about subsistence
17 to the Deputy Secretary of Interior. And he announced
18 there that the Secretaries would be moving forward with
19 the recommendation of the Federal Subsistence Board as
20 far as the changes in the rule process.

21
22 And he also announced that there would
23 be a demonstration project concerning management of
24 fisheries in the Kuskokwim River system. There is a
25 news release that was put out just a little while ago.
26 I'll send a copy of that to your coordinator and he can
27 send it out to each you and you can take a look at
28 that.

29
30 So as far as other Forest Service news,
31 I think many of you know that I plan to retire at the
32 end of the year. A successor to me has been named.
33 His name is Tom Whitford. He'll be with you at your
34 next meeting.

35
36 As far as leaving this position and
37 leaving the Council, it's -- I certainly have a lot of
38 mixed feelings about that. I've worked for the Forest
39 Service about 35 years now. This has been absolutely
40 one of the best positions -- probably the best position
41 I've had in that entire time. And a lot of that has
42 been because of working with people like you, the other
43 Councils around the State, and really benefitting the
44 local users. And it's been just thoroughly enjoyable.
45 Just like Doug Larson said earlier, perhaps at one of
46 your future meetings be here as a citizen rather than
47 as a Federal employee.

48
49 So Tom Whitford is currently a district
50 ranger in Wyoming. He has abundant experience with the

1 Forest Service. He has background as a wildlife
2 biologist and he's been in a variety of management
3 situations for a number of years. He's a member of the
4 Blackfeet Tribe in Montana. And from the little bit of
5 research I've done on the internet, he's been quite
6 involved in some of the Blackfeet Tribal
7 Administration. I think he will be excellent to work
8 with all of you.

9
10 One other thing I wanted to mention was
11 a budget. Because I usually give you a little budget
12 update at each of your meetings. And the budget is
13 looking actually quite good for the Forest Service for
14 the subsistence program for 2015. Of course we don't
15 know what it's finally going to look like because we're
16 still on a continuing resolution. Congress hasn't done
17 their work yet. But at this point it looks like there
18 will be some funds that could be available for the 2016
19 call for projects with Fisheries Resource Monitoring
20 Program. Something that we hadn't expected. So that's
21 good news.

22
23 And finally I don't know how I got away
24 with it, but I never came up in front of the Council
25 and said no comments. And somehow or other -- maybe it
26 just -- Mr. Chairman, because you had Mr. Bangs leading
27 us through those proposals this time, but no comment.
28 Any questions.

29
30 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yeah. I've got one.
31 You say that the funding might be a little bit better
32 for 2016. Does that mean that maybe the Fisheries
33 Monitoring Program will be healthy again, or what. I
34 know we've really been complaining about, you know, a
35 lack of that program being available to us.

36
37 MR. KESSLER: I'm not sure what your
38 definition of healthy is, Mr. Chairman. And this is
39 for actually 2015 that I'm talking about. And we're
40 not actually getting any more funding, but the
41 difference is that the amount of money that's taken off
42 the top for administration is being substantially
43 reduced. And so the effect of that is we actually have
44 more money that we can put out on the ground. More
45 projects that could potentially be started. I think
46 that we're going to have to give some careful thought to
47 whether there's some priority wildlife projects that we
48 might want to do again, as we did in years past.

49
50 Just I think you probably remember that

1 at one point the Forest Service had up to 5.9 million
2 dollars in this program. Right now we're looking at
3 approximately somewhere a little less than 3.5 million
4 dollars. And we were down to about two and a half
5 million dollars. So things are looking up a little
6 bit. We'll see if that sticks as Congress goes through
7 the final allocations for 2015.

8

9 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Great. Thank you.

10

11 Mr. Bangs and then Mr. Kitka.

12

13 MR. BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

14

15 Steve, I really appreciated the help
16 you've given me. And I'm sure a lot of the other
17 Council members have had the same experience. But I
18 had a question about the interagency staff comments.
19 Is there a reason why they don't give comments anymore?
20 Or is that a new policy?

21

22 MR. KESSLER: Well, the way the
23 Interagency Staff Committee and this whole proposal
24 process works is that the Interagency Staff Committee
25 meets with the analyst and with the Office of
26 Subsistence Management's leadership team. And we try
27 and get all the potential issues into these analyses
28 right up front.

29

30 So when we make comments, it would be a
31 comment that would -- it would be something that
32 wouldn't be addressed in the analysis already. And
33 we're not making recommendations to you. We're just
34 making comments. Like here's something you might want
35 to think about as you're deliberating this proposal.
36 And if it's all in the proposal -- it's all in the
37 analysis -- it's all in the writeup, then we don't need
38 to make any comments for you.

39

40 MR. BANGS: Thank you.

41

42 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Anyone else, please.

43

44 Oh, Harvey.

45

46 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
47 Thank you for being with us, Steve. Also, let us know
48 if you started your training on your replacement, say
49 no comment.

50

1 (Laughter)
2
3 MR. KESSLER: No comment.
4
5 (Laughter)
6
7 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. I, too, would
8 like to thank you for working with us all these years.
9 Not only that, but you've been a real personal friend.
10 Kind of a mentor to me, too, as I progressed through
11 this process and coming to Board meetings and so forth.
12 Going to your house for dinner, you know, has really
13 been a treat, although I fell asleep through a couple
14 of them.
15
16 But I hope the next time you come to
17 Yakutat you make sure that you look me up. He was
18 there -- when was that, September? He sent me an email
19 and said he was going to be there and that we needed to
20 get together. So he had other priorities, I guess,
21 huh. We didn't get a chance to see each other. But I
22 forgive you for that. But not the next time, Steve.
23 Okay.
24
25 MR. KESSLER: Understood, Mr. Chairman.
26 I don't know if everyone knows. I lived in Yakutat for
27 a few years back in the early 1980s. And I still have
28 a lot of people there that I needed to see. And then I
29 was with some other people. And I get to see the
30 chairman at least twice a year. It was unfortunate,
31 but next time -- perhaps when you have your Council
32 meeting there next -- maybe I can make my way there,
33 too.
34
35 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Sure. I do know that
36 you said you were going to help me with my wood.
37
38 (Laughter)
39
40 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: You never showed up.
41
42 MR. KESSLER: Give me the date and I'll
43 be there.
44
45 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, sir.
46 Anyhow, have a nice retirement, Steve. You deserve it.
47
48 MR. KESSLER: Thank you.
49
50 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Park Service. Anyone.

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

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I don't see anyone.
Hmm. What happened to Jim Capra. Okay. Okay.

Then we did ADF&G already. Tribal
governments.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Native organizations.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Other organizations.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: That includes you.

MS. YUHAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
And I will be concise. We gave our formal reports that
were requested, but this is usually the section of time
that I address questions I looked up or things that we
didn't get to in another spot on the Agenda.

Although it relates to the National
Park Service, part of the Fish and Game Report is the
issue that the chairman had brought up. That the
Subsistence Resource Council from Wrangell, St. Elias
had sent a letter around. I think that the RAC has
this, but it is part of the Fish and Game Report that
we're very concerned about the new proposed National
Park Service regulations.

We found discrepancies between -- and
it may be as respectful as possible. It's not directed
towards any human individually, but we found some major
discrepancies between what's been advertised as far as
what the regulations are purported to do and what the
regulations actually do.

The press release and the news media
and the call for comments on the proposals say that
they only affect sport. And you know that I work for
the State. And if we wanted to complain that this
wasn't fair to sport, that was what our comments would
say. But we're finding in the details of the
regulations themselves that much of the regulations

1 affect subsistence users. Both state qualified and
2 Federally-qualified when you look at the details.

3
4 It says that they are only directed at
5 illegal sport hunting and predator management.
6 Swimming caribou don't have anything to do with either
7 of those. It's not practiced by sport and it has
8 nothing to do with predator management. The
9 regulations that are affecting brown bear and coyote
10 hunting -- those were brought by local users, including
11 Andrew Firman from Fort Yukon. And you can't tell me
12 he's a sport hunter under the State program.

13
14 It's a local user that spent three
15 years trying to get proposals through two different
16 boards. And now one agency wants to preclude those.
17 We have a handout circulating at AFN that explains very
18 concisely what the regulations say they do versus what
19 they do. And I just got word about an hour ago that
20 Myron Naneng intends to bring a resolution opposing the
21 regulations at AFN.

22
23 And so the State has requested that the
24 regulations be withdrawn. The Eastern Interior RAC and
25 some of the other RACs are taking positions similar to
26 that. And I don't know if that's going to be part of
27 your business, but that's part of my report, as Fish
28 and Game's concern for those regulations.

29
30 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Great. Thank you for
31 sharing that with us, Jennifer. I appreciate it. It
32 slipped my mind, so you helped me out.

33
34 Okay. Anyone else. Do you have a
35 question for Jennifer.

36
37 (No comments)

38
39 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Any other
40 organizations.

41
42 Chuck, go ahead.

43
44 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair, I provided
45 OSM's written report to Robert, which he should have
46 distributed to everyone. But basically it's just a
47 short report talking about staffing changes and then
48 our status on the draft Tribal Consultation Guidelines.
49 There's another meeting on Friday, which is not in
50 this, to try and finalize those Guidelines to take them

1 to the Board for their approval.

2

3 But if you have any questions for me,
4 I'm up at the table now.

5

6 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. I'm sorry. I
7 guess I failed to recognize you during the OSM time.

8

9 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair, you did
10 recognize me. It's just Steve jumped in front of me.

11

12 (Laughter)

13

14 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Oh, yeah. Steve is
15 that way.

16

17 (Laughter)

18

19 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Thank you,
20 Chuck. Appreciate it.

21

22 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair.

23

24 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Larson.

25

26 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair, I have taken a
27 briefing document that talks specifically about
28 personnel changes and those items referenced by Chuck.
29 And I've sent that to you as an email attachment.

30

31 Thank you.

32

33 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Robert.

34

35 So unless there is no other
36 organizations who would like to come forth and make a
37 report, we will move on to the Board of Game Fisheries
38 -- that working group report.

39

40 So we'll do as you suggested, Mr.
41 Bangs. We'll go through these reports and the chairs
42 of the working groups. And then we'll go through the
43 proposals at the same time. Okay.

44

45 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair.

46

47 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Larson, go ahead.

48

49 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair, there is -- I
50 just want to go over the remaining items that we need

1 to deal with.

2

3 First is confirm the date of our winter
4 meeting, that would be next spring and select a date
5 and location for the fall meeting of 2015.

6

7 I suggest that we have a -- since we
8 have a new commissioner to the Pacific Salmon
9 Commission, that we invite her to our winter meeting to
10 -- she replaces David Bedford. And David Bedford was
11 our advocate and representative to the Pacific Salmon
12 Commission. I think it would behoove the Council to
13 develop a relationship with the new commissioner and
14 have a formal invitation to her. And I can take care
15 of that if that is the will of the panel.

16

17 The other is I think it would be nice
18 to have a photo with Steve before we leave.

19

20 And we have three letters that -- well,
21 two letters that have been approved by the Council for
22 preparation. And I have drafted those letters. And we
23 can put them on the screen or I can read them to you
24 for approval.

25

26 That's in addition to the public
27 comments to both the Board of Fish and the Board of
28 Game workgroup report available. I can show that on
29 the screen. I do not have the Board of Fishers Report
30 as yet. So.....

31

32 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Why don't we
33 take a little bit of break and then you can get
34 yourself prepared for the screen. Okay. Take a five-
35 minute break.

36

37 (Off record)

38

39 (On record)

40

41 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Why don't we go ahead
42 and take the working group reports at this point.
43 Okay. Who wants to be the first to give a report. The
44 chairmans of these groups -- Mike, are you prepared?

45

46 MR. DOUVILLE: We can. Yeah.

47

48 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Thank you.

49

50 MR. DOUVILLE: Okay. At our little

1 committee meeting, we came up with the following
2 recommendations for these proposals. I don't know what
3 the numbers are here, but I can read out the numbers
4 and you can read them up there, I guess. Do you want
5 me to read them into the -- do you want me to read
6 them? You can read them up there. But.....

7

8 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair, it appears to
9 me that the process that has been described is for the
10 Council to provide concurrence on the report from the
11 working group. And once that concurrence is made, then
12 this report would become the Council's recommendation
13 or the Council's public comment to the Board of Game.

14

15 I believe it would be sufficient for us
16 to make changes to this document as it's being
17 reviewed. And then a motion to adopt at the end would
18 be appropriate.

19

20 MR. DOUVILLE: So do we want to do them
21 one at a time?

22

23 MR. LARSON: I think we would do it in
24 the order that you have them listed. We'd just start
25 right down and we would concur at the end.

26

27 MR. DOUVILLE: Okay. For propo -- do
28 you want me to go ahead? Okay. For Proposals 1 and 3,
29 open fall brown bear season for residents in Unit 3,
30 was support. The rationale being it provides an
31 increased opportunity or -- I guess it was four. It
32 says or here. But Unit 3 of rural residents provides
33 an opportunity for fall bear -- for culture camp.
34 There appears to be a huntable population and there
35 would be no adverse effect to subsistence users. So I
36 guess we would be asking if there was any changes or
37 additions that the Council may have.

38

39 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. I guess I can
40 conduct from here. So what's the Council think about
41 the recommendation for Proposals -- was that 1 and 3?
42 Do you recommend that we do accept it. Is that okay.

43

44 Okay. Go ahead and move on, Mike.

45

46 MR. DOUVILLE: Proposal 6, redefine
47 broken antler for Units 1 and 3 was no comment.

48

49 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: The Council concur.
50 No comment.

1 Mike.

2

3 MR. BANGS: It's hard to comment when
4 you don't know what the proposal is. You just know the
5 comments. And so I'm -- you know, we could read them,
6 but there are so many proposals. And I'm just
7 wondering, you know, if we all know where Unit 1 and 3
8 is. Or do we all know where -- everyone on the Council
9 feel comfortable with that.

10

11 I trust wholly in the committee. I'm
12 just wondering if there isn't questions about the
13 details. Maybe we don't have time anyway.

14

15 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Do you want to spend
16 another two days here.

17

18 MR. BANGS: No. No. I don't. I'm
19 just asking if everyone else feels comfortable with
20 that. I'm good with it.

21

22 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I'll ask the question.
23 Does everyone feel comfortable with accepting the
24 reports that is being presented to us right now and
25 going along with what they might propose.

26

27 Mike, go ahead.

28

29 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair, if I could
30 interrupt for a second.

31

32 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead.

33

34 MR. LARSON: I would suggest that I be
35 given some editorial license here. I know that this
36 moose hunt RM038 consists of Units 1C -- 1B, and 3. So
37 in the final version of this document, I might do a
38 little bit of reformatting to make that clear that the
39 Council supports the idea that basal points are hard to
40 see and shouldn't make antlers illegal. So thank you.

41

42 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: So you'll get this out
43 to us after you have, you know, developed more detail
44 in the comments.

45

46 MR. LARSON: Yeah. I'll just make sure
47 that it's accurate.

48

49 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay.

50

1 MR. LARSON: And it reflects the will
2 of the Council. Yes.
3
4 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Well, that's all we're
5 asking for anyhow.
6
7 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Larson, are you
8 talking about the next proposal that Mike hasn't read
9 yet?
10
11 MR. LARSON: Well, I'm just saying that
12 RM038 includes 1B and 3, as well as Unit 1C. So.....
13
14 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead, Mike.
15
16 MR. DOUVILLE: Okay. And Proposal 6 --
17 it says redefine broken antler for Unit 1 and 3 moose
18 hunts. And this is what we looked at when we were
19 dealing with these. And further down it says current
20 regulations. There is no Federal definition for broken
21 antler. And that's what we dealt with.
22
23 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Hmm. Okay.
24
25 Comments anyone.
26
27 (No comments)
28
29 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead and move on,
30 Mike.
31
32 MR. DOUVILLE: Okay. Proposal 7 --
33 define points for forked moose antlers for the RM038
34 registration hunt in Unit 1C. And we supported that.
35 The rationale was we agree that a horn that comes off
36 the base is really hard to see. And shouldn't make
37 antlers illegal. So it shouldn't be counted as a point
38 as long as it doesn't -- I think we discussed it
39 doesn't exceed the length of the ear.
40
41 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay.
42
43 Comments anyone.
44
45 (No comments)
46
47 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Move on.
48
49 MR. DOUVILLE: Proposal 8, establish a
50 resident drawing hunt for goats in Unit 4, Sitka area.

1 And we're opposed. The rationale, it would actually
2 reduce the opportunity for subsistence users.

3

4 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay, everyone.

5

6 (No comments)

7

8 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay, Mike. Go ahead.

9

10

11 MR. DOUVILLE: Proposal 14, establish
12 regulations in Unit 2 to allow for appropriate harvest
13 levels and account for unrecovered harvest. We
14 supported that. And the rationale, wolf population is
15 at an appropriate level. Twenty percent of the harvest
16 provides sufficient management flexibility at this
17 time. Can be changed later. And it addresses the
18 current ESA listing concerns. An alternative view
19 point -- oppose. The rationale, already have
20 management flexibility to manage at a reduced harvest
21 level. And it reduces the opportunity for subsistence
22 users. So you have to make a choice here.

23

24 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. We've got to
25 make a decision here. What's the wish of the Council.
26 There's two options. Which one do you want.

27

28 Cathy and then Mike.

29

30 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you. I think in
31 the workgroup I was one of the people who talked about
32 the opposition to this. And I also think that I heard
33 that we would be fine with our report to the Board of
34 Wildlife saying that the Council support this, but
35 maybe it wasn't unanimous. Maybe that there was some
36 opposition. So if the Council wanted us to go with
37 support, we just wanted to make sure that it was
38 recognized that that opposition was -- that it was not
39 a unanimous decision to support.

40

41 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Thanks.

42

43 Patty.

44

45 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
46 was one of those who opposed. But I went and looked
47 through my emails from Mr. Larson that he forwarded
48 from Mike Douville after their community meeting on
49 POW. Then I looked over some of the wolf documents
50 that he emailed also and decided that I would support

1 Proposal 14. And just so you know.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Thank you,
4 Patty.

5

6 Mike, did you have something to add,
7 too.

8

9 MR. DOUVILLE: I support the Proposal
10 14. The actual harvesters themselves were not too
11 concerned with the percentage part of it, but they
12 actually made a recommendation that the harvest number
13 be 25, which is lower than any of these numbers.

14

15 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yeah. Okay. Anyone.

16

17 Go ahead, Cathy.

18

19 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you. Along Patty's
20 lines, and after listening a little bit more to the
21 Department of Fish and Game today when they talked
22 about the wolf thing, if the rest of the Council
23 agrees, I don't necessarily have opposition to the
24 proposal at all. And it could be considered unanimous
25 support.

26

27 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Thank you.

28

29 So what's the Council want to do with
30 this. Most people, you know, want to support Number
31 14. Are you ready to make some kind of a decision one
32 way or another. If you're ready, we can entertain a
33 motion.

34

35 Cathy, go ahead.

36

37 MS. NEEDHAM: I would recommend in this
38 editorial revision that we take out that minority view
39 of opposed and say support the proposal to the Board of
40 Game.

41

42 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. So it would be
43 pretty much unanimous then, right?

44

45 (No comments)

46

47 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Council okay
48 with that?

49

50

1 (No comments)
2
3 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Good. Move on.
4
5 MR. DOUVILLE: Proposal 15, allow
6 trappers to take beaver in Unit 2 with a firearm. And
7 we supported that. And the rationale is that it
8 increases opportunity for subsistence users.
9
10 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay.
11
12 Okay with the Council.
13
14 (No comments)
15
16 MR. DOUVILLE: Proposal 17, increase
17 the resident bag limit for deer in Unit 1C, Lincoln
18 Shelter and Sullivan Islands, to six deer, of which the
19 last two must be bucks. And we opposed that. The
20 rationale -- would increase competition with other
21 subsistence users. Long term affects on population
22 would reduce hunter opportunity and would provide a
23 more liberal harvest limit than the Federal system.
24
25 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Hmm. Okay.
26
27 Comments anyone.
28
29 (No comments)
30
31 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Move on.
32
33 MR. DOUVILLE: Proposal 22, shift the
34 resident moose season two weeks earlier in Unit 5B,
35 Mamby Shore area. And we did not have a comment for
36 that.
37
38 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Council okay with
39 that.
40
41 (No comments)
42
43 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Go ahead.
44
45 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair.
46
47 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Larson.
48
49 MR. LARSON: Just a note. If the
50 Council has no comment, then I'll remove that from the

1 comments. So is that appropriate.
2
3 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Sure.
4
5 MR. LARSON: Okay. Good.
6
7 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Next.
8
9 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.
10
11 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Patty, go ahead.
12
13 MS. PHILLIPS: While you're deleting,
14 that was the Malaspina Forelands, opening it up two
15 weeks earlier. And that I since then asked our board
16 chair -- our council chair, you know, about that. And
17 he didn't support it.
18
19 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I did not. And I
20 forgot to say that.
21
22 MS. PHILLIPS: And so I wouldn't
23 support it.
24
25 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I wouldn't support it.
26 I would recommend that we don't go with that. Opening
27 it up two weeks early, you know, the weather's still
28 pretty warm yet. And there's an opportunity or a
29 chance, you know, that the meat might spoil before you
30 get to process that. We like to hang it for several
31 days before we start butchering. There's a pretty good
32 chance of spoilage there before the seasoning is
33 finished.
34
35 Thanks for bringing that up, Patty.
36 Thanks.
37
38 What else.
39
40 MS. PHILLIPS: So do we support it, or
41 not.
42
43 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: What's the wish of the
44 Council.
45
46 MS. PHILLIPS: We were going to oppose
47 it. I mean we were going to take no action, but I'd
48 like us to oppose it.
49
50 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Why don't you

1 go ahead. Turn that into a motion then, Patty, please.

2

3

4

Cathy.

5

6

MS. NEEDHAM: Since this is a workgroup
7 recommendation and I recall when we were in the
8 workgroup we didn't know enough about this and we did
9 say that we would try to follow up with Mr. Adams
10 because he was from Yakutat to determine if we should
11 take a position on that. During this discussion -- and
12 it's because we didn't -- as a workgroup we didn't
13 under -- we just said no comment because we didn't know
14 if there would be adverse impacts to the community of
15 Yakutat. So hearing Bert say that he would oppose it
16 and the rationale, I think that the workgroup should -
17 - if we all agree -- keep this in our working --
18 because we said we would follow up with that. And then
19 we decide to adopt this document at the end, it'll be
20 in there.

21

22

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: That will work, too,
23 Cathy.

24

25

So is the Council okay with that.

26

27

(Council nods affirmatively)

28

29

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead. Next.

30

31

MR. DOUVILLE: I think we're at
32 Proposal 27, establish deer hunting seasons for elder
33 hunters and individuals with disabilities in Units 1
34 through 5. And we opposed that. The rationale, same
35 seasons RAC opposed this proposal during the last
36 wildlife cycle.

37

38

CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay.

39

40

All right with the Council.

41

42

Cathy.

43

44

MS. NEEDHAM: I would like to request
45 that those reasons were going to be -- staff was going
46 to look up those reasons and actually put them into
47 this so that when it goes to the Board of Game, those
48 reasons would be restated. Not just saying that one
49 thing. So.....

50

1 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Move on.
2
3 MR. DOUVILLE: Okay. Proposal 37. Add
4 five days to all resident hunting seasons and allocate
5 75 percent of the drawing permits to residents in the
6 Southeast region. And we opposed that. And the
7 rationale was the seasons are already liberal. And 75
8 percent is less than the residents are already getting
9 at least in Southeast.
10
11 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)
12
13 Council okay with that.
14
15 Alrighty.
16
17 Got anymore.
18
19 MR. DOUVILLE: That concludes our
20 review of these proposals.
21
22 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: That's it. Thank you,
23 Mike. Well done.
24
25 The other Mike.
26
27 MR. BANGS: Yes. Is what the plan is
28 -- so we make a motion now and adopt all these comments
29 as part of the Council's deliberation, Mr. Larson.
30
31 MR. LARSON: That's correct. Motion to
32 adopt would be in order.
33
34 MR. BANGS: Okay. So moved.
35
36 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. Is there a
37 second.
38
39 MR. KITKA: Second.
40
41 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Harvey seconded. All
42 right. All in favor, say aye.
43
44 IN UNISON: Aye.
45
46 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Oh. Did you have a
47 comment.
48
49 MS. NEEDHAM: Well, I was trying to
50 grab the attention -- I was hoping that the motion

1 would include that we send Mr. Douville to the Board of
2 Wildlife so we have that action item on record. That
3 he'll represent this viewpoint at the Board of Game
4 meeting.

5
6 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: We talked about that.
7 And that's I think.....

8
9 MS. NEEDHAM: But we never voted on it.
10 And I don't know if it's an action item or not.

11
12 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yeah. Do you want to
13 include that in your motion, Patty. Or who made the
14 motion.

15
16 MR. BANGS: I made the motion.

17
18 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay.

19
20 MR. BANGS: And I would add that in as
21 part of the motion to include Mike Douville as going to
22 the Board of Game meeting.

23
24 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes. Thank you.

25
26 Is there a -- the second concur.

27
28 I'm assuming yes. So all in favor, say
29 aye.

30
31 IN UNISON: Aye.

32
33 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Opposed.

34
35 (No opposing votes)

36
37 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Motion carried.

38
39 Okay. We're going to the fisheries.

40
41 MR. BANGS: Okay. If I -- I can just
42 quickly read the proposals that we were able to cover.
43 There was quite a few of them. And a lot of them took
44 a lot of discussion.

45
46 And I'll start with Proposal 148. And
47 real quickly the brief summary is allow for designation
48 of community subsistence harvesters for Hoonah
49 residents. And it's submitted by the Hoonah Indian
50 Association. And the proposal would help other

1 communities if applied Southeast wide.

2

3 But we decided that because the
4 proposal was submitted by Hoonah -- we did add an
5 amendment. Add other species of salmon. Because this
6 one was directed at sockeye only. So we wanted to add
7 in other species of salmon and all existing subsistence
8 gear and commercial fishing year in traditional use
9 area District 14. That was what we came up with.

10

11 And the rationale was that it would
12 help all subsistence users. And it would also allow
13 for commercial gear to be used. And that has been the
14 case in the past where Mr. Wright has gone out and
15 seined up -- got a permit and gone out and seined up
16 fish for the community.

17

18 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. So Council okay
19 with that.

20

21 Alrighty. Go ahead.

22

23 MR. BANGS: Okay. The next one is 149,
24 modify weekly subsistence salmon fishing schedule for
25 the Klawock Inlet, Klawock River, and Klawock Lake.
26 And we support because this affords additional access
27 for subsistence users.

28

29 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay.

30

31 MR. DOUVILLE: Wait a minute.

32

33 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Sound okay. Thank
34 you, Mike. Move on.

35

36 MR. DOUVILLE: Wait a minute.

37

38 MR. BANGS: Yeah. Mr. Douville.

39

40 MR. DOUVILLE: Are you on 149?

41

42 MR. BANGS: Yes. And that was
43 submitted by the Craig AC.

44

45 MR. DOUVILLE: That's right. But I
46 think this pertained to after the sockeye season. I
47 don't think they're messing with the sockeye season,
48 but there was some -- I think this has to do with after
49 the sockeye season. I don't think they asked to change
50 -- well, maybe they -- I'm confused now. Because one

1 of them closed two days a week after the sockeye
2 season.

3

4 And I was the dissenting vote on the AC
5 because I didn't -- with all the cohos going in the
6 river, I don't know why they would have it closed two
7 days a week. There was no conservation reason. And
8 they never did produce any real rationale for wanting
9 to do that. And I disagreed with it. But I don't
10 know. Without having the details here, it's hard to
11 determine if this -- you know, how it read exactly.

12

13 MR. BANGS: And we agreed that a couple
14 of these proposals, we would appreciate Mr. Douville's
15 input because he's from that area. And we weren't real
16 up on exactly what the Craig AC's rationale was.

17

18 Mike.

19

20 MR. DOUVILLE: We're okay with the
21 sockeyes being closed two days a week. I think they
22 shifted it a day to accommodate people that have to
23 work on weekends and miss that opportunity -- is what
24 they were requesting. But on the other portion, that
25 isn't sockeye fishing. It's fishing other species
26 after sockeyes have gone through. I was not in favor
27 of keeping it closed.

28

29 It could be open seven days a week
30 because there's no conservation concerns. And there's
31 nobody fishing really. But still it's closed two days
32 a week for whatever reason. I don't know. There was
33 no good rationale presented to do that. But without
34 looking at the proposals themselves, it's hard to
35 address them correctly.

36

37 MR. BANGS: Well, what's the wish of
38 the Council.

39

40 MS. PHILLIPS: When does the sockeye
41 season close?

42

43 MR. DOUVILLE: The 7th of August, I
44 believe.

45

46 (Pause)

47

48 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman, here's the
49 issue I had with it. It closes it for days a week
50 during the whole subsistence season. And it's only --

1 might be deemed necessary during the sockeye harvest
2 because they're low numbers and so on. But during the
3 rest of the subsistence season for other species, that
4 closure remains in effect for two days a week. And
5 it's not necessary after August 7th.

6

7 And that was my argument with them.
8 And I couldn't get it changed or anything, but it's --
9 I still think it's unnecessary. There's no
10 conservation concerns for the other species.

11

12 MR. BANGS: Patty.

13

14 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
15 So could we modify it to state specific.

16

17 MR. BANGS: So do you want to just
18 oppose it.

19

20 Mr. Douville.

21

22 MR. DOUVILLE: Well, I would think that
23 we could support that proposal. But not support it
24 beyond August 7th, when the sockeye season closes,
25 because it's not necessary for the rest of the season.
26 I don't know. I don't know how you'd it. But.....

27

28 MR. BANGS: Or just take no action.
29 Can we just attach a note expressing our concerns, but
30 we do support it. Would that suffice.

31

32 MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.

33

34 MR. BANGS: Okay. If the Council's
35 good with that, we'll just add Mike's concerns in the
36 comments and support it. Okay. Let's go on to the
37 next one.

38

39 Number 150 -- they were both addressed
40 in FP15-15, which we addressed at length. And we
41 actually ended up picking 151 to close the Klawock
42 River to subsistence salmon fishing upstream in the
43 Klawock River Bridge. And the reason we picked that
44 one -- Mr. Isaacs was there and he thought that that
45 would be easier for everyone to understand. And so
46 anyway, that's why we picked that one. But we've dealt
47 with that in the Federal side, so we thought we would
48 support 151.

49

50 So everybody -- Cathy.

1 MS. NEEDHAM: Was that for just sockeye
2 salmon.

3
4 MR. BANGS: No. The low escapement was
5 for sockeye, according to that.

6
7 MS. NEEDHAM: Well, our little briefing
8 paper says close Klawock River to subsistence salmon
9 fishing. Does the proposed regulation say sockeye
10 salmon or is it for all salmon.

11
12 MR. BANGS: It's up there on the board.

13
14 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair, I would like to
15 -- it's a little confusing. We don't see the proposed
16 regulatory language here. But the sockeye salmon
17 season in State regulations and the one that this would
18 address -- and it's the same as the one at 149 -- is
19 that the sockeye salmon season goes through August 7th.

20
21
22 So without seeing that part of this
23 regulation, I think it's a little hard to presuppose
24 what it means. But I would guess it would be August
25 7th. That's what makes sense. But anyway, we have
26 this proposal summarized, but we don't see all of it.

27
28 MS. NEEDHAM: I have a question.

29
30 MR. BANGS: Cathy.

31
32 MS. NEEDHAM: Is that for all gear
33 types then or do we know that as well. Because when
34 our companion proposal went in, it was specific to
35 seines and gillnets, but not other gear types. And so
36 would this include other gear types.

37
38 MR. BANGS: Yeah. Maybe if we could
39 look at 150, it would explain the gear types.

40
41 MR. LARSON: And I believe that the
42 Klawock subsistence fisheries management plan already
43 prevents the use of gillnets. So this would affect
44 only seines. Because that's the only gear that I -- I
45 believe that's true. It's the only gear I've ever seen
46 used there.

47
48 MR. BANGS: Patty.

49
50 MS. PHILLIPS: Shouldn't we be

1 supporting our own proposal.

2

3 MR. BANGS: Well, that was kind of what
4 we were thinking. But the only member was from Klawock
5 that agreed that the other one was easier to read
6 because of the wordage as far as the bridge and instead
7 of the lat/longs. So it's up to the Council.

8

9 MS. NEEDHAM: It might be easier to
10 read, but it seems to be more restrictive to
11 subsistence.

12

13 MR. BANGS: Mr. Douville.

14

15 MR. DOUVILLE: I would support Proposal
16 150 before I would support the other. Because it says
17 the use of seines and gillnets during July and August.
18 And then in September when the cohos are in there, that
19 restriction would be lifted. And that makes more sense
20 to me.

21

22 MR. BANGS: Does that make sense to the
23 counsel. Okay. 150, support. Okay. That means we
24 would not support 151.

25

26 152, repeal the outboard motor
27 horsepower restriction for the Klawock River. Support
28 with the intent of keeping commercial gear out. That's
29 what our rationale was to support it. But the purpose
30 of that was to keep commercial seine skiffs. And from
31 listening to testimony by Mr. Douville that that isn't
32 the case anymore. So anyway, that's why we supported
33 it.

34

35 (No comments)

36

37 MR. BANGS: 153, allow subsistence
38 harvest of salmon with purse seine and drift -- or in
39 gillnet gear in portions of Districts 12 and 13 in
40 Angoon. And this is our proposal. And the only
41 concern that came out was that we didn't specify the
42 areas of fishing. And we decided that it might be
43 appropriate to exclude those places like Basket Bay and
44 places -- of terminal bays and coves where fish might
45 congregate and keep them from being able to protect
46 those streams.

47

48 So we did express concerns about the
49 areas that we wanted to open up to gillnet and seine.
50 So what does the Council feel.

1 (No comments)

2

3 MR. BANGS: No comment. So Mr. Larson,
4 how would we describe that.

5

6 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair, you have a
7 proposal that describes it. So what we're not at is
8 the proposal. We're looking at a summary of the
9 proposal. So the proposal that you submitted -- and I
10 can put it on the screen in a short while -- is the
11 same as all the rest of these proposals. We're not
12 looking at the proposal. You're looking at a summary
13 of the proposal. So unless you know the proposal, it's
14 hard to make heads or tails of this except to remind
15 you what it is they're talking about.

16

17 MR. BANGS: Right. Well, we definitely
18 agreed that this was a good thing. But what the stuff
19 we had in front of us -- it was still in question that
20 it was a good thing to be able to have it open in those
21 tight areas. But if that's the extent of the proposal,
22 we would support it.....

23

24 MR. LARSON: No, I.....

25

26 MS. PHILLIPS: We support it with your
27 concerns.

28

29 MR. LARSON: It's your proposal.
30 Right.

31

32 MR. BANGS: That was brought forth by
33 Staff that they weren't sure because we didn't have the
34 full proposal. And there was just concerns that came
35 up to the committee and we decided to wait to hear from
36 the Council. That was our only concern. But we
37 supported it.

38

39 So if the Council's good with that,
40 that would be.....

41

42 Patty.

43

44 MS. PHILLIPS: I support with your
45 concerns also but I support it either way.

46

47 MR. BANGS: Okay. As long as those are
48 addressed.

49

50 MR. LARSON: And Mr. Chair, you are

1 taking good notes here with these concerns and will
2 assist me in the final document.

3

4 MR. BANGS: Yes.

5

6 (Laughter)

7

8 MR. BANGS: Okay. The next one -- we
9 didn't want to address the ETJ so much without the
10 Council's consent. We talked a little bit about them,
11 but there was a couple that we just didn't feel we
12 could do that.

13

14 Okay. We did have -- let's see. We
15 did 173, require the Board to address habitat,
16 conservation, and subsistence priority when considering
17 regulation and policies. 173.

18

19 MS. PHILLIPS: Support.

20

21 MR. BANGS: I think it's -- I have to
22 get Mr. -- Mr. Schroeder had the wording down. And so
23 I had him write that note and I can't read it.

24

25 MR. SCHROEDER: And I don't know if I
26 can read it.

27

28 (Laughter)

29

30 MR. SCHROEDER: Which one.

31

32 MS. PHILLIPS: This one.

33

34 MR. SCHROEDER: I'm just reading my own
35 notes. SERAC and the Federal Subsistence Board
36 regularly consider traditional use areas and cultural
37 patterns and use of fish and wildlife in making
38 recommendations and decisions on regulatory proposals.

39

40 We support Kootznoowoo's proposal that
41 the Board of Fish consider these factors.

42

43 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay, Patty.

44

45 MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.

46

47 MR. SCHROEDER: Okay.

48

49 MR. BANGS: Yeah. We talked about we
50 just wanted to make sure that our concerns were into

1 the support of that proposal.

2

3 (Pause)

4

5 MR. BANGS: Yeah, I'm just trying to go
6 through this as quickly as possible.

7

8 192. And that is Districts 12 and 14
9 require reporting of commercially caught sockeye salmon
10 that are not sold. And we support reporting all salmon
11 not sold, but modify it to include all salmon.

12

13 Okay.

14

15 MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.

16

17 MR. BANGS: Okay.

18

19 MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.

20

21 MR. BANGS: Okay. So then we got into
22 some more. Restrict and prohibit commercial purse
23 seining in portions of District 12 and 14. And that's
24 also Kootznoowoo, Incorporated. And we thought we
25 better approach the entire Council on these other ETJ
26 proposals.

27

28 So I think if Robert could put those
29 up, if possible. It would be 193.

30

31 Yes, Mr. Schroeder.

32

33 MR. SCHROEDER: Just in the interest of
34 time, I think even if we did have a lot of time to
35 discuss these, I found that it was a little unclear
36 when we heard from Angoon on the teleconference exactly
37 what it was they wanted. My suggestion would be that
38 we draft something of a more generic statement that we
39 really support Angoon's and Kootznoowoo's desire to
40 increase subsistence opportunity, but that we don't
41 weigh in specifically on these proposals.

42

43 So that would be our comment on all of
44 these proposals basically including I suppose ours --
45 the SERAC.....

46

47 MR. NAOROS: Mr. Chairman, this is
48 Peter Naoroz. I just went back to Council and now I'm
49 available if you have questions on what specifically we
50 were intending to do.

1 MR. BANGS: Well, Peter, this is Mike
2 Bangs. We're going over the proposals, but we have an
3 extremely time sensitive -- like the airport is waiting
4 for us. And so what we're trying to do is go through
5 these. But we want to make sure that the essence of
6 the proposal is looked at and dealt with properly from
7 the Council's portion. And these are proposals to the
8 Board of Fish.

9
10 MR. NAOROZ: I understand. I've been
11 listening for the past 45, 50 minutes. And, you know,
12 I am making myself available because we don't have
13 anybody from the Angoon area on the Council right now.
14 And it seems like you all put a great deal of deference
15 to those individuals from the local area. So I'm here
16 to help.

17
18 MR. BANGS: Okay. Well, thank you for
19 your help. We have four minutes left before we have to
20 adjourn and we still have a couple other things that we
21 have to do.

22
23 So I'll have to refer to the rest of
24 the Council to see what their feelings are on this and
25 what we should do.

26
27 Mr. Schroeder.

28
29 MR. SCHROEDER: Just responding to
30 Peter. Peter, I think the best we can do at this --
31 given our time constraints and as you say the lack of
32 having an Angoon person here to brief us on these
33 proposals -- would be to come up with something more of
34 a general support for the goals that Kootznoowoo and
35 Angoon have for increasing subsistence fishing
36 opportunity and protecting the stocks that Angoon
37 relies on.

38
39 Would that be helpful to you?

40
41 MR. NAOROZ: Of course it would. I
42 just want to make sure that the Council can do its
43 work. That's all.

44
45 MR. BANGS: Okay. Thank you. I think
46 that would be appropriate, if the Council's good with
47 that.

48
49 And then there's only one important
50 proposal that I thought we might want to address that

1 has to do with ETJ. And it's submitted by ADF&G. And
2 that is to change -- instead of the emergency order
3 closures around those sensitive areas to be put into
4 statute and establish closed waters around sockeye
5 salmon streams in Angoon area. So, you know, that
6 would be.....

7
8 MR. LARSON: It's your proposal.

9
10 MR. BANGS: Yeah. No.

11
12 MS. PHILLIPS: No.

13
14 MR. BANGS: No, it says ADF&G here. We
15 did the same thing. Yeah.

16
17 So anyway, I think we should support
18 theirs as well. Support ours and their -- okay.
19 That's all I have, I think, for now.

20
21 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. So thank you
22 for a job well done. I think -- are we in order for a
23 motion to adopt or accept your reports.

24
25 That is open.

26
27 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.

28
29 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Patty, go
30 ahead.

31
32 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
33 Move to support the Fisheries Committee's Board of Fish
34 Proposal Report.

35
36 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Patty.

37
38 MS. PHILLIPS: And send Mike Bangs to
39 the Board of Fish meetings to represent the RAC.

40
41 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Exactly. Thank you.

42
43 Is there a second.

44
45 MS. NEEDHAM: Second.

46
47 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: By Cathy. Okay. It's
48 been moved and seconded. We're going to move. All in
49 favor, say aye.

50

1 IN UNISON: Aye.
2
3 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Opposed, nay.
4
5 (No opposing votes)
6
7 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Motion carried. Thank
8 you, you guys. You did a good job.
9
10 We've got two letters up there that we
11 need to go over right now. And again, you know, we're
12 working on some time constraints, so keep that in mind.
13
14 Robert, go ahead and explain that for
15 us, please.
16
17 MR. LARSON: The Council has asked me
18 to prepare two letters. One is to the Northern
19 Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association. And that
20 -- short and sweet, the text is on the screen. I would
21 think you'd want a motion to adopt.
22
23 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.
24
25 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead.
26
27 MS. PHILLIPS: Move to adopt the letter
28 written to Mr. Reifenhohl about the Kanalku Lake
29 enhancement project.
30
31 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Patty. Is
32 there a second?
33
34 MR. KITKA: Second.
35
36 MR. YEAGER: Second.
37
38 MR. HERNANDEZ: Second.
39
40 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Motion seconded. All
41 in favor, say aye.
42
43 IN UNISON: Aye.
44
45 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Opposed.
46
47 (No opposing votes)
48
49 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Motion carries.
50

1 There's another letter there. Some
2 more.

3
4 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair, there is
5 another letter. This letter is directly to the
6 Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior. There may
7 be some advice coming from the Office of Subsistence
8 Management exactly how we would engage the Secretaries
9 directly, but what you have on the screen is the text
10 of this letter. I'll make it a little bit bigger for
11 you.

12
13 So what it says is that, you know,
14 you're concerned. There's been happenings that has
15 increased that concern. We've been in communications
16 with you previously. We haven't heard a response.

17
18 MS. PHILLIPS: But we did hear a
19 response.

20
21 MR. LARSON: Well, we didn't hear it
22 back from the Secretaries. We heard from an
23 intermediary. That, you know, this needs to get
24 elevated. So here's -- those last two sentences --
25 those are -- is your request.

26
27 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.

28
29 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Patty.

30
31 MS. PHILLIPS: So ANILCA .802(3),
32 except as otherwise provided by the act or other
33 Federal laws, Federal land managing agencies and
34 managing subsistence activities on public lands and in
35 protecting the continued viability of all wild
36 renewable resources in Alaska shall cooperate with
37 adjacent land owners and land managers, including
38 Native Corporations, appropriate State and Federal
39 agencies, and other nations. So that is where we're
40 delegated a say.

41
42 Thank you.

43
44 I think we should reference that in our
45 letter.

46
47 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. So noted.

48
49 MR. LARSON: And where is that? That's
50 .80.....

1 MS. PHILLIPS: .802(3).
2
3 MR. LARSON: .802. Okay.
4
5 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, move to
6 approve the letter written to the Secretary on the
7 Transboundary mining issue.
8
9 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Do I hear second.
10
11 MS. NEEDHAM: Second.
12
13 MR. YEAGER: Second.
14
15 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: It's been moved and
16 seconded. All in favor, say aye.
17
18 IN UNISON: Aye.
19
20 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Opposed, same sign.
21
22 (No opposing votes)
23
24 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Motion carried.
25
26 All right. Mike, did you have
27 something.
28
29 MR. LARSON: And I will make these
30 appropriate changes as referenced by Patty regarding
31 .802(3).
32
33 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you.
34
35 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead, Mike.
36
37 MR. BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
38 Very quickly, I wanted to make sure that the Council
39 would respond to these three herring proposals. And
40 we've already gone over the criteria of all three of
41 them through the extra, additional closed area of
42 Makhnati Islands. Two of them are from the Southeast
43 Herring Conservation Alliance. They want to re-open
44 all the area that's already closed. And I thought the
45 Council would be in opposition to that.
46
47 And the other one is expand the
48 commercial herring fishery in closed waters district in
49 13 in Sitka Sound. That's the proposal to the Board of
50 Fish from Sitka Tribe. And I thought we should support

1 that.
2
3 So -- and that's it.
4
5 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Thanks. All
6 right.
7
8 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.
9
10 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes.
11
12 MS. PHILLIPS: So move to accept Mr.
13 Bangs' report on the herring.
14
15 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Patty. Is
16 there a second.
17
18 MR. DOUVILLE: Second.
19
20 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. All in favor,
21 say aye.
22
23 IN UNISON: Aye.
24
25 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Opposed.
26
27 (No opposing votes)
28
29 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Motion carries. Thank
30 you.
31
32 What else.
33
34 MR. LARSON: Meetings. Meeting dates.
35
36
37 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Future meeting
38 dates. We need to confirm the location of the Winter
39 2015 meeting. It was tentatively set for March in
40 Yakutat. However, I'll let Mr. Larson explain this.
41 It says here that Yakutat is not a hub community and
42 will take special cost analysis for the approval. Do
43 you want to address that, Mr. Larson.
44
45 MR. LARSON: Yes, Mr. Chair. Because
46 Yakutat is not listed as a hub community and one that
47 has a preapproval for a meeting, I will need to -- if
48 the Council wishes to meet there, I'll need to do a
49 cost analysis regarding meeting in Yakutat versus
50 meeting in some other community.

1 I would like to note though that the
2 Office of Subsistence Management has been very, very
3 lenient regarding meeting in non-hub communities for
4 other councils this year. They've met in some fairly
5 small and isolated communities. And I would expect
6 that there would not be a resistance from OSM to
7 meeting in Yakutat.

8

9 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Bangs.

10

11 MR. BANGS: There was a couple other
12 issues that I felt related to where we meet next time.
13 If we wanted to do some more work with the
14 transboundary issues -- have people come in for that.
15 And also being wintertime, I personally would like to
16 go to Yakutat in the fall. In the winter meeting, I
17 just thought more of a hub community might be easier
18 for travel at that time of year. And that we could put
19 together some additional presentations for some of
20 these issues that we've been dealing with -- especially
21 the transboundary river problem.

22

23 I don't know everybody else feels.

24

25 Thank you.

26

27 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Thank you, Mr.
28 Bangs.

29

30 Anyone else have an issue with that.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I think -- I wasn't
35 going to do this, but I think I will make an
36 announcement now that if you have it in Yakutat, it'll
37 probably be my last meeting. My wife's health isn't
38 that good. And it has been deteriorating over the past
39 year or so, you know. So it's almost a full time job
40 for me to take care of her.

41

42 And it used to be that when I came to
43 these meetings, I would always discuss it with her.
44 How do you feel about me going to these meetings and
45 being away for a week. And she said go, you know, if
46 you're needed. You're doing good work. So she always
47 supporting these meetings, you know, in the past. But
48 in the last couple of meetings that I've gone, she says
49 I don't want you to go. And that's pretty hard to
50 take, you know. And I almost didn't come this time

1 because of that.

2

3 So I just want you to know that it's
4 possible that might be -- the next meeting might be my
5 last one, no matter where you might have it.

6

7 Okay.

8

9 Thank you.

10

11 So what's the wish of the Council for
12 -- you know, Mike brought out a real good, you know,
13 comment about the Transboundary thing. And maybe it
14 would be more appropriate to have it someplace like
15 Juneau but what does the Council feel about where we
16 should have the next meeting.

17

18 Cathy.

19

20 MS. NEEDHAM: Yakutat has a
21 Transboundary watershed and mining issues and so it
22 still might be the right venue.

23

24 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: That's a good point.
25 Thank you.

26

27 Go ahead, Mike.

28

29 MR. BANGS: I would agree with Cathy.
30 I think maybe that if it's workable. But I think we
31 should have a backup for Robert to investigate because
32 of the problems that might occur.

33

34 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Sure.

35

36 MR. BANGS: But I'm totally fine with
37 Yakutat. If the will of the Council wants that, I
38 would like to be able to be there.

39

40 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Other Council members
41 feel okay with that.

42

43 MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.

44

45 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Good. All
46 right. So that's fixed.

47

48 The next one would be the 2005 (sic)
49 fall meeting. Select the date and time for that. You
50 should have a calendar toward the back of your book.

1 You know where that is specifically, Robert?

2

3 MR. LARSON: 196.

4

5 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: 196.

6

7 MR. LARSON: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman.

8 If you look on Page 196, I have some additional

9 information that's not included in your book. The

10 Northwest Arctic is going to meet in a community called

11 Buckland on October 6th and 7th. The Yukon Delta will

12 meet on October 7th and 8th. The Seward Peninsula

13 Council is going to meet on October 14th and 15th. I'm

14 not -- there should be an agreement from Eastern

15 Interior, but I don't know what it is.

16

17 So those are the only three Council

18 members that I'm aware of that have selected meeting

19 dates. So you cannot meet during the week of October

20 5th. There's already two councils meeting that week.

21

22 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: What's the wish -- oh,

23 I'm sorry, Donald. Go ahead.

24

25 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.

26 Chairman. I'm going to propose we meet the week of

27 October 12th.

28

29 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: October 12th has been

30 identified.

31

32 MR. BANGS: Second.

33

34 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Is that a motion.

35 Okay. It's been seconded by Mr. Bangs. So any further

36 discussion.

37

38 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman.

39

40 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes, sir.

41

42 MR. SCHROEDER: I think I'll be

43 unavailable until the end of October, should I be

44 reappointed to the Council. So if the meeting could be

45 held in later October. My preference would be October

46 26 or that week, if that was possible.

47

48 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. So we do have a

49 motion on the floor. What's the Council feel like.

50 You know, we have to do an action on it. You either

1 vote it up or down and reconsider another date.
2
3 MR. WRIGHT: Question.
4
5 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Question's been
6 called. All in favor of the motion to have the next
7 fall meeting the week of October the 12th, please
8 signify by saying aye.
9
10 IN UNISON: Aye.
11
12 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Opposed, nay.
13
14 IN UNISON: Nay.
15
16 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Let's take a roll call
17 vote, Mr. Kitka.
18
19 MR. KITKA: Arthur Bloom.
20
21 MR. BLOOM: Nay.
22
23 MR. KITKA: What did he say?
24
25 MR. BANGS: Nay.
26
27 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: We are taking a roll
28 call vote right now, folks.
29
30 MR. KITKA: Frank Wright.
31
32 MR. WRIGHT: Nay.
33
34 MR. KITKA: Patricia Phillips.
35
36 MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.
37
38 MR. KITKA: Michael Douville.
39
40 MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.
41
42 MR. KITKA: Harvey Kitka votes yes.
43
44 MR. KITKA: Bert Adams.
45
46 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes.
47
48 MR. KITKA: Robert Schroeder.
49
50 MR. SCHROEDER: No.

1 MR. KITKA: Donald Hernandez.
2
3 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.
4
5 MR. KITKA: Kenneth Jackson.
6
7 MR. JACKSON: Yes.
8
9 MR. KITKA: Aaron Isaacs.
10
11 mr. JACKSON: He's gone.
12
13 MR. KITKA: Oh. He's gone.
14
15 John Yeager.
16
17 MR. YEAGER: No.
18
19 MR. KITKA: Michael Bangs.
20
21 MR. BANGS: No.
22
23 MR. KITKA: Cathy Needham.
24
25 MS. NEEDHAM: Yes.
26
27 MR. KITKA: The ayes have it.
28
29 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: The ayes have it.
30
31 MR. LARSON: How did Art Bloom vote?
32
33 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: How did Mr. Bloom
34 vote?
35
36 MR. KITKA: Who?
37
38 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Art Bloom.
39
40 MR. BANGS: He voted no.
41
42 MR. LARSON: No, okay.
43
44 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: No. Okay. All right.
45 So let me see.
46
47 MR. LARSON: And now we need to have a
48 venue -- a community.
49
50 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yeah. The next is

1 where do you want to meet.
2
3 MR. BANGS: Kauai.
4
5 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Kauai? Maui.
6
7 MS. NEEDHAM: Can we decide that at our
8 next meeting.
9
10 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yeah. I think so.
11
12 MR. LARSON: Depending on the
13 community, it would be advantageous to me to do a
14 little bit of legwork before the next Council meeting.
15 So if you have a community in mind, I wouldn't mind
16 hearing about it. It would make my life a little
17 easier.
18
19 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: John.
20
21 MR. YEAGER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
22 Petersburg.
23
24 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: You're not going to
25 ask for Wrangell again, are you?
26
27 MR. YEAGER: Petersburg.
28
29 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Petersburg, huh.
30 That's a good spot.
31
32 MS. NEEDHAM: I'd vote for Petersburg
33 because we already decided to go there and then at the
34 last minute told them no.
35
36 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. All right. So
37 we're going to redeem ourselves.
38
39 MR. BANGS: Will Robert be able to make
40 it?
41
42 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Hmm?
43
44 MR. KITKA: Will Robert make it.
45
46 MR. BANGS: Robert.
47
48 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Are you going to be
49 able to make it?
50

1 (Laughter)
2
3 MR. LARSON: Who knows.
4
5 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. All right. So
6 everyone in agreement with Petersburg the week of
7 October 12th. Well, folks, we're done with the Agenda.
8 We need to hurry and get out to the airport.
9
10 So it was a good meeting.
11
12 Thank you very much for doing such a
13 great job.
14
15 And this meeting is adjourned.
16
17 Thank you.
18
19 (Off record)
20
21 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
)ss.
STATE OF ALASKA)

I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public in and for the state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 330 through 487 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the SOUTHEAST FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME III taken electronically on the 23rd day of October in Wrangell, Alaska;

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

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

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 14th day of November 2014.

Salena A. Hile
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My Commission Expires: 09/16/18