

1 SOUTHEAST ALASKA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

3
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5
6 VOLUME II

7
8
9 Ketchikan, Alaska
10 September 25, 2013
11 9:00 a.m.

12
13
14 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

- 15
16 Bertrand Adams, Chairman
17 Timothy Ackerman
18 Michael Bangs
19 Michael Douville
20 Donald Hernandez
21 Aaron Isaacs
22 Kenneth Jackson
23 Harvey Kitka
24 Floyd Kookesh
25 Cathy Needham
26 Patricia Phillips
27 Frank Wright
28 John Yeager
29
30
31
32
33 Regional Council Coordinator, Robert Larson

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44 Recorded and transcribed by:
45
46 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
47 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2
48 Anchorage, AK 99501
49 907-227-5312/sahile@gci.net

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

2
3 (Ketchikan, Alaska - 9/25/2013)

4
5 (On record)

6
7 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Folks, if you can take your
8 seats, please, we'll get our meeting started this
9 morning. We're going to call this meeting to order.
10 However, last night there was testimony on rural
11 determination and I was really impressed with the
12 turnout and the testimonies that were given. However,
13 we didn't finish the people who wanted to testify, so
14 there was four individuals who didn't get their
15 opportunity, so we decided we would take care of that
16 first thing this morning. So I'm going to turn the mic
17 over to Jack here and he will go ahead and finish that
18 portion of their meeting last night.

19
20 So, Jack, go ahead.

21
22 MR. LORRIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
23 My name is Jack Lorrigan. I'm the Native liaison for
24 the Office of Subsistence Management and I'm continuing
25 in my role as a hearing officer for the rural
26 determination comments on the process. Last night, due
27 to the volume of people, we had decided on a five-
28 minute time limit for people, so we'd like to extend
29 that to this morning for people to try to keep your
30 comments to five minutes, please.

31
32 I'd like to reemphasize that Ms. Beth
33 Pendleton is in the audience as a Board member also and
34 so we're still continuing on with your comments to the
35 Board. So with that I'd like to.....

36
37 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Excuse me, Jack. I
38 didn't mean to interrupt you, but I think it would be
39 appropriate if you want that the Council go ahead and
40 move into the audience and then Beth, is she here, if
41 you want to come up here and sit among the group here.
42 Is Tony here? Guess not. We'll have as much of the
43 same setting as last night.

44
45 MR. LORRIGAN: All right.

46
47 (Pause)

48
49 MR. LORRIGAN: Okay. I guess we'll get
50 started. First name I have is Daniel Monteith.

1 MR. MONTEITH: (In Tlingit)
2 Gunalcheesh. My name is Daniel Monteith. Presently I
3 reside in Douglas, Alaska. I'll try and be very brief
4 and thank you very much to the Regional Advisory
5 Council for allowing us to come in today and finish off
6 our testimonies.

7
8 Plain and simple, I'd like to ask the
9 Federal Subsistence Board to reinstate Saxman's rural
10 determination and subsistence priority because I
11 believe it's based on a previous decision that was
12 based on arbitrary data and weak scientific analysis.
13 I ask you today to please reverse this active ethnocide
14 and that's really what it is. A Federal policy and
15 Board decision of ethnocide.

16
17 I'll be brief on some of the things
18 that I prepared after the testimonies given last night.
19 The Tlingit people have been here since time
20 immemorial. The archeological records back this up
21 that they've been here for thousands of years.

22
23 There was a lot of testimony given last
24 night about the history of Saxman and many of the
25 people relocating to Saxman, the Saanya Kwaan and the
26 Taan ta Kwaan. Plain and simple, some of the things
27 that elders shared with me over 20 years ago, those
28 elders who aren't with us anymore, said that one of the
29 reasons why they came to Saxman was they were promised
30 by the Federal government and missionaries, medical
31 assistants, and this was in particular in the form of
32 small pox vaccines because in the 1860s small pox had
33 gone through and had a devastating impact on the Saanya
34 Kwaan and Taan ta Kwaan is going through a 30-year
35 cycle, 1893-94. So they were very concerned about
36 that, particularly for their young people.

37
38 They also came with the promise of a
39 mission. And finally, interestingly enough because the
40 Federal Subsistence Board used this against them, their
41 children going outside of Saxman to Ketchikan for high
42 school. They came with the promise of a school.

43
44 Over the past century after 1893-94,
45 there are so many ways in which Saxman, to any rational
46 social scientist has proved, their independent status,
47 a municipal government. They recognized by Congress in
48 the sense of the Indian Reorganization Act of having a
49 tribal IRA. Ketchikan Indian Corporation or Ketchikan
50 Indian Community as they're known today, both have

1 separate tribal governments and this should be
2 recognized by a Federal Subsistence Board. It's
3 recognized by other agencies and aspects of the Federal
4 government.

5
6 Today Saxman continues to be recognized
7 by the State of Alaska on many different levels,
8 including being a second class municipality. Nora, I
9 believe, covered many aspects of the municipality and
10 all the services they represent. The government also
11 represented under the Federal government by acts of the
12 Indian Self-determination Act and so many grants and
13 contracts they pursue today.

14
15 It should be clear to the Board that
16 Saxman is an independent separate village from
17 Ketchikan. Here, amongst specific suggestions with
18 regard to rural criteria and aggregate grouping, first
19 and foremost the process and criteria should be open,
20 transparent and simple. Some of the things that
21 transpired in the final decision I think are
22 inexcusable and inexplicable.

23
24 The rural criteria should not be based
25 on population thresholds, rather rural status should be
26 based on historical, cultural, political, economic,
27 social sources, both qualitative and quantitative
28 sources. They should be holistic. This idea of -- and
29 I think the Regional Advisory Council will talk about
30 it more today. The idea of what are the
31 characteristics in a qualitative sense.

32
33 Aggregate criteria should no longer be
34 called that. What does that mean. That's something
35 you get when you go to the rock dump or something for
36 rocks or something. Aggregate should be referred to as
37 grouping. I think most folks in Alaska understand the
38 term grouping.

39
40 Plain and simple, communities should
41 not be grouped unless they say they are. Arbitrary
42 variables of commuting to different communities, high
43 school attendance, place of employment, proximity to
44 roads and concrete box retailers is a poor indicator of
45 ruralness or grouping and should be abandoned for more,
46 as I've already said, qualitative, political, economic,
47 historical and social, cultural sources.

48
49 The Board should not review the status
50 of communities every 10 years unless there's been a

1 major demographic change. This 10-year cycle is
2 exhausting to small communities, financially,
3 physically and otherwise. It's also unwise in terms of
4 Federal budget cuts.

5
6 Finally, the Board should trust the
7 Regional Advisory Council. This one size fits all
8 criteria in process does not fit a state as culturally
9 and ecologically diverse as Alaska.

10
11 (In Tlingit)

12
13 Gunalcheesh.

14
15 MR. LORRIGAN: Thank you. Gunalcheesh.

16
17 Holly Churchill.

18
19 MS. CHURCHILL: (In Tlingit) My given
20 name is Holly Churchill and I'm a resident of
21 Ketchikan. However, over the past 58 years I have
22 attended Saxman's community to community events and
23 have been graciously invited to eat their Native foods
24 and participate in their Native dance, which is unique
25 to Southeastern Alaska. They're a very traditional
26 tribal entity here in this community. Tourism has
27 increased here because of their presence in a village
28 on Revillagigedo.

29
30 Over the course of my lifetime I've
31 watched their health deteriorate. To my understanding
32 -- I remember what my mother, Delores Churchill, had
33 said to me, that her grandmother had said to her on
34 some of the foods that have been introduced into our
35 diets and she never spoke any English, but my mom does
36 and she used to say look at those members of this tribe
37 or that tribe within the Haida Nation, they're drinking
38 that cow's milk, they're going crazy.

39
40 You know, there's just some things that
41 is so necessary for our DNA to be acquired and
42 accumulated into our systems, just as sciences to
43 alcohol to the Natives where we don't have the enzymes
44 and it doesn't come out of our systems as quickly as
45 other Caucasian societies that have had it in their
46 systems for hundreds of years. So our DNA requires us
47 to have our eulachons, which is the first amount of
48 Vitamin D and our seaweeds that give us our iodines and
49 so on and so forth.

50

1 Those of us that might not be schooled
2 in the medical or health wise, but we are seeing an
3 increasing amount of people of our youths in this
4 generation with diabetes juvenile for no other reason
5 that should have any of these diseases that hadn't been
6 previously around, but also mental illness. Being a
7 mother that has a child that has a disorder, I know
8 directly that in the lack of our foods it is so
9 important and I see that out in Saxman.

10

11 Maybe we can't help our community here,
12 Ketchikan, to get rural status because of Congress, but
13 because of us, members that live here, we care about
14 our people and we care about the people of Saxman and
15 we would ask you to consider for them to be reinstated
16 for rural status.

17

18 Thank you.

19

20 MR. LORRIGAN: Gunalcheesh. Haw'aa.

21

22 Ronald Leighton.

23

24 MR. LEIGHTON: Good morning. Thank you
25 for allowing me to come speak to you. Mr. Chair, I
26 would like for you people to review the maps here.
27 There's a purpose that I'm bringing these maps forward.
28 I'm here on behalf of the Organized Village of Kasaan
29 and we are here to support Saxman in their effort to
30 continue their subsistence ways. We don't like the
31 word subsistence, so we use customary and traditional
32 use.

33

34 It's important to think on these maps
35 here. Saxman is fighting to keep their rural status
36 because you're saying Ketchikan, which is urban, links
37 them together. Well, I'm here to say that we're using
38 the wrong criteria. The urban and the rural should not
39 be used. When you have people in communities such as
40 Ketchikan that can demonstrate and have demonstrated
41 for a number of years that they are not only dependent
42 and have a need for their subsistence, they also can
43 demonstrate that they have utilized this for a number
44 of years. I think this is very important for the Board
45 to understand and look at this as a process of their
46 determination on who can retain a level of subsistence.

47

48 Personal use -- and this puzzles me up
49 and I'll tell you why. The subsistence and personal
50 use gatherers in the state probably only utilize about

1 1.2 percent, maybe 1.5 percent of the total resource.
2 So I don't know why they have to sit down here and try
3 to fight for this use. It's not depleting in any way
4 any resource. It doesn't add to the depletion.
5 Personal use is not as prioritized as subsistence and
6 if you have subsistence users, they are a way of
7 tattle-tailing on the over commercial harvest of
8 certain resources. If we are there to gather and we're
9 not getting our traditional customary levels easily,
10 then there is a reason and the reason is it's being
11 overharvested or maybe there's a disease or something
12 in the system there that took this out of the picture.

13

14 If everybody was just personal use, you
15 guys wouldn't have to listen to us. We come to you
16 saying we're not getting our personal use levels.
17 Well, so what. You're not priority. So I'm saying
18 it's very important throughout the state to realize and
19 I think if you guys would sit there and think about
20 this for a while.

21

22 If I could demonstrate where my family
23 had utilized some land prior to 1906, prior to the
24 Tongas being formed, my chances of getting that land
25 are pretty good. Getting it turned over to a patent in
26 my family name. I'm saying you've got to look a little
27 bit further than that and say, okay, if you can
28 demonstrate -- and the reason why I put those maps
29 there.

30

31 This is a map of Ketchikan 1900. If
32 you look on that map there, you could see the city
33 blocks, mission, the streets are downtown there, and
34 off to the left portion of that map there you could see
35 where it says Indian Village. I'm going to argue with
36 you that that Indian Village is still there. It might
37 be obscured and everything, but it is definitely still
38 there. This tells you that the people that were living
39 here was living off the resources.

40

41 They're still living off the resources.
42 They were taught by their parents' grandparents and
43 goes way back. And we have been teaching. I've taught
44 my kids. I'm still teaching my nieces and nephews.
45 There is one -- our own loader head out there in
46 Kasaan, right at the bottom of it it says we are
47 borrowing the resource from our grandchildren and
48 that's very important to understand.

49

50 I think if you use and change your

1 process of criteria and bring in the fact that if
2 somebody can demonstrate -- the gentleman yesterday
3 from Pennock Island says, you know, they don't consider
4 me rural, but I live off the grid. There is people
5 like that. They're tribal and non-tribal that depend
6 on this and can demonstrate that they need and depend
7 on the resources. It's important that -- it's not a
8 conservation issue by giving them this subsistence
9 rural preference. I would say a subsistence
10 preference, a gathering preference or maybe a cultural
11 preference and maybe all of them combined and put into
12 your process of determination.

13

14 I feel it's important that you change
15 the way in which you reach a decision. Right now under
16 the State and stuff you could go and get a C&T finding,
17 but you have to demonstrate in the state that you had
18 utilized, you had need and you had ongoing long use of
19 a resource. Then they'll put that down as, okay, he
20 demonstrated -- they demonstrated that -- and they did
21 it on a village level, they could do it on an
22 individual level, but I think it's important that you
23 be able to realize that people that live within larger
24 communities do have a need to subsist. A need to the
25 resources and a need to be heard. When the resources
26 are being depleted or damaged for whatever reason, they
27 need to be able to explain, wait a minute, we're not
28 getting this needed resource.

29

30 I want to thank you for holding these
31 meetings here. It's very important. It's obvious that
32 the Secretary of Interior knew there was damage. He
33 says we've got to get something fixed. I think this is
34 going to be a major step in deciding what process
35 you're going to put in place because you're going -- it
36 would be the shotgun approach to management. A law
37 enforcement officer looks over there and he sees 10
38 people. He says if I blast them with a shotgun, I'm
39 going to get the guilty one that's amongst them.

40

41 By doing a community type thing and
42 calling Ketchikan urban, it isn't fair to the people
43 that are dependant on the resources. So I think you
44 ought to throw that aside and come back through on
45 individual.

46

47 MR. LORRIGAN: I'm sorry. Could you
48 summarize.

49

50 MR. LEIGHTON: Sure, sure. If the

1 individual -- if the Federal government could put
2 together a form and this person here could fill it out,
3 and you have boxes and checks and stuff like that, and
4 they submit it to you and they say, okay, fine, we make
5 a determination you are a true subsistence gatherer and
6 put it in the form of an affidavit.

7

8 So, thank you.

9

10 MR. LORRIGAN: Thank you.

11

12 Mr. Wallace.

13

14 MR. WALLACE: Mr. Chair. If you would,
15 I'd like to request an elder, Joe Thomas, to come up,
16 please. Last night I asked Joe Thomas's presence this
17 morning. He's a Tlingit elder out in Saxman. I view
18 myself as a Haida having the opportunity to live in a
19 Tlingit village and I've had the humble experience of
20 having 11 years being elected as tribal president of
21 the Federally recognized tribe of OVS.

22

23 What we've been talking about here for
24 years is our way of life. Part of our way of life is
25 the spiritual aspect of it and part of that spiritual
26 aspect is prayer and the medicines that we had. With
27 that, I'm going to request that Joe Thomas have a
28 prayer for us.

29

30 Thank you.

31

32 MR. THOMAS: Let's bow our heads. (In
33 Tlingit) Heavenly Father, in the name of Jesus Christ,
34 our Lord and Savior, we are speaking this morning about
35 the foods that pertain to us, that help us to live,
36 that help us to prosper and grow in health. We ask,
37 Lord, this morning that all these things will be
38 decided in the name of Jesus Christ in favor Lord of
39 our people. Lord, we thank you for this opportunity.
40 In Jesus' name we pray.

41

42 Amen.

43

44 Gunalcheesh.

45

46 MR. WALLACE: Thank you for allowing
47 that. It's important. Other important aspects
48 throughout the years as I came before the FSB and the
49 Southeast RAC. I made it a point to wear Indian
50 medicine. Beth had complimented the necklace a couple

1 times. Yesterday was one of them. I explained to her
2 the meaning and the spirituality of the medicine that
3 we receive from what is termed devil's club. It's the
4 wrong name for the Indian medicine. It's the English
5 version. So I gave her the Indian medicine this
6 morning for her to wear and for her to have and for
7 hopefully to get some of that medicine that we totally
8 rely on in our way of life.

9
10 With that stated, my comments have
11 changed, you know, throughout the whole process. We
12 have received the nine questions and we've been going
13 through the village with those nine questions and we
14 have been meeting as a council and inviting Cape Fox
15 Corporation, the city of Saxman to partake in our issue
16 with answering those nine questions and we've had the
17 fortune of receiving a BIA grant to assist us with that
18 and with that we have the assistance of Dr. Dan
19 Monteith.

20
21 We will be submitting probably about a
22 58-page written testimony before the November 1st
23 deadline. With that stated, there's been discussion of
24 you'll receive all this oral testimony, all this
25 written testimony, and I've seen some of the binders at
26 FSB and they're thick. The question is, who really
27 reads those? Do you guys really read them? I mean
28 there is a statement I believe in the Q&As and going
29 through the timeline and by a certain date the FSB
30 would review all comments received. Our question is,
31 well, just really, in fact, that's going to be a lot of
32 data to read for Tony and for Beth and for the other
33 four members of the FSB.

34
35 With that, I would really like
36 consultation for the FSB and for Staff members to meet
37 with the Organized Village of Saxman before the
38 November 1st deadline and I want to have that
39 consultation with some dialogue, meaningful dialogue.
40 It's something that's been put out there and I would
41 formally request that.

42
43 My testimony today changed. It changed
44 through sidebar conversations. It was changed by
45 testimony that I heard last night and it was changed a
46 lot by a personal phone call. Yesterday afternoon I
47 was called back to the office to tend to some business,
48 tribal business, and that's why I'm really fortunate
49 that this meeting did come to this area. When I'm
50 traveling away from Saxman, I'm in contact through my

1 iPad, through emails, through my texting. So I just
2 got this new request to take care of some tribal
3 business, so I went back to the office.

4
5 I received this personal phone call
6 from a family member. Yesterday the Council, a couple
7 of the councils mentioned the issue of cancer. When I
8 received that phone call about my sister-in-law, she's
9 been battling cancer and the care providers are saying,
10 well, you've got X amount of months. When we heard
11 that news, it was devastating as you might well know if
12 you've experienced that.

13
14 With that, I would almost personally
15 say, well, gosh, I'm really pretty much emotionally
16 done for the day, for the week, but what my sister is
17 doing is she's battling for her life and that puts it
18 in perspective for the Organized Village of Saxman,
19 Saxman IRA Council, a Federally recognized tribe. We
20 have been in a battle for our way of life to practice
21 what we've been doing since time immemorial as you've
22 been hearing in last night's comments.

23
24 Yes, we do demand and request that the
25 rural determination for Saxman be reversed. It's an
26 administrative thing that can happen. It's not a
27 congressional thing. We're not -- yeah, we may be
28 trying to change things legislatively and that takes
29 time, but really this decision can be handled with a
30 stroke of a pen or with a motion from the FSB or from
31 the Secretary of Interior or the Secretary of
32 Agriculture. It really can be an administratively
33 thing done. Serving on the IRA for the last 12 years
34 we make decisions and sometimes those motions come back
35 to the table and those motions can be changed.

36
37 With that, I know the FSB has a process
38 in the organization. Well, you go through the RFR and
39 then it has requirements that RFR has to meet. With
40 that all said -- my iPad keeps going off. Actually
41 last night's presentation it could have ended with the
42 young girl, the young 8-year-old girl. After hearing
43 her read her testimony, we should have all gone home
44 instead of being there till after 10:00 o'clock. I
45 know the RAC Council was here all day since 9:00
46 o'clock and here you are after you were up until 10:00,
47 so we didn't have to be there.

48
49 Jamie made a comment on an unknown
50 person, unknown agency. How important -- is it really

1 important for Saxman's rural status? For the
2 individual making a decision like that really not being
3 effected by it, it probably doesn't mean a whole lot,
4 but to us, again, it's a way of life that we've been
5 experiencing since time immemorial and we want to
6 continue that for that young girl that was up here last
7 night giving her testimony. It's for her and her
8 future generations, her future children and
9 grandchildren to enjoy what has been ours since time
10 immemorial. Unknown individual, unknown agency.

11
12 The comment was Saxman really wasn't
13 hurt. It wasn't hurt legally yet, but, yes, Saxman has
14 been hurt ever since that decision to the vote that
15 they made years ago. A couple times individuals
16 mentioned that one vote changed things and, yes, it
17 hurt us.

18
19 We're a Federally recognized tribe and
20 we operate on small funds, being a small and needy
21 tribe. That's the actual funding source that we
22 receive in Saxman. A small and needy tribe. The real
23 thing about being a Federally recognized tribe is that
24 trust responsibility that we have with the Federal
25 government and its agencies. That trust responsibility
26 to manage our land, our waters. What's really behind
27 the battle for Saxman is really a sovereign issue. If
28 it didn't really mean that much to us, we wouldn't even
29 be battling it, but it's important to us and that's why
30 we're here.

31
32 You heard a lot about the history of
33 Saxman and where the people came from originally and
34 that will be further documented in our written
35 documents. Thresholds arbitrary. In my research and
36 activity at OVS, we recently applied for a USDA rural
37 loan and to apply for that rural loan and to be
38 eligible for that rural loan with the USDA out of the
39 Sitka office, plain and simple, it was 20,000. That's
40 what they considered rural. If USDA rural development
41 is using 20,000 people as a threshold, guess what. The
42 only community in Southeast would be Juneau that
43 wouldn't be eligible for that loan.

44
45 The Ketchikan Gateway Borough has
46 applied for that rural loan before and they've received
47 funds from the USDA. Beth, you're under the USDA being
48 with the Forest Service. In that loan process, that
49 was the criteria. That was the only thing mentioned.
50 I hear there was a brief paragraph on threshold. What

1 happened with criteria is somebody decided let's throw
2 all this different criteria and aggregation into the
3 mix of it and it was really unnecessary.

4
5 Plain and simple, the agency has got to
6 be fiduciary responsible to Federally recognized
7 tribes. By that, when you make decisions for Federally
8 recognized tribes, you're making it in the best
9 interest of the Federally recognized tribe. And that
10 wasn't done. There's two acts that you guys had to
11 take into mind. Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act
12 and ANILCA Title VIII. The intent of ANILCA is
13 protect. There has been no protection going on, not
14 with the steady rules and regulations that have been
15 coming down the pike and the heavy enforcement. This
16 summer I heard of an individual involved in the halibut
17 subsistence. He was, to me, harassed, profiled, and he
18 was boarded four times in a three-week period.

19
20 I'm going to summarize and close
21 because, yes, we will be submitting a final written
22 report before it's all said and done by November 1st.
23 In closing, I've been in my chapter of life serving as
24 a public servant serving with the Organized Village of
25 Saxman for 12 years. I'm coming to the point where I
26 want to go back to my other chapter in life. You guys
27 know that my real avocation is being a carver. Without
28 doubt, if there is an unfavorable action that's not
29 favorable to Saxman, there will be a ridicule pole
30 carved.

31
32 With all the different agencies that
33 were involved in the decision making, it would be --
34 when I get into carving, it's pure pleasure. It
35 doesn't seem like work at all. It's in my DNA. I come
36 from five generations of carvers in my family. You
37 know, you heard from the mayor of Saxman last night and
38 we have a totem pole part that's visited by hundreds
39 and thousands of people. We have a ridicule pole of
40 Secretary Seward. It's really not my wish to do one
41 for the FSB if there is a determination like that. I'd
42 like to maybe do the opposite.

43
44 With that, I know we have a busy
45 schedule for the next day and tomorrow, so I'll close
46 and thank you for this time.

47
48 MR. LORRIGAN: Thank you. We'll close
49 public comment for this session on the rural
50 determination process. I'd like to invite the Board if

1 they have any closing comments.

2

3 MS. PENDLETON: Thank you. Last
4 evening and this morning were extremely helpful to me
5 as a member of the Federal Subsistence Board I think to
6 gain a greater understanding to hear the issues, the
7 concerns, the passion. It's brought some greater
8 clarity for me. I believe that the Board and as we
9 continue through this process has an important role to
10 fulfill and I think a big part of that has been this
11 opportunity really just to listen to gain greater
12 understanding.

13

14 I just want to express my appreciation
15 and I know many of the folks are not here, but their
16 testimonies, everything from the little eight or nine
17 year old girl from the community of Saxman all the way
18 up to the elders are just greatly, greatly appreciated.
19 I thank all of those who provided comments. It's
20 helped me to gain a greater understanding.

21

22 Thank you.

23

24 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Anthony
25 Christianson. I too really appreciated last night and
26 all the heartfelt testimony. Coming from a rural
27 village of exactly 411 people myself, we have a similar
28 feeling about that and culturally share a lot of values
29 and to see the people draw the strength to come forward
30 and share their message and try to help bring some
31 insight to where Saxman sits in this determination
32 process was valuable for I think the Board and the
33 recorder and the public record to hear, especially as
34 you started to align down some of the criteria and what
35 it meant. The component missing is that cultural
36 aspect and the lifestyle that the community lives and
37 breathes every day.

38

39 So it was valuable for me to sit here
40 and hear your experiences and the things that Saxman
41 feels about it. It was also good to hear some of the
42 other Ketchikan residents that came out and had a
43 different opinion about it and that opinion really
44 brought some light to the whole process itself and I
45 think this region as a whole is different than other
46 areas in Alaska. So hopefully we can come to some
47 consensus on this determination process in favor of
48 everybody.

49

50 Thank you.

1 MR. LORRIGAN: Thank you. I'll
2 conclude the public comment and I'll turn the meeting
3 back over to Chairman Adams.

4
5 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Thank you,
6 folks. So if the Council would like to return back to
7 their seats, we will get underway again.

8
9 (Pause)

10
11 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: If everyone would
12 please take your seats, we would like to get started.
13 I would like to get started.

14
15 So we're back in session now. Welcome
16 to our meeting this morning. Welcome Council members.
17 I need to remind everyone we just finished up the
18 testimonies for rural status. We will not be -- let me
19 repeat, we will not be taking any more testimony on
20 rural status. If you submit us a blue request here, it
21 will not be acknowledged, so just don't even bother.
22 We're done with the rural status testimony. With that,
23 we are going to get started.

24
25 Before we do, I'd just like to make an
26 observation that came to my mind when we were listening
27 to the testimonies last night and then somebody made a
28 comment this morning that triggered this idea. When I
29 was a lot younger, maybe 30 or so years ago, I served
30 as the magistrate for Yakutat. I had to go and do some
31 training before they gave me the badge to conduct court
32 in Yakutat. So the training, you know, was pretty
33 extensive, but our trainer said something that really
34 sparked my interest. He said that courts are supposed
35 to protect you. He just made that simple statement.
36 Then I said protect us from what. I asked that
37 question, what are the courts supposed to protect us
38 from, and he said from the government. I've always
39 carried that within me.

40
41 Some of the things that are happening
42 in our world today with subsistence particularly and
43 other issues, we see that not being done. Subsistence
44 is an inherent right. I can remember Mark Jacobs, when
45 he would get up and he would bellow throughout the
46 room, everyone heard him, even a couple blocks down he
47 was so loud, that subsistence was an inherent right and
48 it cannot be taken from you.

49
50 That is one of the things that we, as

1 members of the Council, under the guidance of ANILCA,
2 are supposed to do, is to protect the rights of
3 subsistence users so that they would be able to carry
4 on and do the issues of taking care of their lives and
5 their families and to pursue happiness.

6
7 I just wanted to leave this with you,
8 ladies and gentlemen, that we have three different
9 forms of government before us. They all have their own
10 duties and responsibilities, but I thought it was
11 interesting that the courts are established by the
12 founders of this nation to protect us from the
13 government infringing upon our rights to do what we
14 feel is important to our lives. With that, I'll just
15 leave that as a matter of thought for your
16 consideration.

17
18 Anyhow, I'm going to have Robert make a
19 couple announcements and then we'll go on with the
20 agenda.

21
22 MR. LARSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
23 I think the first thing is to remind any new people
24 that we do have internet access in this room. The
25 network is called the Ted Ferry Civil Center. The
26 login name is renter and the password is Fall2013. So
27 if you want to get online here, you could use their
28 wifi service.

29
30 The other is that there's
31 teleconference capability during this meeting. If you
32 look on Page 3 of your agenda, there's copies of the
33 agenda in the back of the room. There's also copies of
34 the Council book in the back of the room. There's the
35 -- well, it looks like maybe the Council books have
36 been used, but there's copies of the agenda in
37 additional to the books at the back of the room. In
38 there is the teleconference number if you needed to
39 share that with somebody.

40
41 There are green sign up sheets at the
42 back of the room. We'd very much appreciate it if
43 everybody that attended this meeting could sign up.
44 That would help our process. If you wish to address
45 the Council on any topic, there are blue cards. They
46 look like this and we'd appreciate it if you could fill
47 one of those out and they'll bring it here to me at the
48 front desk and we'll make sure that you get heard.

49
50 One addition to the agenda that we

1 don't see is we've been informed that the Cape Fox
2 Dancers will be here at 4:00 o'clock. That will be
3 quite a treat for us and encourage everyone to stay and
4 enjoy that presentation.

5
6 I think that's all.

7
8 Thank you.

9
10 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Larson.
11 I'd like to know if there's anyone on teleconference
12 line. If so, please identify yourself.

13
14 MR. FOX: Good morning. This is Trevor
15 Fox with OSM in Anchorage.

16
17 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Trevor.

18
19 Anyone else?

20
21 (No comments)

22
23 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. I think we'll
24 go ahead and take a couple of testimonies at this
25 point. What's the next one there, Mr. Larson.

26
27 MR. LARSON: These are non-agenda
28 items.

29
30 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: These are non-agenda
31 items. Is Mr. Louie Wagner here? All right, Louie,
32 there you are. You're hiding behind the red head and
33 she attracts all my attention, so I couldn't see you
34 behind her.

35
36 (Laughter)

37
38 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Just trying to make
39 her feel good. Okay, Louie. Haagu. Ganu.

40
41 MR. WAGNER: Good morning. My name is
42 Louie Wagner. I'm from Metlakatla and I serve on our
43 community council. I'm here today to stay informed on
44 the process and what's going on. I understand, looking
45 at maybe.....

46
47 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Excuse me, Louie.
48 Before we begin testimony, I would also ask that you
49 respect our time and make your comments brief as
50 possible. We've got a few here that we need to go

1 through today and we're going to take them a couple,
2 three at a time. We would appreciate it if you would
3 limit -- I don't like to put time limits on there, on
4 your comments.

5
6 But one of the former chairmans, the
7 first one in fact, Big Bill, he didn't have anything
8 about using that turn-off button. I know I would talk
9 many times and when he got tired of listening to me,
10 he'd just turn me off. I don't want to do that to you,
11 okay. So please let's keep your comments brief and we
12 do appreciate your being here, Louie, so go ahead. I'm
13 sorry. That goes for all of you.

14
15 MR. WAGNER: On the monitoring system
16 that possibly might be going in on the Unuk, what
17 should be really nice for the water temperature and the
18 water quality control. I know when I attended the
19 meetings in Anchorage, they've been doing this on the
20 Yukon and Kuskokwim Rivers, I believe, and it helped to
21 answer a lot of questions. So that was my basic
22 interest here today and I thank all of you very much.

23
24 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. Thank you
25 very much. I appreciate it.

26
27 Anyone have a question.

28
29 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.

30
31 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Patty, go ahead.

32
33 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
34 Thank you, Mr. Wagner. I know that you pay attention
35 to the eulachon, the status of the eulachon
36 populations. So what are you seeing?

37
38 MR. WAGNER: My son and I, we've been
39 going up to the river to check on it and see how the
40 run is materializing. They're slowly coming back from
41 what we've seen. We were a little bit late in getting
42 up there last spring. For this year hopefully we can
43 get there earlier. A lot of times the weather has a
44 lot to do with it, so it makes it tough to get up there
45 and leave your boat out exposed to the weather, so
46 you're at great risk all the time. We're going to go
47 up so we can keep watching it. The run seems to be
48 strong. It's just spread all out. All of our streams
49 throughout the canal and even upon the Carol Inlet in
50 the past here.

1 I bought this book 12, 14 years ago on
2 Stevenson, BC and it has in there stories on the
3 eulachons there and in the book it tells how the
4 eulachons don't always go back to the same streams that
5 they will and the Nass has always been the strongest
6 with the knowledge of the Canadians on the eulachon
7 run. The Skeena has missed a lot, Kitimat, all the
8 streams they vary depending -- they're smaller streams
9 and they're shallow, so the water seems to have a lot
10 to do with what the eulachon do to make sure they
11 survive when they spawn. So it's been real
12 interesting. It's nice to find the old information
13 like that.

14
15 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. I remember
16 a couple years ago when there was a movement to try to
17 close down the Unuk River and it got up to the Federal
18 Subsistence Board for their consideration. You and
19 your colleagues went up there and very powerfully gave
20 some testimony and you said that it was going to
21 return. All we needed to do was give it time. We see
22 that happening right now. Of course, the Board didn't
23 close it off as was expected. So you and your
24 knowledge -- I can't remember who was with you, but
25 your prediction came true.

26
27 They started to come back.

28
29 Tim, you have a question.

30
31 MR. ACKERMAN: Yeah, thank you, Chair.
32 Mr. Wagner, I'd just like to share some information.
33 Our eulachon run disappeared up in the Haines area for
34 a couple years and it came back finally, but in 2011 we
35 had a record run that happened on the Chilkoot side.
36 They estimated it was a huge biomass that filled up the
37 river and went across the four, five mile Chilkoot Lake
38 and filled up the river for many miles. The Chilkat
39 side, they went up at least 20 miles up the river and
40 that was a record run, so we're waiting and watching to
41 see what happens.

42
43 Then this spring in March down in
44 Oregon the smelt run was so big it filled up the river.
45 It was just unbelievable. So, like you said, they
46 don't always go to the same, but they could disappear
47 and then come back many times their number. So very
48 interesting. I just thought I'd share that with you.
49 Thanks.

50

1 MR. WAGNER: Yeah, and thank you for
2 sharing that. I didn't realize on the Chilkat it
3 disappeared for a couple years. My brother, he lives
4 down on the border down there, it was unbelievable the
5 amount of eulachons that came back. All the way up to
6 the -- was it Bonneville Dam, I believe. People were
7 picking up dead ones and they were getting busted for
8 it. Even one of the people that were cleaning the
9 area, they had 15, 20 pounds on him and he got cited
10 for it. That was kind of funny. But something else,
11 darn. Shoot, I forget now, but there was something
12 else I was going to -- it would have went along with
13 that.

14

15 Thank you for sharing that.

16

17 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Gunalcheesh, Mr.
18 Wagner. We've got one more on non-agenda testimony.
19 Mr. Rob Sanderson, please come forward. Your discussion
20 is on bycatch. That will be our last non-agenda item
21 testimony for now. The rest deals with the next item
22 we have, which are proposals.

23

24 Go ahead, Mr. Sanderson.

25

26 MR. SANDERSON: Thank you, Mr.
27 Chairman. Good morning members of the RAC. Rob
28 Sanderson. I'm here representing the Ketchikan Tlingit
29 and Haida Community Council. I serve as the chairman
30 here on the Revill Island area.

31

32 With that, two weeks ago one trawler,
33 and I touched on this last night before the Federal
34 Subsistence Board, took out 104 tons of halibut.
35 That's just one boat. We don't know what the rest of
36 them are doing. I'm just bringing this to you to make
37 you aware of what's going on. I'm pretty sure the
38 numbers are a lot higher on other trawlers. There's a
39 lot of attention being put on the chinook salmon.
40 Nobody is making too much noise on the halibut right
41 now. That needs to be addressed at all levels, at all
42 fishery groups. If this is not addressed -- as we all
43 know, halibut is a slow evolving fish.

44

45 It hurts to see a lot of our people
46 cited, gear confiscated and the list goes on because of
47 one fish over the limit. I'll use my brother as an
48 example over in Prince of Wales this summer. He had to
49 go 30 miles just to get his fish outside of Hydaburg.
50 That's probably 30, 40 bucks in gas back and forth. He

1 was one over the limit on one of his rockfish and they
2 took it from him. They met him at the dock. So he was
3 only allowed to take one home, a yellow eye.

4
5 Those are the things we're facing here
6 in Southeast and the rest of the state. I'm sure that
7 you all are well aware of that, but I just wanted to
8 bring those comments this morning. I'm not going to
9 take too much more of your time. We do have meetings
10 in Anchorage this week on chinook bycatch, which I'll
11 be attending and I'll be reporting back at your guys'
12 next meeting. I don't know if it's final decision. I
13 don't think it will be, but final decision will be
14 probably at one of the next three meetings at the North
15 Pacific Fisheries Management Council on chinook
16 bycatch.

17
18 My main thing before I leave here is
19 that we need to start paying attention to the halibut
20 bycatch too. So that's all, sir, and I thank you for
21 your time.

22
23 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you for sharing
24 that with us, Robert. Appreciate it.

25
26 Gunalcheesh.

27
28 Got a question.

29
30 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
31 don't really have a question. I want to thank Robert
32 for keeping track of this. We need somebody that will
33 be constantly on their case because this is very
34 important not only to the fishermen in Southeast but
35 the subsistence people up in the Yukon area and in the
36 Western part of Alaska. They need to be kept aware and
37 somebody keeping an eye on these trawlers to make sure
38 that we have some fish set aside for subsistence.

39
40 MR. SANDERSON: Yes. I just want to
41 touch on your question. In Juneau last spring, the
42 North Pacific Fisheries Management Council, they were
43 able to get the numbers on non-trawl bycatch down to
44 7,500 per vessel. So it's important to have that
45 tribal voice at the meetings. We were told that two
46 tribal entities that were there played a big role and
47 helped in maybe getting the attention of the North
48 Pacific Fisheries Management Council, enough to get
49 those numbers turned down. So our tribal voices are
50 very important to attend any kind of meeting that

1 affects our way of life and our food. That's not just
2 for you guys here, but also to our Native brothers and
3 sisters that are sitting behind me.

4

5 Thank you very much.

6

7 You guys have a good day.

8

9 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Rob.

10

11 Tim, question.

12

13 MR. ACKERMAN: Yeah, I think a couple
14 years ago we made a request for the amount of halibut
15 bycatch, I believe, in one of the meetings here and I
16 think the numbers we received on the halibut bycatch
17 exceeded the whole quota that was for the inside waters
18 from these bycatch on these draggers here.

19

20 In our end of the gauntlet is what we
21 call it up in Haines there, we got what we call ping
22 pong paddles now, is the halibut. We call them ping
23 pong paddles. Very lean, small, very small, very small
24 numbers. Everybody s tired of doing water hauls.
25 People are going broke trying to catch the halibut up
26 there, so they just gave up. There's a few that are
27 caught, but not anything like it used to be.

28

29 It s a problem, like you said. Very
30 interesting to see on our end of the gauntlet is what
31 we call it. Very few and far between. A lot of people
32 gave up halibut fishing. One guy caught 10 sharks and
33 that was it for the whole season. Everything else is
34 gone for us up there. So I just thought I'd pass that
35 along. Thanks.

36

37 MR. SANDERSON: Yeah, they migrate like
38 salmon and they re intercepted out there in the Gulf
39 and they're not making their way in. Just to answer
40 one more question. One trawler does more damage than
41 our entire communities in Southeast Alaska in a year
42 and what they would do in one trip.

43

44 So there you go.

45

46 Thank you.

47

48 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Rob. We're
49 going to take a break at this point and then we're
50 going to come back and start doing the proposals we

1 have on the agenda.

2

3 Ten minute break.

4

5 (Off record)

6

7 (On record)

8

9 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Please take
10 your seats. I turned the gavel over to Mr. Bangs, so
11 he'll conduct this portion of the meeting. We're now
12 on wildlife proposals.

13

14 So go ahead, Mr. Bangs.

15

16 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
17 Chairman. We're going to start on the wildlife
18 proposals.

19

20 WP14-03.

21

22 Mr. Chester.

23

24 Excuse me, Dennis. Mr. Larson.

25

26 MR. LARSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
27 I'd like to bring to the attention of the Chair that
28 Mr. Ron Leighton would like to speak to his Proposal
29 03-04 during the public comment period.

30

31 Thank you.

32

33 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
34 Larson. Should we have the public testimony right
35 after the Staff analysis?

36

37 MR. LARSON: Yes.

38

39 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Okay. Thank you.

40

41 Dennis.

42

43 MR. CHESTER: Good morning, Mr. Chair.
44 Members of the Council. My name is Dennis Chester and
45 I'm with the U.S. Forest Service, Juneau Ranger
46 District, and I'm presenting the analysis for Proposal
47 14-03. That starts on page 40 of your books.

48

49 Proposal WP14-03 was submitted by Ron
50 Leighton and requests that the female deer harvest

1 season in Unit 2 be eliminated. The existing Federal
2 regulation is a five deer harvest limit, one of which
3 may be a female deer. The season is open from July
4 24th through December 31st and female deer may be taken
5 from October 15th through December 31st. The State has
6 a four deer harvest limit with no harvest of female
7 deer allowed. The State season extends from August 1st
8 to December 31st.

9

10 The Federal regulation allowing the
11 harvest of one female deer was established in the 1995
12 season. There have been seven proposals to the Federal
13 Subsistence Board requesting closure of the female deer
14 harvest since that time and all have been rejected.

15

16 One of the key questions in the
17 analysis of this proposal is what is the population
18 status. It was far from perfect. The main data we
19 have to address that question is pellet group transects
20 that have been done since the early 1980s.

21

22 Figure 2 on Page 45 shows the results
23 of the Unit 2 pellet group surveys. This data suggests
24 that population unit wide has been generally increasing
25 for the last 10 years. Harvest data can also provide
26 an indication of the population status. Figures 3 and
27 4 on Page 47 generally indicate that deer harvest is up
28 in recent years and that the effort it takes to harvest
29 a deer is down. This supports the pellet group data
30 that the population has increased. Figure 3 also shows
31 the estimated female deer harvest, which has remained
32 pretty steady at just over 100 does per year or about 4
33 percent of the total harvest.

34

35 If this proposal is adopted, it would
36 likely reduce deer harvest and harvest efficiency as
37 well as opportunity for subsistence users. The OSM
38 preliminary conclusion is to oppose Proposal WP14-03.
39 It does not appear necessary for conservation of the
40 resource. Available data suggests that the deer
41 population is healthy and that existing female deer
42 harvest does not appear to be limiting the Unit 2 deer
43 population.

44

45 Thank you.

46

47 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
48 Chester. Are there any questions from the Council.

49

50 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.

1 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Ms. Phillips.
2
3 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Chairman
4 Bangs. Mr. Chester, it says on Page 45 that the
5 Brinkman study estimates a 30 percent population
6 decrease. With that factored in, is it still a healthy
7 enough population?
8
9 MR. CHESTER: That study was done
10 during the last high snow winters and when I kind of
11 teased into the data, the different watersheds had
12 different numbers, so overall they showed a 30 percent
13 decrease. But even since that time Fish and Game
14 publications have indicated that they believed that the
15 population has increased and it's very healthy right
16 now.
17
18 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Mr. Douville.
19
20 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Chairman. So
21 what I'm hearing then is they just devised a more
22 accurate way of counting the deer, which indicated a
23 lesser number but more accurate way of counting them,
24 but overall the population is fine.
25
26 MR. CHESTER: Through the Chair. I'm
27 assuming you're talking about the DNA. Yeah, it seems
28 to be a more effective, more accurate way. It's still
29 kind of in development shall we say, but it does seem
30 to give a more accurate estimate of deer populations.
31
32 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Any other questions.
33 Mr. Wright.
34
35 MR. ISAACS: Yeah, a question. When
36 you estimate the population in the areas, are you
37 talking about the road systems or are you also counting
38 the island population deer?
39
40 MR. CHESTER: The traditional pellet
41 group transects that were the main data that I was
42 looking at are -- that estimate is for the island as a
43 whole, Unit 2 as a whole.
44
45 MR. ISAACS: Which includes the road
46 systems, correct?
47
48 MR. CHESTER: Correct.
49
50 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.

1 Isaac.

2

3 Mr. Wright.

4

5 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

6 Does this study show that if you had a tough winter,

7 the high snow, that the population would still be

8 healthy?

9

10 MR. CHESTER: I'm not sure what would

11 happen the next time we have a big snow winter, but it

12 appears Unit 2 did not suffer as bad during 2006 to

13 2009 timeframe when we had those several bad winters in

14 a row. It seemed like some of the local watersheds

15 probably had some pretty definite impacts whereas

16 others didn't seem to be effected as much, but Unit 2

17 as a whole seems to have faired pretty well.

18

19 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.

20 Chester.

21

22 Any other questions.

23

24 (No comments)

25

26 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Hearing none. Thank

27 you.

28

29 Ms. Yuhas.

30

31 MS. YUHAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

32 For the State's comments, we'll also have Mr. Doug

33 Larsen with us, who is the regional supervisor for

34 Division of Wildlife Conservation for Southeast Alaska.

35 The Department is neutral on this particular proposal

36 and Mr. Larsen is here to explain details and take

37 biology questions.

38

39 MR. D. LARSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman

40 and RAC members. For the record, my name is Doug

41 Larson. I am the regional supervisor for the Wildlife

42 Division in Southeast Alaska. Unlike my esteemed

43 distant cousin Robert Larson, I spell my name L-A-R-S-

44 E-N, so just for distinction.

45

46 (Laughter)

47

48 MR. D. LARSEN: Before I get started I

49 did want to take a moment to acknowledge and compliment

50 Patty for her long service. I can remember the first

1 meeting we were at together in Craig back in the early
2 '90s and to think 20 years has passed, it's just
3 amazing how fast time goes by and how many issues have
4 come before the Council that we interacted with you on
5 and sure appreciate all your service.

6
7 In terms of this particular proposal, I
8 think it's important to note and I think Dennis has
9 done a very good job of giving you good background for
10 your consideration. Places like Prince of Wales where
11 you've got predator/prey systems that have multiple
12 predators and in this case we have black bears and
13 wolves, typically those predators are able to keep
14 populations at lower levels than what the habitat can
15 support.

16
17 Consequently, in most instances, doe
18 seasons wouldn't necessarily be recommended. In fact,
19 the State in the past had some concerns about doe
20 harvest in Unit 2 for that reason. What we've observed
21 though over time and I think Dennis again has given
22 good testimony about this, is that the deer population
23 at this point in time appears to be, relatively
24 speaking, up. At least on a good portion of Unit 2.

25
26 At the same time, I think it's
27 important to recognize that all indications are that
28 the black bear and wolf populations are somewhat at
29 lower levels. This may, in fact, be a cause and effect
30 in terms of why the deer numbers are higher at this
31 point than they have been in the past.

32
33 Given that deer numbers are at
34 relatively speaking high numbers, having a doe harvest
35 isn't necessarily a bad thing. In fact, as you get
36 closer to the carrying capacity, obviously taking out
37 some does and reducing the capability of the population
38 to increase can be a benefit.

39
40 The reason we're neutral is we don't
41 have sufficient data in my mind to say that, yes, we
42 need to do something about the population growth. In
43 fact, I think there are places in Unit 2 and I think,
44 in talking with Mr. Hernandez, there are places, for
45 example, on the north end where the numbers may benefit
46 from additional growth. So, in fact, harvesting does
47 in that part of the island maybe isn't a good idea.
48 But then you get into the complicating factor of, well,
49 do you allow it parts of the island but not all the
50 island. You've got the bootlegging issues, enforcement

1 issues, those kinds of things that really complicate
2 it.

3

4 So, all things considered, it seems to
5 us that at this point continuing to have a doe season
6 would not necessarily be a bad thing and it certainly
7 is not a conservation issue. Now, that said, I think
8 it's important to recognize and I know this Council is
9 fully aware of second growth timber habitats and how
10 the stem exclusion affects deer populations.

11

12 Also the winters. As Mr. Wright asked
13 a question about how do big winters affect deer
14 populations. Well, as we know, Mother Nature has a big
15 hand in what happens with populations. To the extent
16 that we have healthy population today, tomorrow we have
17 a bad winter, we could see that change. I think the
18 real key is that as we see those changes and the
19 information becomes available for us to make decisions
20 with, that we take appropriate action.

21

22 So, in the future, if and when we have
23 that tough winter that knocks a deer population down or
24 when we see the stem exclusion result in less habitat
25 availability for deer, I think it's going to be
26 important for the State and the Federal systems to
27 recognize that and to make appropriate changes to stay
28 in sync with that reality. Again, at this point in
29 time, the State doesn't see any issue with continuing
30 to harvest a few does in Unit 2.

31

32 With that, I would take questions if
33 there are any. Thanks.

34

35 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
36 Larsen. Any questions.

37

38 Mr. Ackerman.

39

40 MR. ACKERMAN: Yeah, I was over in
41 Prince of Wales, just some information I would share
42 here, last March and just happened upon this trapper
43 that had got two wolves up there in Sea Otter Sound and
44 the wolves were pretty emaciated. They were just all
45 skin and bones. Evidently they were so hungry that
46 there was something partially dead on the island out
47 there and they had actually swam out to the bait set
48 that was on this island and there was two of them
49 together, apparently from the same litter, but they
50 were pretty emaciated.

1 Any indication of the ecosystem as in a
2 loss of food, given the deer population possibly not
3 sufficient enough to feed these wolves and keep the
4 entire population healthy, it could be an indicator, it
5 could be other things other than, but very interesting
6 to listen to that.

7
8 As well, the interesting thing is when
9 you speak about logging and the effects on the
10 ecosystem, not only on the animals, but given an
11 example of Hoonah, one of the finest deer producing
12 areas that I've ever seen in my time until it was
13 logged, then it was over. There was no old growth
14 canopy for the deer to sustain themselves throughout
15 the winter, so it changed the whole ecosystem in Hoonah
16 there and as well it affected all the subsistence
17 users, as well as the fishing streams, as well as deer
18 population and the bear moved on or moved into town.
19 But, yeah, very interesting to hear that. Thanks.

20
21 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
22 Ackerman.

23
24 Any other questions for Mr. Larsen or
25 Ms. Yuhas.

26
27 (No comments)

28
29 VICE CHAIR BANGS: I have one question,
30 Doug. I know that you were part of the Unit 2 deer
31 study years ago that we had a subcommittee from this
32 Council involved in and I was part of that as well. We
33 found that the doe harvest -- part of the reason, other
34 than just for subsistence uses, people felt that they
35 had always taken does and they would continue to take
36 does and we were concerned about the stem exclusion
37 stages that were inevitably going to come. We found
38 that after we went to a few of these communities and
39 were able to educate some of the people about the
40 effects of taking does that they weren't aware of, they
41 decided that that wasn't a good thing and they would
42 only take them if they really needed to.

43
44 I was wondering -- we went through a
45 process of education outreach. I was wondering if you
46 knew how that transpired after our study was done
47 because we were really adamant about trying to educate
48 the people that used the resources on Unit 2 to be
49 aware of the consequences of taking too many does.
50

1 MR. D. LARSEN: Thank you, Mr. Bangs.
2 I think that certainly any time we can spend time
3 sharing thoughts back and forth, not just us educating,
4 but others educating us, which I think is important, I
5 think we all grow from that. And I do think that based
6 on the information that we've seen in terms of the data
7 that are available -- and, you know, in all honesty,
8 the data are what they are and we try our best to get
9 as good as we can in terms of harvest numbers and we
10 feel like we accomplished that to the extent that we're
11 able, with the limitations that we're faced with. The
12 reality is we don't have super high integrity in terms
13 of our data quality, but what we have available
14 certainly suggests that the numbers of does that people
15 are taking is relatively small. I mean certainly in
16 terms of the overall population.

17
18 What I don't know though, Mr. Bangs, is
19 whether -- I'd have to go back and look, frankly, to
20 see whether there's been any change in those estimates
21 of doe harvest, but I do think that the communication
22 lines have certainly been opened and I do think, as
23 you've said, that there are people who have, in those
24 conversations, you know, come to realize that, boy,
25 there's some implications behind whatever actions we
26 take and I think that there are at least some who have
27 thought, you know, given what we understand about the
28 system, we're going to do exactly as you said. We're
29 going to limit the numbers of does taken and I think,
30 again, our data reflects that it's a relatively small
31 number that are harvested.

32
33 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
34 Larsen.

35
36 Any other questions.

37
38 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.

39
40 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Ms. Phillips.

41
42 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Could I before Ms.
43 Phillips.

44
45 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Mr. Adams.

46
47 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: It's a point of order.
48 I'm sorry, Patty. If you remember a couple years ago
49 we had some pretty good training in Sitka about how the
50 Council can play their part in moving the agenda

1 forward. When we're at this part, you know, of the
2 agenda where the analysis is given and then the State
3 comes up and does their thing, that we reserve this
4 portion of it to questions of the people that are at
5 the table right now. Our comments can come when we are
6 deliberating, okay. We could make a comment and say
7 for this reason I'm going to vote for or against the
8 proposal.

9

10 But I just wanted to remind us all, you
11 know, that this portion of this particular issue is
12 reserved for questions. Maybe a short comment or two,
13 but mostly for questions.

14

15 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
16 Adams.

17

18 Ms. Phillips.

19

20 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Chairman
21 Bangs. I have a couple of questions that I'll be
22 asking. One is we heard from Councilman Jackson that
23 in the Kake area that the ANCSA lands are being thinned
24 by Sealaska and that they're seeing greater
25 productivity of forage foods. Do you see that
26 happening on Prince of Wales Island, that the ANCSA
27 lands are being thinned and greater forage habitat is
28 there for the deer?

29

30 MR. D. LARSEN: Through the Chair,
31 Member Phillips. I think what we've learned is that
32 any time we go in and thin stands and take out some of
33 the overstory and provide light to get into otherwise
34 shaded areas, that does result in an increased flourish
35 of understory shrubs and forbs, which, of course, are
36 very important for deer.

37

38 So, in the near term or short term,
39 yes, the answer is any place we can do that it does
40 result in at least some short term positive effects for
41 food availability for deer. The bigger question is how
42 much of that can you actually do from a cost standpoint
43 and does it have, you know, a big effect overall with
44 the population as a whole. That's a separate question,
45 but in terms of does that effect or have a positive
46 effect on deer, the answer is yes.

47

48 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, Mr.
49 Larsen. We heard from Councilman Isaacs that the roads
50 are being closed on POW and only certain roads are

1 open, so in my mind that means those roads are getting
2 heavier hit with hunting effort. So would that leave a
3 perception that there's less deer because it's a
4 heavier harvest in those areas?

5
6 MR. D. LARSEN: Through the Chair to
7 Member Phillips. That's a really interesting question.
8 I think perception is reality. So, to the extent that
9 people go to maybe favorite places that they've gone to
10 and they see either more or less, then to them that's
11 what the population as a whole is doing because that's
12 their experience. So, to the extent that people have
13 that history with given areas and they can't move into
14 other areas where they may have hunted otherwise, I
15 could see where that perception would be there.

16
17 Certainly, you know, when we've asked
18 people about their perception of numbers, not really
19 surprisingly you get the whole gamut from, boy, I see
20 all sorts of deer to, man, I can't find a deer. So I
21 think to some extent that's reality because people have
22 different experiences and some of that experience may
23 be skill level, some of it may be places where habitat
24 is changing and certainly one of the things that we've
25 observed over time is places that were clear-cut logged
26 obviously had very good sightability at least for a
27 while, but as those areas grew up and people who
28 traditionally hunted those same areas, the changes were
29 not necessarily because there were fewer animals, but
30 because there was less ability to see those animals.

31
32 So I guess my point is that there's an
33 awful lot of factors that can play into perceptions,
34 which then become individual realities.

35
36 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
37 Larsen.

38
39 Any other questions.

40
41 (No comments)

42
43 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Hearing none. Thank
44 you both.

45
46 Is there any Federal agency staff.

47
48 (No comments)

49
50 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Any Native, tribal,

1 village comments.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 VICE CHAIR BANGS: InterAgency Staff

6 comments.

7

8 Mr. Kessler.

9

10 MR. KESSLER: Good morning, Mr.

11 Chairman. Members of the Council. InterAgency Staff

12 Committee found the Staff analysis to be a thorough and

13 accurate evaluation of the proposal and that it

14 provides a sufficient basis for a Regional Advisory

15 Council recommendation on this proposal.

16

17 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Steve.

18

19 Any questions.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Mr. Larson, are

24 there any Fish and Game Advisory Committee comments?

25

26 MR. LARSON: No, Mr. Chair, there are

27 not.

28

29 VICE CHAIR BANGS: There's nobody from

30 the National Park Service. Is there any written

31 comments?

32

33 MR. LARSON: Bear with me just one

34 second. Mr. Chair, there are no written public

35 comments.

36

37 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.

38 Larson.

39

40 Mr. Leighton, public testimony.

41

42 MR. LEIGHTON: Good morning. My name

43 is Ron Leighton. I'm here representing myself. I put

44 the proposal in for a doe hunt in Unit 2 for -- I

45 became aware of a situation that happened in Kasaan and

46 it appalled me that something like this could happen at

47 that level. It was a family that had six kids. The

48 kids weren't old enough to buy a license, but they'd go

49 -- because they can hunt they went and got the tags for

50 each one of the six children plus both parents. Then

1 they went out on the road system outside of Kasaan
2 there and they took eight does. They, at the time, did
3 not care whether or not that doe was in the presence of
4 and had fawns. I felt that -- and this was done
5 legally. I felt if this can be done legally and it
6 does catch on, how much of an effect would it have.

7

8 Myself, personally, I don't take doe.
9 I know a lot of people that don't take does. I've seen
10 plenty of tough winters over a period of time, my
11 lifetime, that happened pretty sudden, pretty fast and
12 deplete deer populations rapidly. We haven't had those
13 winters yet that I've seen in the past. They could
14 happen. They could happen this year, maybe next year.

15

16 I know there's a lot of people -- like
17 the State just says there's not a conservation issue at
18 this point. Well, maybe there isn't at this point, but
19 if we're hit with a severe winter, then you have a
20 conservation issue. I feel that we shouldn't have to
21 wait for a conservation issue to go ahead and enhance
22 and protect the resources. I think that we have to
23 weigh the situation pretty carefully and see what's
24 going on.

25

26 There was a lot of mention here on the
27 road system. Patty was saying there that -- you know,
28 asked a good question, that you know there's a lot of
29 road closures and this and that and the concentration
30 is being concentrated down into the area that is more
31 populated. Some of the other areas, especially in the
32 stormy part of the seasons, they don't get hunted, so
33 those people that come to the island or hunt on the
34 island they do concentrate on areas immediately around
35 the villages and stuff.

36

37 So this is why I felt it was important
38 maybe to even bring it up. Is there a process? Do you
39 have to review a process or do you have to put in place
40 a process that maybe this shouldn't happen. Maybe if
41 there's a large family like that maybe two doe per
42 household or one doe per household, but these eight doe
43 per household it just appalls me and that's why I put
44 the proposal in.

45

46 With that, I'll end it.

47

48 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
49 Leighton.

50

1 Any questions.
2
3 (No comments)
4
5 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
6 Leighton. What's the wish of the Council.
7
8 Mr. Hernandez.
9
10 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.
11 Chairman. I would move to adopt Wildlife Proposal 14-
12 03.
13
14 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I'll second.
15
16 VICE CHAIR BANGS: We have a motion to
17 accept the proposal and a second.
18
19 Discussion.
20
21 Mr. Hernandez.
22
23 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.
24 Chairman. With this proposal I think the evidence
25 shows that for Unit 2 as a whole we're not dealing with
26 a conservation concern at this time. However, I would
27 like to state for the record that with some confidence
28 I think I could say on the north end of the island we
29 do not have the high deer population that the southern
30 portion of the island is enjoying. The north end of
31 the island has a different climate and different
32 landscape to some degree.
33
34 It's the north end of the island and
35 most of the winter -- a lot of the winter range is
36 northerly facing exposure. We have the influence of
37 the cold winds that come down the Stikine River, flow
38 through Summer Strait, making our winters a little bit
39 harder than the rest of the island, which benefits from
40 the warmer climate of the Pacific exposure. I wouldn't
41 characterize the north end of the island as having a
42 conservation concern at this time because the
43 population is relatively good.
44
45 In my opening comments, community
46 concerns, I kind of talked about this idea of hunting
47 and harvesting. The people in our communities that
48 utilize the north end of the island are not having
49 their needs met to the extent that they would like.
50 We're getting deer, but we're spending a lot more time

1 out there hunting. If the populations were healthier,
2 it would be more of a harvest.

3
4 People that have been on the -- lived
5 there for long periods of time can easily remember when
6 going out and getting enough deer to meet your needs
7 was just a matter of going down to your favorite
8 hunting spot and spending a few days and you'd come
9 back with everything you need. I don't know of anybody
10 that's doing that anymore. We're getting the deer to
11 meet our minimum requirements and we're spending a lot
12 of time, a lot of expense.

13
14 The characteristics of our community is
15 we're a fishing community. Virtually everybody in the
16 community is a fisherman and when the fishing season is
17 done, we go deer hunting. Nobody has a job. We're not
18 limited to going out on the weekend or a vacation or
19 something to get our deer. We take as much time as we
20 need to go out and get the deer that we need. People
21 are not satisfied that their needs are being met
22 because it's just getting to be a lot of work.

23
24 So, for the north end of the island,
25 it's not to the point where it's a conservation
26 concern, but it's meeting our needs. So as far as the
27 criteria go, how does this address our subsistence
28 needs. I know my community would want me to support
29 this proposal to eliminate the doe hunt because we do
30 see it as a limiting factor in helping the population
31 grow to the point where we could have more of a deer
32 harvest and less of a deer hunt.

33
34 Every doe taken essentially eliminates
35 two, if not three deer as potential population because
36 they're going to have fawns, it's going to help to
37 increase the population even to a small extent. We
38 would like to see any factor that could help increase
39 the population.

40
41 One of the other factors in the
42 population on the north end that I didn't mention was
43 the predation. We probably have a fairly healthy wolf
44 population up there. Most people would agree with me
45 on that. The local area we don't have a lot of active
46 wolf trapping happening on the north end of the island,
47 so for localized conditions we probably do have a few
48 more wolves, a little more predation.

49
50 So, yes, any effort that would help to

1 increase the deer population would be appreciated. So
2 it's kind of a balance, kind of a trade-off here. If
3 you eliminate the doe hunt, you are taking away some
4 opportunity to harvest a deer. Almost everybody I
5 know, with maybe a few exceptions, like Mr. Leighton
6 will not shoot a doe. Very few does get harvested.
7 Then you're in this situation where your needs are not
8 being met. There are a few people that when they're
9 not meeting their needs will go out and shoot a doe.

10

11 So, like I say, it's a balancing act,
12 increasing the population, decreasing opportunity.
13 It's kind of a tough call to make. I think just given
14 the feelings of most of the members of my community, I
15 would probably be voting to support this proposal.

16

17 Thank you.

18

19 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.

20 Hernandez.

21

22 Any other comments.

23

24 Mr. Douville.

25

26 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Chairman. I
27 will not support this proposal. It's always been
28 customary and traditional to take does, there's no
29 conservation concern and the numbers harvested are very
30 small. I live on the other end of the island than
31 Mr. Hernandez and we have healthy deer populations.

32

33 For some people it's a personal
34 preference to take a doe later in the year. If you
35 want one late in November or December or want to get
36 meat then, it's the best meat, December particularly.
37 Some people have that preference and they should not
38 lose that opportunity, particularly when populations
39 are really good.

40

41 I cannot support this proposal.

42

43 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.

44 Douville.

45

46 Mr. Kitka.

47

48 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
49 have to go back. In the early days when I was hunting
50 with my father and he was involved with the Federal

1 Fish and Game over studies that were done on the deer
2 population back in the '30s and '40s. During those
3 times when there was tough winters and the deer
4 populations had decreased to such an extent and they
5 didn't know why. They only used to have a buck hunting
6 season and they never took the does.

7

8 I realize Prince of Wales is a little
9 different because of the predation, but up in the
10 country where I come from the bucks don't come down
11 from the mountaintops until real late in the rutting
12 season and when they come down and when they're through
13 with whatever they're doing, they're pretty weak. Come
14 to find out the doe population had increased so much
15 that there was no food for those bucks after the
16 rutting season was over and they were dying on the
17 beach.

18

19 I'm not too sure that's what happened
20 up in the Hoonah area, but when you have no food for
21 them and they're eating whatever they can find a lot of
22 them will starve and will die right there. That's why
23 we have such a big winter kill sometimes is there's no
24 food for them when they come down.

25

26 Thank you.

27

28 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Harvey.

29

30 Any other comments.

31

32 Mr. Adams.

33

34 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr.
35 Chairman. I'm at a point where I think I'm going to
36 oppose this proposal. I sympathize with the proponent,
37 with his concern of a family taking eight female deer.
38 I think maybe I would have had a different view of it
39 if the proposal would say limit, as he suggested,
40 families to two or three deer instead of being
41 unlimited.

42

43 There is no conservation concern, as
44 already indicated. However, I think the proponent is
45 looking ahead a little bit, that this kind of practice
46 might take hold in the future and to protect the
47 resources, you know, I think that's pretty visionary.
48 However, I don't believe that I could support this
49 proposal at this time.

50

1 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2

3 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
4 Adams. I'd just like to make a comment. The reason I
5 asked Mr. Larsen about the educational outreach that we
6 spoke about earlier is it addresses the problem that
7 Mr. Leighton spoke about. The people that are taking
8 the does don t always understand the consequences and
9 that's why I think it's important that the education
10 part is out there so that everybody understands what
11 the consequences are when you take too many.

12

13 Anyway, thank you.

14

15 Any other questions or comments.

16

17 Mr. Jackson.

18

19 MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman. Listening
20 to everybody and knowing not too much about Unit 2
21 except the geographics that it's such a big island, I
22 think the proponent, when he introduced this, was
23 concerned basically about, you're right, taking eight
24 does, but I look at it as the villages that are down
25 towards the southern end of the island are mostly
26 hunting to keep their families alive and fed. I think
27 if there should be any problem towards the southern
28 end, and the northern end already seems to be in a
29 problem, is that maybe a boundary by the Fish and
30 Wildlife could be put in if they could study the
31 northern part better.

32

33 Customarily and traditionally,
34 everybody, Sitka, Hoonah, Kake, I would have to say
35 when it comes to getting meat, we take does. Unless it
36 becomes apparent that we're going to lose because of
37 weather and/or some tidal wave or something wipes out
38 something, I would have to be against this proposal.

39

40 Thank you.

41

42 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
43 Jackson.

44

45 Mr. Douville.

46

47 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Chairman.
48 One thing I did not say is this proposal would put an
49 unnecessary restriction on subsistence users. Before
50 you can restrict the rural user in Title VIII you have

1 to eliminate all other users and I don t feel it's
2 necessary to go there at this time.

3

4 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
5 Douville.

6

7 Anyone else.

8

9 Mr. Kookesh.

10

11 MR. KOOKESH: Yeah, Mr. Banks. I m
12 from Unit 4 and one of the things we run into in Unit 4
13 is the magnitude of our unit because it encompasses a
14 road system like Hoonah's. When you try to make a
15 regulation for a unit, say for example for Hoonah, you
16 have to make sure it doesn't affect Angoon. One of the
17 things that's been talked about is about breaking our
18 unit out so that road systems are separate units.
19 Maybe that would probably be something to think about
20 as we go through this process and to break out Unit 2
21 because it seems to be a big island in itself. Just a
22 thought.

23

24 Being from Unit 4, I'm just listening
25 to what the Unit 2 people say because I'm not too
26 knowledgeable and I value their expertise and I'll
27 probably follow their lead.

28

29 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
30 Kookesh. So you're referring to the NECCU.

31

32 Mr. Hernandez and then Mr. Isaacs.

33

34 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Responding
35 to this idea of the differences between the north end
36 of the island and the south end of the island, that's
37 something that the subcommittee talked about quite a
38 bit, whether there was some advantage to separating the
39 island into different districts. I guess we pretty
40 much got away from that idea.

41

42 It is interesting to note that we did
43 draw a line at the southern end of the island between
44 where subsistence and non-subsistence users can hunt.
45 There is an area at the very southern end of the island
46 where it's -- the rest of the island is restricted to
47 hunting in the early part of August, but the south end
48 of the island is not restricted. Between subsistence
49 users, we didn't want to draw any lines, so it was kind
50 of a distinction there. So nobody from my community

1 really wanted to make a proposal to make this a
2 northern/southern division within subsistence users.

3

4 I guess one other point I'd like to
5 make as far as decreasing the subsistence opportunity
6 if you eliminate the doe season, I guess I would argue
7 that in a good, healthy deer population as apparently
8 exists on the lower part of the island, how much of a
9 restriction would you really be placing on people if it
10 was easy to go out and harvest enough bucks to meet
11 your needs without having to harvest a doe. So I would
12 just throw that out for some consideration.

13

14 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Don.

15

16 Mr. Isaacs.

17

18 MR. ISAACS: In reading the proposal
19 the way it is written, the proponent is concerned that
20 the harvest of female deer contributes to the decline.
21 Earlier Mr. Larsen, S-E-N, said that there is no
22 decline in population of does.

23

24 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Mr. Larsen, could
25 you come -- he just wanted to know if you had stated
26 that there was no population decrease in does. Is that
27 what you're saying, Mr. Isaac?

28

29 MR. D. LARSEN: Thank you for the
30 spelling distinction. I did not say that specifically.
31 When we estimate deer populations, it's just deer
32 populations as a whole. We really have no way to
33 differentiate bucks from does at this point.

34

35 One of the things though that you
36 talked about earlier relative to the DNA work, assuming
37 that actually works for us and we're hoping it will and
38 we're still testing that, that could help with that
39 distinction between bucks and does to get some sense
40 for numbers of bucks versus numbers of does. Currently
41 we just go with population trends as a whole.

42

43 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Doug.

44

45 Mr. Isaacs, follow up.

46

47 MR. ISAACS: Thank you. I learned a
48 long time ago not to ask government workers too many
49 questions because they just go on and on and on.

50

1 (Laughter)

2

3 MR. ISAACS: Earlier I was dead set
4 against the proposal supporting it, but the mention
5 though of the opportunity for someone who does need the
6 food, the deer meat, and that opportunity being taken
7 away from them in the time of a difficult winter for
8 deer changed my mind.

9

10 I have to mention years ago my Uncle
11 Frank Peratrovich told me, he said when you get to
12 these meetings, he said, and you're dead set against
13 something with somebody, he said sit down and talk with
14 them. They might turn you around or they'll turn you
15 around -- or you'll turn them around on an issue. He
16 said, so don't take it personal. I learned that from
17 my Uncle Frank Peratrovich and I've always tried to
18 keep that in mind when I'm sitting and deliberating on
19 an issue.

20

21 I might mention what's turning me
22 around on this now. I don't shoot does as personal
23 preference. I try not to shoot does. I remember my
24 mother telling me as my brothers and I were getting
25 ready to go hunting and telling us in Tlingit not to
26 shoot these does and her reason for it and that still
27 stays in my mind. Now I've got sons that hunt and I
28 keep telling them this.

29

30 Then again there s other factors
31 involved of why we could and maybe why we might have to
32 take a doe once in awhile and I've learned to
33 distinguish the difference between a barren doe and a
34 regular doe. Anybody that has a barren doe running at
35 them, you know what I mean. I shot one up on Klawock
36 Mountain one time and I thought to myself, I should not
37 have touched that darn son of a gun because I had to
38 pack it down. But barren does are huge.

39

40 All these little things that come into
41 play on the proposal and I appreciate Ron's work in
42 putting this together, but I think now I'm going to
43 have to turn around on this.

44

45 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

46

47 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Aaron.
48 Any other comments, questions.

49

50 Mr. Adams.

1 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr.
2 Chairman. My mind hasn't been changed as to how I'm
3 going to vote. However, I'd just like to share with
4 you my own personal experiences. I don't hunt deer in
5 Yakutat. My sons do that. In fact, they retired me
6 from hunting moose and deer a long time ago. Last year
7 -- and I hope Ms. Oehlers later will be able to share
8 with us the deer situation in Yakutat this past year,
9 but the year before that we had a real big snowfall.

10
11 The year before that big snowfall there
12 was a lot of deer in there, so my sons, my step-son and
13 my son, they both got deer and my grandson got a deer.
14 So most of our needs were met. But last year, after
15 the heavy snowfall, they did not go out. They did not
16 go out because of the deep snow, that the deers were
17 trying to survive in that year and they knew that there
18 might be a problem with the conservation issues, so
19 they decided that they were not going to hunt any deer.

20
21
22 This is self-regulation. Somebody
23 mentioned education. I think it appears to me that
24 this family who took these eight deers, you know, needs
25 to be educated on real, honest to goodness subsistence
26 hunting and fishing as opposed to -- some people call
27 it greed.

28
29 Anyhow, that's my comments and I'm
30 still going to vote no on this issue. Mr. Chairman.

31
32 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
33 Adams.

34
35 Mr. Douville.

36
37 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Chairman
38 Bangs. I believe we've covered the four criteria and
39 I'd call for the question.

40
41 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
42 Douville. The question has been called for.

43
44 Can we have a roll call vote, please,
45 Mr. Kitka.

46
47 MR. KITKA: Tim Ackerman.

48
49 MR. ACKERMAN: Here.

50

1 (Laughter)
2
3 VICE CHAIR BANGS: It's a vote, yes or
4 no.
5
6 MR. ACKERMAN: Yes.
7
8 MR. KITKA: Frank Wright.
9
10 MR. WRIGHT: No.
11
12 MR. KITKA: Patricia Phillips.
13
14 MS. PHILLIPS: No.
15
16 MR. KITKA: Michael Douville.
17
18 MR. DOUVILLE: No.
19
20 MR. KITKA: Harvey Kitka votes no.
21 Bert Adams.
22
23 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: No.
24
25 MR. KITKA: Floyd Kookesh.
26
27 MR. KOOKESH: No.
28
29 MR. KITKA: Donald Hernandez.
30
31 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.
32
33 MR. KITKA: Kenneth Jackson.
34
35 MR. JACKSON: No.
36
37 MR. KITKA: John Yeager.
38
39 MR. YEAGER: No.
40
41 MR. KITKA: Michael Bangs.
42
43 VICE CHAIR BANGS: No.
44
45 MR. KITKA: Cathy Needham.
46
47 MS. NEEDHAM: No.
48
49 MR. KITKA: Mr. Chair.....
50

1 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Mr. Isaacs.
2
3 MR. KITKA: Did I miss Mr. Isaacs? I'm
4 sorry.
5
6 MR. ISAACS: I vote no.
7
8 MR. KITKA: Mr. Chair. WP14-03 has
9 been opposed.
10
11 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you. Mr.
12 Larson.
13
14 MR. LARSON: Point of clarification,
15 Mr. Chairman. Tim Ackerman voted yes or no.
16
17 MR. ACKERMAN: Yes.
18
19 MR. LARSON: Okay. Thank you.
20
21 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
22 Larson. Okay. That motion fails or the proposal
23 fails.
24
25 The next proposal WP14-04.
26
27 Mr. Reeves.
28
29 MR. REEVES: Good morning, Mr.
30 Chairman. Jeff Reeves, U.S. Forest Service. I'll be
31 presenting the analysis for Wildlife Proposal 14-04.
32 Your executive summary is on Page 49 of your materials.
33 The analysis begins on Page 50. This proposal was also
34 submitted by Ronald Leighton and requests that
35 Federally qualified subsistence users 60 years and
36 older and those with disabilities be allowed an earlier
37 start date for harvesting deer under Federal
38 regulation.
39
40 The proponent is concerned that these
41 individuals have a harder time harvesting the deer
42 needed for their households because of competition from
43 younger, disability free hunters. By allowing both
44 individuals 60 and older and the physically disabled an
45 earlier season, these subsistence users will be able to
46 harvest deer that are less spooky, which can be located
47 road side, at lower elevations on the island and on
48 beaches. As a result, the individuals will feel more
49 personal worth in providing their own household
50 sustenance. The proponent defined the minimum

1 qualifying age for the hunt at 60, which is the same
2 age requirement under State regulation for issuance of
3 a permanent identification card.

4
5 Although the proponent has indicated a
6 starting date of June 15, he indicated he would be
7 satisfied with any start date that gives these
8 individuals an opportunity to harvest deer for their
9 own household without competition. He feels the
10 earlier harvest of male deer should not be a problem
11 because they are easily identified by their developing
12 antlers, and that hunters already have a season harvest
13 limit in place.

14
15 Following years of numerous Unit 2
16 deer-related proposals to the Federal Board, the Board
17 directed this Council to form the Unit 2 Deer Planning
18 Subcommittee back in 2004. This 12 member subcommittee
19 worked together to address the contentious deer
20 management issues within the unit. The Subcommittee
21 recommended to the Council that no major changes to the
22 Unit 2 deer harvest management occurred during 2005
23 through 2007 with the exception of reopening deer
24 hunting on Federal public lands on the southeast
25 portion of the island to non-Federally qualified
26 hunters in 2006.

27
28 For future years, the Subcommittee
29 recommended that deer harvest management tools could be
30 applied in Unit 2 as deer population trends and hunting
31 use patterns change. The degree to which these tools
32 would be employed would be decided through the
33 established public regulatory processes.

34
35 In Southeast Alaska, there are no hunts
36 specifically for Federally qualified users 60 and older
37 or that are physically disabled. There are, however,
38 two sheep hunts in Federal regulation with specific
39 seasons for Federally qualified users that are 60 years
40 of age or older in Units 11 and 12. In 1998, the Board
41 supported WP98-28 creating a sheep season in Unit 11
42 for Federally qualified users 60 or older. In 2004,
43 the Board also considered WP04-80 which created a sheep
44 season in Unit 12 that mirrored the previous created
45 season in Unit 11.

46
47 There had been several other proposals
48 addressing components related to those sheep hunts in
49 Units 11 and 12. WP04-20 requesting that designated
50 hunting be allowed for the late season elder hunt in

1 Unit 11, but the proposal was rejected by the Board
2 because the proposal contradicted the original purpose
3 for establishing the hunt. Other proposals acted upon
4 in 2005 and 2012 allowed for youth to participate with
5 elders in these expanded seasons.

6
7 Although rural residents of Units 1A,
8 2, and 3 qualify for the Unit 2 subsistence deer hunt,
9 the majority of the participating Federally qualified
10 subsistence users reside in one of the eleven
11 communities located in Unit 2.

12
13 A summary of deer harvest in Unit 2
14 since 2005 can be found in Table 1 on Page 56. An
15 estimated 16.8 percent of the Federally qualified
16 subsistence users who could harvest deer on Prince of
17 Wales Island are age 60 and older and you can find a
18 breakdown by age segment in Table 2, which is also on
19 Page 56.

20
21 Determining the actual number of rural
22 residents meeting the disabled category is problematic
23 and may be undeterminable as State and Federal agencies
24 differ in making their determinations. Federal
25 designated hunting does occur in Unit 2 under the terms
26 of a Federal Designated Hunting permit. Since the
27 hunter may hunt on behalf of another Federally
28 qualified user or referred to as recipient, documenting
29 age or disability of
30 the recipient is not required.

31
32 Determining numbers of deer harvested
33 for a disabled recipients or recipients over 60 is
34 impossible. Federal designated harvests can be found
35 in Table 1, which I mentioned earlier.

36
37 In 2009, the Forest Service received
38 direction to review the road base mileage within Unit 2
39 to identify road systems which could be removed from
40 the road inventory. The agency analyzed approximately
41 1,360 miles of Forest Service roads to determine if
42 they should be maintained. Based on the alternative
43 selected for implementation, approximately 427 miles of
44 existing roads in Unit 2 will remain open and
45 maintained for either highway vehicles, off highway
46 vehicle or for mixed use.

47
48 Within the five wildlife analysis areas
49 where the highest deer harvests occur, they actually
50 reduced the available road mileage from 945 miles to

1 approximately 360 miles and of this 132 miles of those
2 roads had been scored as high for subsistence use and
3 these will either be decommissioned or stored.

4

5 Additional road closures may also occur
6 in the area because of proposed wolf related
7 mitigations as proposed in the Record of Decision for
8 the Big Thorne Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
9 Because of the reductions in road mileage subsistence
10 users may be unable to access customary hunting
11 locations while facing increased competition between
12 all user groups.

13

14 Although the proponent seeks to expand
15 the deer hunting season for subsistence users 60 and
16 over and for the physically disabled, keeping the
17 earlier hunt only for subsistence users 60 or older may
18 be a better option. Determining disability has been
19 shown to be complex and problematic, and would require
20 a Federal permit to participate in the hunt. Keeping
21 the earlier season only to within the month of July is
22 preferred by managers, as the hunt will fit better
23 within the Federal wildlife regulatory year, which is
24 July 1 through June 30.

25

26 This proposal increases the opportunity
27 to hunt deer with reduced competition within Unit 2 for
28 Federally qualified subsistence users over the age of
29 60 or those that can demonstrate a 70 percent physical
30 disability. With a season starting date in June,
31 Federally qualified users will need to have two sets of
32 deer harvest tickets to participate. Prior year
33 harvest tickets would be required for the June portion
34 of the hunt and any deer harvested during this month
35 would fall under the previous year s harvest limit.
36 The hunter would then have to obtain new harvest
37 tickets with the change of the regulatory year on July
38 1. Harvest reporting would be complicated since
39 harvest before July 1 would be reported in one
40 regulatory year and the
41 harvest after July 1 would be reported in another
42 regulatory year.

43

44 The earlier season would provide an
45 advantage for Federally qualified users meeting these
46 categories without having to rely entirely on Federal
47 designated hunting provisions. The stated purpose of
48 this proposal is for persons meeting these categories
49 to have the satisfaction of harvesting a deer
50 themselves. Allowing designated hunting during this

1 special season would not be consistent with this
2 purpose. The Board has previously rejected a proposal
3 requesting allowance of designated hunting in two other
4 age related subsistence hunts, as it was believed that
5 designated hunting during this season defeated the
6 purpose of those hunts.

7
8 A five week head start may provide too
9 much of an advantage at the expense of other Federally
10 qualified subsistence users. A one week head start,
11 however, should provide adequate opportunity to fulfill
12 the stated purpose of harvesting less wary deer for
13 themselves.

14
15 The Staff recommendation was to support
16 the proposal with modification. The modified language
17 would remove the physically
18 disabled category, reduce the early hunt start date by
19 one week rather than five weeks, removes the
20 requirement of a Federal permit and prohibits
21 designated hunting during the early season. The
22 modified regulation can be found on Page 58 in your
23 materials.

24
25 Adoption of the proposal, as modified,
26 provides additional opportunity for Federally qualified
27 users over the age of 60. Currently, a very small
28 percentage of the overall deer harvest is taken by
29 individuals over the age of 60. The Federal
30 Subsistence Board has established this same age as the
31 minimum age for two other Federal subsistence hunts in
32 other management units. Age as a defining option
33 removes the need for a specific permit to participate
34 in the hunt as age can be easily determined in the
35 field by the hunter s state issued driver s license,
36 permanent identification card or other photo ID and
37 thus removes the need for a Federal permit.

38
39 Establishing a special season for
40 disabled persons to hunt is more challenging to
41 implement as there is no standard definition of
42 disabled. Many agencies have different definitions of
43 disability. If the disability provisions are adopted,
44 a Federal permit would be required to demonstrate to
45 law enforcement in the field that the said person was
46 eligible to hunt during the early season.

47
48 The five week head start may provide
49 too much of an advantage at the expense of other
50 Federally qualified subsistence users. A one week head

1 start should provide adequate opportunity to fulfill
2 the stated purpose of harvesting less wary deer for
3 oneself. Also, a season start date in July would
4 require only one set of deer harvest tickets and
5 harvest would easily be attributed to the proper
6 regulatory year.

7
8 The stated purpose of this proposal is
9 for Federally qualified users 60 and older to have the
10 satisfaction of harvesting a deer for themselves.
11 Allowing designated hunting during this special season
12 is not consistent with this purpose. The Board has
13 previously rejected a similar proposal requesting
14 allowance for designated hunting in the age related
15 sheep hunt as allowance of designated hunting during
16 that season defeated the purpose of the hunts.

17
18 This concludes my presentation.

19
20 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Jeff.
21 Any questions.

22
23 Mr. Hernandez.

24
25 MR. HERNANDEZ: Jeff, can you explain,
26 is there any biological reason why prior to us changing
27 the season to July 24th in Unit 2 -- all of the hunting
28 seasons begin on August 1st. Is there some biological
29 reason for starting a season on August 1st?

30
31 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman. Mr.
32 Hernandez. I'm typically a fish biologist by nature,
33 so I'd have to hand that one off as to why those were
34 certain set dates. What I can tell you from living on
35 the island though is regardless whether it's August 1st
36 or July 24th, as the proponent had mentioned about
37 locations of finding these less wary deer, that's where
38 you'll see them. Obviously they're going to be less
39 wary until the season begins regardless of date.

40
41 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you.

42
43 Mr. Isaacs.

44
45 MR. ISAACS: You mentioned the
46 difficulty of identifying someone with a disability.
47 Do you folks use the veteran's method? I know quite a
48 few of my veteran friends that do have a disability.
49 Myself, I do have a disability that I got from the VA
50 and I m hoping that the VA's criteria is well enough

1 for the State.

2

3 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman. Mr. Isaacs.
4 As for how the State determines, I would have to hand
5 that one specifically over to State personnel. In the
6 Federal regulations, our regulations are actually --
7 you could say fairly vague on disability. We don't
8 really have a defined definition of disability like you
9 might see where under the State proxy provisions they
10 might -- it says like a 70 percent disability and
11 here's what that is.

12

13 So the Federal regulations basically
14 would assume -- the disability factors would probably
15 have to mirror what the State's determining factor and
16 they do have apparently like an application that you
17 can fill out to have the determination made. Inquiring
18 with this, like I mentioned in the presentation,
19 whether it's Federal agency such as Social Security
20 Administration or the State agency of -- like DSHS.
21 There's different -- obviously the military they have
22 different definitions as to what is disability.

23

24 So that's why from the Federal
25 standpoint the recommendation right now because there's
26 too much vagueness and trying to keep the hunt as
27 simplistic as possible with reducing paperwork and
28 whatnot. The easiest way at this point is to just keep
29 it age related. But I suppose it's up to this Council
30 if they would like to put some disability -- there's
31 just some confusion.

32

33 Probably my recommendation, if
34 anything, would be inquire with the State as to what
35 their actual definition is. If you look on page 52,
36 you'll see that there's some State regulations that are
37 related. One of them has a definition for 70 percent
38 disabled, yet another one talks about disabled veterans
39 and it drops that percentage down to like, I believe,
40 50 percent. It would probably be easier for a State
41 person to explain their system.

42

43 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
44 Reeves.

45

46 Mr. Kookesh.

47

48 MR. KOOKESH: I was just making sure he
49 was done. Mr. Reeves, one time we had a proposal on
50 the table and we had law enforcement speaking to the

1 proposal and law enforcement said if we did the
2 proposal, it would make their job harder and I said I'm
3 sure in the ideal world we'd all like easy jobs, but
4 that's not how it works. I'm wondering that when
5 you're talking about on Page 57 the other alternatives
6 to consider, you're talking about having two permits,
7 creating complexity. How can two permit harvest
8 tickets create complexity? Is the mindset -- is there
9 something with the mindset or what? I'm not following
10 how two tickets can be complicated.

11
12 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman. Mr.
13 Kookesh. What that's showing is that, okay, the
14 typical deer season in Unit 2 runs from July 24th to
15 December 31st and one set of harvest tickets will do
16 that. The regulatory wildlife year runs from July 1st
17 to.....

18
19 MR. KOOKESH: (Microphone turned off)

20
21 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Mr. Kookesh, are
22 you.....

23
24 MR. KOOKESH: Yeah, my question was how
25 can two tickets be complex for Federal staff who are
26 being paid to do the job. That's my question. How can
27 somebody who is getting paid consider a little more
28 work complicated, harder or something? I'm wondering.
29 I know what you're saying, but my question is how can
30 two permits be complex when you're being paid to do a
31 simple job?

32
33 MR. REEVES: Well, basically then what
34 it would have to do is you'd have to initiate probably
35 more paperwork on that individual to go out and utilize
36 something like this because having this January,
37 February, March, April, May, June -- six month gap in
38 when those harvest tickets expire and then forcing
39 someone that if the -- say the season had started June
40 15th and they went out on June 30th. Well, they're
41 going to finish their fifth -- potentially their fifth
42 deer until Federal regulations, but then they'll have
43 to run back into town to go pick up a new set of deer
44 harvest tickets.

45
46 So the complication -- I mean it would
47 exist there for both the user and probably even for --
48 by keeping it within the Federal regulatory year, then
49 everything is set more like the one specific set of
50 harvest tickets. So that should ideally reduce any

1 complications, whether it's for law enforcement,
2 Federal biologists or even the user themself.

3

4 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Does that answer
5 your question, Mr. Kookesh?

6

7 MR. KOOKESH: No.

8

9 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Go ahead, follow up.

10

11 MR. KOOKESH: Well, the idea here is
12 not to restrict the opportunity, but to create the
13 opportunity. I believe that's what Mr. Leighton is
14 looking for, is creating an opportunity. I mean you're
15 the Forest Service. I mean, my God, cut more trees.
16 That way you can have more paper to do that work.

17

18 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman. Mr.
19 Kookesh. I understand the frustration behind this.
20 Basically Staff is just trying to recommend let's just
21 try to keep whatever is simplest. So, like there's
22 alternatives, but keeping it within July would do that.
23 You know, keeping it where with the age, the age is
24 easily identifiable. I even spoke with law enforcement
25 about that, saying what would you do if you made
26 contact and the officer spelled it out and this is what
27 would make it very easy.

28

29 You're right, there shouldn't be
30 complication to it, something going back as far as
31 probably June because the proponent indicated he wants
32 to make it easier for this user group, but, like I
33 said, the complication just I think is there because of
34 overlapping dates. So the accountability in a sense
35 isn't there as to the actual harvest. If you keep it
36 to within the one set of regulatory framework, meaning
37 harvest tickets, hunt report, then it should reduce the
38 complications.

39

40 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
41 Reeves.

42

43 Anyone else.

44

45 Mr. Ackerman.

46

47 MR. ACKERMAN: Yeah, I've got a
48 question here on this disability hunt. Very
49 interesting that this comes up. I have a friend that's
50 a Vietnam vet and the last time I took him out, he's 71

1 years, and we got up to 2,000 feet and he was so worn
2 out, two times cancer survivor, Agent Orange and the
3 whole nine, but after 2,000 feet I had to pack his pack
4 and his gun back down the mountain because he was
5 physically unable to continue. But very interesting
6 that he had the heart and we went for it and this is
7 his last hunt.

8

9 We have or you have guides working
10 throughout the area that you folks keep track of and
11 they have out-of-state clients that you keep track of
12 for various hunts, right?

13

14 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman. Mr.
15 Ackerman. There is a limited number of special use
16 permitted guides. The actual use for deer I don't
17 know, but I think most of them target bear, but, yes,
18 there is some use.

19

20 MR. ACKERMAN: Yeah, thank you. Very
21 interesting that -- you know, to give a seven day
22 headstart to these disabled people I believe would give
23 them a little bit more edge because as you get older
24 and depending on your disabilities, it would be, I
25 think, a good one.

26

27 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Excuse me, Mr.
28 Ackerman. Is this a question? We'll have time for
29 discussion later.

30

31 MR. ACKERMAN: Okay.

32

33 VICE CHAIR BANGS: This is the time for
34 questions.

35

36 MR. ACKERMAN: Yeah. That was mixed.
37 Thanks.

38

39 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Anyone else have any
40 questions.

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 VICE CHAIR BANGS: I have one quick
45 question. Are bucks easily identified on Prince of
46 Wales in the middle of June?

47

48 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman. It depends
49 on their antler development. Probably some of the
50 younger button bucks might not be as easy to see, but I

1 would assume that most of the bucks are at some form of
2 development with velvet antlers.

3

4 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Okay. Thank you.

5

6 Anyone else.

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.

11 Reeves.

12

13 State of Alaska.

14

15 Ms. Yuhas, Mr. Larsen.

16

17 MS. YUHAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

18 The State is also neutral on this proposal and Mr.

19 Larsen is here to explain the difference between the

20 June versus July seasons as it relates to the biology.

21

22 MR. D. LARSEN: Thank you, Mr.

23 Chairman. One quick thing I wanted to mention to the

24 Council is normally Boyd Porter, who is our area

25 biologist for Unit 2 would have been here to chat with

26 you, but he just got back from an international bear

27 conference and he brought back an international bug and

28 he didn't want to share that international bug here

29 today, which I think we can all appreciate. So on his

30 behalf I wanted to let you know that he had hoped to be

31 here but couldn't for that reason.

32

33 So in terms of Proposal 14-04, the

34 State sees this as a clearly allocation issue, not a

35 conservation issue. A few observations -- and,

36 therefore, we see it as being neutral. But a few

37 observations that we would make is that obviously this

38 is an allocation issue among Federally qualified users,

39 so it really doesn't affect users beyond Federally

40 qualified, so in that sense the State really has no

41 real dog in this issue.

42

43 Under observation, there's currently a

44 long deer season in Unit 2 for Federally qualified

45 hunters as well as non-Federally qualified hunters.

46 The Designated Hunter Program obviously provides

47 opportunities, as does the State proxy system, so there

48 are provisions in place to provide for opportunity.

49

50 The one piece, and I think Jeff did a

1 good job of explaining, is there are complications --
2 and I know, Mr. Kookesh, you had an interest in this
3 specifically, in this whole idea of a June season start
4 date versus July. Now, from a biological standpoint, I
5 don't frankly see any issue with starting in June
6 versus July.

7
8 In terms of the question about can you
9 differentiate bucks from does, you know, earlier than
10 later, obviously the later on during the antler
11 development the better chance you have of
12 distinguishing a buck from a doe. But in terms of what
13 that means to the hunter, if you have it start earlier
14 and if it's a button buck and you can consequently see
15 the antler, then you're going to assume it's a doe, so
16 it wouldn't be a legal animal anyway. So it's kind of
17 a moot point I would say in that regard.

18
19 So, from a conservation standpoint, you
20 know, starting in June versus July, not an issue. The
21 complication thing is not -- in my mind at least, not
22 an issue of more workload on staff because, certainly,
23 I think you make a very good point. I mean people are
24 hired to do the job and to get the job done, whatever
25 it takes to do that.

26
27 The bigger issue that I would observe
28 is we know that regulations are complicated. I mean
29 within the State system they're complicated, within the
30 Federal system they're complicated, and then you've got
31 both State and Federal regulations. If you have a
32 season that starts July 1 and goes all the way through
33 and includes some allowances in June, I think, as Jeff
34 said, for the hunter, for the user, they've got to be
35 cognizant that, boy, I've got to remember to go in and
36 get my tag. Now, again, is that an insurmountable
37 issue? No. But in terms of what we're setting the
38 public up for, that would be my concern.

39
40 So then the question in my mind becomes
41 can we provide additional opportunity for these
42 individuals that have been proposed and, again, the
43 State has no issue with that, but can we do it in a way
44 that doesn't create that complication. Can we give
45 them that opportunity without creating the
46 complication. It seems to me -- again, we're not
47 taking a pro or con approach on this. It just seems to
48 me that if we're able to provide that opportunity and
49 not complicate the issue, then it seems like it's a
50 win-win.

1 So, to that extent, we share that
2 observation just as a point of reference in terms of
3 what that means to the public. Again, from a workload
4 standpoint, heck, you know, we can get the job done.
5 Federal government get the job done. It's again, in my
6 mind, more about the user.

7
8 Thank you.

9
10 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
11 Larsen.

12
13 Any questions.

14
15 (No comments)

16
17 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Seeing none. Thank
18 you.

19
20 Are there any Federal agencies.

21
22 (No comments)

23
24 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Native, tribal,
25 villages.

26
27 (No comments)

28
29 VICE CHAIR BANGS: InterAgency Staff
30 comments.

31
32 MR. KESSLER: Good morning, Mr.
33 Chairman. Members of the Council. Steve Kessler with
34 U.S. Forest Service. The InterAgency Staff Committee
35 found the Staff analysis to be a thorough and accurate
36 evaluation of the proposal and that it provides a
37 sufficient basis for a Regional Advisory Council
38 recommendation on the proposal.

39
40 However, there are a few points for the
41 Council to consider that are not included in the
42 analysis. First, the Staff Committee recognized that
43 this type of proposal would create a special class of
44 Federally qualified users that is not specifically
45 identified in ANILCA; that is, over 60 years of age or
46 disabled.

47
48 Typically all Federally qualified users
49 are treated equally under ANILCA unless a shortage of a
50 resource requires restrictions among Federally

1 qualified users using the Section .804 process. There
2 is no conservation concern with deer in Unit 2, so
3 Section .804 would not apply in this case. This
4 proposal could set a precedent of creating special
5 classes of users when it is unclear if that is the
6 intent of ANILCA.

7

8 Second, it is unclear how much demand
9 there is for this type of provision. Public testimony
10 at this Council meeting should help determine that.
11 Third, there is no cultural proponent identified in
12 this request.

13

14 Thank you.

15

16 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
17 Kessler.

18

19 Any questions.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Steve.
24 Okay, Mr. Larson, are there any Fish and Game Advisory
25 comments.

26

27 MR. LARSON: No, Mr. Chair, there's no
28 Fish and Game Advisory comments.

29

30 VICE CHAIR BANGS: And are there any
31 written comments.

32

33 MR. LARSON: No, Mr. Chair, there are
34 no written public comments.

35

36 VICE CHAIR BANGS: I have one public
37 testimony here from Mr. Ronald Leighton, the proponent
38 of the proposal.

39

40 MR. LEIGHTON: Good morning. My name
41 is Ronald Leighton and I would like to address the
42 Council through the Chair concerning this. I know
43 there's a lot of testimony on behalf of the people.
44 There's been a lot of review. When I put this in, I
45 didn't know the difference -- I didn't know that the
46 one cycle ended the end of June and started the 1st of
47 July. Had I known that, I probably would have went and
48 said that I would like to see the season start July 1st
49 and that way it would not complicate the issue like
50 they say it might or make it too complex.

1 I don t know, quite frankly, would I
2 want to double back and go get another set of tags. I
3 live remote. For me to get a set of tags I have to
4 skiff quite a ways to Kasaan and then drive over to
5 Thorne Bay. Unfortunately, I became old and
6 unfortunately I also suffered some disability and it
7 happened overnight, the disability.

8
9 Because I live remote and in the area I
10 live, the rest of the people that live there are in the
11 same boat as me. They are all up in the age over 60,
12 so there's no designated hunters in the area where I
13 live. For me to sit down there and depend on a
14 designated hunter to come from Ketchikan to do my hunt
15 for me, it's pretty unlikely, number one, and, number
16 two, they also have their priorities of taking care of
17 their own needs and I'd be second on their list or
18 maybe even third.

19
20 Another component to this is that I
21 like to go out and do my own harvest. I appreciate it
22 more. It gives me more self-esteem to go out and do
23 the hunt. When I was out and doing some designated
24 hunts and stuff like that for the elders in Kasaan, I'd
25 go out and get them deer, bring it to them and they
26 said, jeez, thanks, thanks, thanks. One time I decided
27 to take an elder out, so I went out and found an area,
28 made sure it was easily accessible, a lot of deer sign,
29 took him out there, he did his hunt. I realized
30 something there. He was proud, very proud, and when he
31 got home with that deer that he harvested himself, with
32 his wife I could see the difference between a deer that
33 he harvested himself that he hasn't been able to do for
34 a while. That's why I would like this to happen.

35
36 I know Jeff and I spoke on this. He
37 had me in his office there in Craig and I could see his
38 point concerning the June 15th to July 1st. I'd say
39 I'd be good with the July 1st. I don't think one week
40 would be enough. Everybody knows that in that one
41 week, especially in this country, it could storm for a
42 week, you know. So I think the July 1st would be more
43 realistic. It will give us a better chance to go out
44 there and maybe fulfill.

45
46 He did mention something about 60 years
47 of age and older and how much deer is harvested on the
48 island. I think he said in the three units. From the
49 three units, but in the area, 1, 2 and 3. Anyway, it's
50 not very much for the 60 years of age and older. I

1 don't think that's going to increase by giving us this
2 opportunity. I know I can only handle X amount of deer
3 myself, so I'm not going to increase my bag limit
4 because they're there. I don't do it that way. I go
5 shoot and take what I need and can use.

6

7 Thank you.

8

9 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
10 Leighton.

11

12 Are there any questions.

13

14 Ms. Needham.

15

16 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
17 Mr. Leighton, when you submitted this proposal, did you
18 have an idea of how 70 percent physical disability
19 would be demonstrated? How did you pick 70 and how was
20 that going to be demonstrated to be eligible?

21

22 MR. LEIGHTON: Well, I picked 70
23 because the State has a deal in place to where -- in
24 fact, I have a permit in here to shoot and fire from a
25 boat. You have to be 70 percent disabled and a doctor
26 sign a permit showing this in order to do that, so
27 that's why I hit on 70. The 70 percent -- right now
28 I'm at 40 percent disabled as far as the VA recognizes
29 and they go through pretty stringent examinations and
30 to get you there it's amazing. I think the same goes
31 for the Social Security disabled. They go through quite
32 an extensive check in order to give you your different
33 percentages.

34

35 So I think it would be easy for
36 somebody to recognize it and a doctor could sit down
37 there and write something, say, hey, he's 70 percent
38 disabled. But I was saying something along the line if
39 you're already on a disability, whether it be VA
40 disability or Workman's Comp disability or something,
41 even if it was temporary, you know. If a person was
42 taken out and messed up just temporarily, but he's 70
43 percent disabled, then he could come in and apply for
44 this type of a hunt. It might not be able to apply the
45 following year, but at least he gets to have the
46 opportunity.

47

48 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
49 Leighton.

50

1 Any other questions.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
6 Leighton. I think that the Council shares your desire
7 to increase opportunity for rural users and we
8 appreciate proposals that do that.

9

10 Thank you.

11

12 Okay. There's no other public
13 testimony.

14

15 MR. MORRIS: Can I say something?

16

17 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Yes. Please come up
18 and identify yourself. Usually we have you fill out a
19 blue card. In this case, I'll allow you.

20

21 MR. MORRIS: Mr. Chair. John Morris.
22 I live here in Ketchikan, but my mother lives over on
23 Prince of Wales. Just listening to this testimony, I
24 guess there was some questions that arise. To me, it
25 sounds like it's for the hunter. My mother is a
26 widower and, as Mr. Leighton was saying, if you have
27 somebody else hunt for you, you'd be like on the back
28 burner. Would this proposal -- have you guys
29 considered if this proposal would be for me or a person
30 like me living here in a nonrural area go over there
31 and hunt for my mom that's well over 60. You know,
32 would that be a consideration?

33

34 You know, there's so many questions
35 that arise from this proposal, you know, and then where
36 did the number 60 come from versus other things? You
37 know, there's just so many holes that I hear in this
38 proposal that need to be filled and questions like this
39 needs to be asked before anything like this could go
40 forward.

41

42 I d love to go over there July 1st and
43 shoot a buck for my mom. They're everywhere, you know.
44 So I guess that's my testimony right here, right now.

45

46 Thank you.

47

48 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Okay. Thank you for
49 those comments. I think we'll discuss these in our
50 deliberation when we get to it.

1 Mr. Larson has a comment regarding
2 that.

3
4 MR. LARSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
5 just want to respond really quickly to the question of
6 whether or not you, as a resident of Ketchikan, could
7 in fact hunt for your mother who is a resident of
8 Prince of Wales. So your mother would be a qualified
9 rural resident and this is a Federal program, so you
10 are a non-qualified person and you cannot participate.
11 Only qualified people can participate in the Federal
12 subsistence hunts.

13
14 Thank you.

15
16 MR. MORRIS: Thank you.

17
18 VICE CHAIR BANGS: What's the wish of
19 the Council. Did you want to wait, go to lunch and
20 deliberate after?

21
22 Mr. Adams.

23
24 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I'd be prepared to
25 make a motion and then we can ponder over it during
26 lunch.

27
28 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Are you making a
29 motion?

30
31 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yeah. Before that
32 I'll offer my rationale. Listening to the testimonies
33 and so forth, I don't see any conservation concern, Mr.
34 Chairman. It seems like it's going to benefit, you
35 know, certain groups of people.

36
37 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Mr. Adams.

38
39 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes?

40
41 VICE CHAIR BANGS: We need to get it on
42 the floor before we can.....

43
44 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Well, I was going to
45 offer my rationale first and then make a motion.

46
47 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Okay.

48
49 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. I'm going to
50 make a motion that we adopt WP14-04 with the

1 modification found on Page 58. Mr. Chairman

2

3 VICE CHAIR BANGS: I'll entertain a
4 second.

5

6 MR. DOUVILLE: I'll second it.

7

8 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Mr. Douville
9 seconded it. Go ahead, Mr. Adams.

10

11 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I'd just like to offer
12 my rationale. I'm going to say that there is no
13 conservation concern as far as I can see and that, you
14 know, there seems to be substantial information here to
15 help me make my decision on the vote when the vote
16 comes. Also that it doesn't appear that it's going to
17 adversely affect subsistence and non-subsistence users.
18 So, with that, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to vote in favor
19 of the motion.

20

21 Thank you.

22

23 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Ms. Phillips.

24

25 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Chairman
26 Bangs. I'm going to be voting against the proposal. I
27 have a deep respect for Mr. Leighton and I understand
28 he's old and he's becoming disabled, but if you look at
29 ANILCA, ANILCA provides the opportunity for rural
30 residents. It doesn't say provides the opportunity for
31 people over 60 who are rural residents and rural
32 residents. It says provide the opportunity for rural
33 residents and I just want to emphasize that.

34

35 What it would do is restrict all other
36 subsistence users because they'd be classified as not
37 eligible because they're not over 60 or they're not
38 disabled. As very well spoken by some of our Staff
39 members and State staff that the regulations are
40 complicated enough without adding another layer of
41 complication. We have people saying what is the rule,
42 am I understanding right, am I under Federal or -- you
43 know, so it's just another layer of complexity.

44

45 This is an allocation issue, it's not a
46 conservation issue and if we're going to be allocating,
47 we're going to be opening up a can of worms for other
48 special interests. All Federally qualified users are
49 to be treated as equals, we heard that from our
50 InterAgency Staff Committee, except for in times of

1 shortage. As we've heard, there's no conservation
2 concern and there's no need identified.

3
4 So I will be voting no for the
5 proposal.

6
7 Thank you.

8
9 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Ms.
10 Phillips.

11
12 Mr. Hernandez.

13
14 MR. KOOKESH: I thought you said we
15 were going to lunch after we made the motion.

16
17 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.
18 Chairman. I was going to raise the same exact concerns
19 that Patty just brought out. I think it would
20 differentiate between subsistence users. That is
21 something that Section .804 of ANILCA deals with and I
22 don't think we really want to go there yet. Granting
23 an earlier hunt, I think the Board has kind of
24 established that competition is a factor in meeting
25 subsistence needs and by giving them an earlier hunt,
26 even though the bag limit may remain the same, the fact
27 that they get a chance to out-compete other subsistence
28 users would be a factor.

29
30 So I, too, would be voting against this
31 proposal.

32
33 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
34 Hernandez. A comment was made that we were going to
35 break for lunch after the motion was made and I think
36 there is a way we could table this or we could just
37 continue on. I was hoping we would break for lunch
38 before the motion was made so that we could start and
39 finish. What's the will of the Council.

40
41 MR. KOOKESH: Just recess.

42
43 MR. ISAACS: Go eat lunch.

44
45 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Chairman. I move
46 that we recess and then take up the issue after lunch.

47
48 Thank you.

49
50 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.

1 Adams. So we have a motion to recess. Has it been
2 seconded? We have to vote on it or anything? No?
3 Okay. We're going to recess for lunch until 1:30.

4
5 (Off record)

6
7 (On record)

8
9 VICE CHAIR BANGS: This meeting is back
10 in session. We're going to continue with deliberations
11 on Proposal WP14-04. (Pause) Is there any more
12 discussion.

13
14 (No comments)

15
16 VICE CHAIR BANGS: We need to go over
17 the justification criteria, the four criteria for that
18 unless there's more discussion.

19
20 (No comments)

21
22 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Is everybody on the
23 right page and know what proposal we're talking about?

24
25 (Laughter)

26
27 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Mr. Douville.

28
29 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Chairman
30 Bangs. I will not support this proposal. One of the
31 reasons is there's no provision in Title VIII for this
32 type of thing. In the past we've made considerable
33 effort to give a subsistence priority in Unit 2. Our
34 first effort was to restrict the season in August for
35 the first week and we couldn't do that. We eventually
36 wound up extending the season into July to give a rural
37 preference, but there's other means of getting a deer
38 early. For some potlatches can get a permit to get a
39 deer early, that type of thing.

40
41 Big Bill advised against -- he didn't
42 advise against, but he said that if you stay within the
43 confines of Title VIII, he said you can't go wrong.
44 Something like this clearly is not in there. And I do
45 believe we've made a lot of effort already to provide a
46 priority. I just can't justify this thing because we d
47 be adding something to Title VIII and I think that we
48 should always try to work within the confines without
49 adding or taking away from the rules and regulations.

50

1 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
2 Douville.
3
4 Any other comments.
5
6 (No comments)
7
8 VICE CHAIR BANGS: I'd like to say I
9 appreciate Mr. Leighton s attempt at trying to make
10 more opportunities, but I think I agree with Mike and
11 Patty that this is probably something out of the
12 purview of ANILCA Title VIII and I'm going to vote
13 against this proposal as well.
14
15 Mr. Adams.
16
17 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr.
18 Chairman. After listening to Patty and Mike just now,
19 I'm going to change my position on this and I'll vote
20 against it.
21
22 Thank you.
23
24 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Mr. Adams, do you
25 want to go over the four criteria?
26
27 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Pardon?
28
29 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Would you like to go
30 over the four criteria of the justification?
31
32 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. The four
33 criteria is that there has to be a conservation issue
34 and, number 2, is there substantial data to support the
35 proposition and how does it affect subsistence and
36 non-subsistence users. Those four criteria are those
37 four I just addressed. Anything else you want?
38
39 VICE CHAIR BANGS: I was just going to
40 have you go over them and.....
41
42 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.
43
44 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Ms. Phillips.
45
46 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr.
47 Chairman. I'll address the criteria or the
48 justification. The proposal does not address any
49 conservation concern. The existing ANILCA Title VIII
50 rural determinations are Federally qualified users in

1 place now has been supported by substantial evidence
2 and to change that would require bringing in further
3 evidence, which was not presented other than with Mr.
4 Leighton's proposal and testimony. It will not address
5 subsistence needs other than for rural residents over
6 age 60 and it would be detrimental to other subsistence
7 users who are not rural residents over age 60 and it
8 would unnecessarily restrict -- no, it wouldn't. I
9 don't see where it would unnecessarily restrict other
10 uses, but would it?

11

So that's my justification.

12

13
14 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Ms.
15 Phillips. Mr. Adams.

16

17 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yeah, Mr. Chairman,
18 after I made the motion to accept the proposal and we
19 got a second, then I gave the rationale addressing
20 those four criteria at that time. I thought you were
21 asking for something different, so I apologize.

22

Thank you, Patty, for doing that.

23

24
25 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
26 Adams. At that time you held a different position on
27 the proposal. Yes, Mr. Isaacs.

28

29 MR. ISAACS: Just a question, Mr.
30 Chairman. Is there any way the State Fish and Game
31 regulations can overturn our decision?

32

33 VICE CHAIR BANGS: No. This is Federal
34 regulation.

35

MR. ISAACS: Great. Thank you.

36

37
38 VICE CHAIR BANGS: I would entertain
39 someone to call for the question.

40

MR. JACKSON: Question.

41

42
43 VICE CHAIR BANGS: The question has
44 been called for. Mr. Kitka, can you take roll call,
45 please.

46

MR. KITKA: Cathy Needham.

47

MS. NEEDHAM: No.

48
49
50

1 MR. KITKA: Michael Bangs.
2
3 VICE CHAIR BANGS: No.
4
5 MR. KITKA: John Yeager.
6
7 MR. YEAGER: No.
8
9 MR. KITKA: Aaron Isaacs.
10
11 MR. ISAACS: No.
12
13 MR. KITKA: Kenneth Jackson.
14
15 MR. JACKSON: No.
16
17 MR. KITKA: Donald Hernandez.
18
19 MR. HERNANDEZ: No.
20
21 MR. KITKA: Floyd Kookesh. Absent.
22 Bert Adams.
23
24 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Tleik. That means no.
25
26 MR. KITKA: Michael Douville.
27
28 MR. DOUVILLE: No.
29
30 MR. KITKA: Patricia Phillips.
31
32 MS. PHILLIPS: No.
33
34 MR. KITKA: Frank Wright.
35
36 MR. WRIGHT: No.
37
38 MR. KITKA: Tim Ackerman.
39
40 MR. ACKERMAN: No.
41
42 MR. KITKA: Harvey Kitka votes no. The
43 vote fails.
44
45 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Did you get Don?
46
47 MR. KITKA: Gentlemen, no, I didn't.
48
49 MR. ISAACS: Kookesh said maybe.
50

1 (Laughter)

2

3 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Harvey.

4

5 MR. KITKA: Kookesh is absent.

6

7 VICE CHAIR BANGS: The proposal fails.

8 We're on Wildlife Proposal 14-05. Mr. Chester.

9

10 MR. CHESTER: Good afternoon, Mr.

11 Chairman. Members of the Council. I'm Dennis Chester,

12 for the record, with the Forest Service and presenting

13 the analysis for this proposal WP14-05 and starts on

14 Page 62 of your books.

15

16 Proposal W14-05 was submitted by the
17 Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council
18 and requests that the deer harvest season within the
19 Lindenberg Peninsula portion of Unit 3 be reduced from
20 the current four-month season to a two-week season and
21 the harvest limit be reduced from two male deer to one
22 male deer. The map on Page 65 shows the proposal area.

23

24 This proposal mirrors a change in State
25 regulations passed by the Board of Game in January of
26 2013. Currently the Federal harvest limit is two
27 antlered deer with a season from August 1 through
28 November 30th. As I just mentioned, the State season
29 was changed this year to a one buck harvest limit with
30 a two-week season from October 15 to 31.

31

32 As many of you are aware, Unit 3 in
33 general has relatively restrictive deer seasons and
34 limits since a series of severe winters in the late
35 '60s and early 1970s. The Lindenberg Peninsula was
36 closed to deer harvest from 1975 to 1993. From 1993 to
37 2003, the State and Federal seasons for the Lindenberg
38 Peninsula were one buck or antlered deer in a two-week
39 season from October 15th through the 31st. Beginning
40 in 2003, the harvest limit was raised to two buck or
41 antlered deer and the season extended from August 1st
42 to November 30th.

43

44 In June of this year, the Alaska
45 Department of Fish and Game submitted a special action
46 request to implement the changes in this proposal via
47 special action for this harvest season. A public
48 meeting was held in Petersburg with video conference
49 connection to Wrangell and there seemed to be a
50 consensus that the deer population is low, but there

1 were a variety of opinions on what the best solution
2 was. A summary of the meeting is included in the
3 appendix on Page 79. The in-season manager approved
4 the special action request. What that means is this
5 season the seasons and harvest limits of this proposal
6 are in place.

7
8 Another recent event pertinent to this
9 proposal is that the Board of Game authorized a wolf
10 predator control program in a
11 portion of Unit 3 that includes the Lindenberg
12 Peninsula.

13
14 Pellet group and harvest data presented
15 in Figures 1 through 7 on Pages 69 through 75 suggest a
16 declining population
17 following the deep snow winters starting in 2006-2007.
18 These data also do not show any indication of a
19 substantial recovery. Of particular interest, Figure 4
20 on Page 72 indicates that the estimated harvest and
21 hunter effort since 2006 is similar to what it was
22 prior to the liberalization of the season and harvest
23 limits in 2003.

24
25 A range of alternatives to this
26 proposal were considered. Maintaining the two male
27 deer harvest limit, reducing season length would reduce
28 opportunity, but may not reduce overall harvest.
29 Reducing the harvest limit to one male deer but
30 maintaining the existing season could reduce harvest
31 while maintaining opportunity. Harvest data estimates
32 suggest that about 25 percent of the harvest is by
33 hunters taking a second deer. Another option would be
34 to reduce the harvest limit to one male deer and reduce
35 the season to some intermediate length, for example
36 August 1st through October 31st.

37
38 Following the InterAgency Staff
39 Committee review, ADF&G graciously provided data on
40 harvest timing for the Lindenberg Peninsula. You
41 should have a supplemental table showing the harvest
42 and effort information for the last five years. I put
43 that on the table before the start of the meeting.
44 Hopefully you still have it. I know it's been a while
45 ago. If not, I do have some extra copies if somebody
46 would like one.

47
48 The table indicates that most of the
49 effort occurs in October and November. The most deer
50 are taken in November, but hunting in August seems to

1 be the most efficient.

2

3 If adopted, this proposal as submitted
4 would substantially reduce the season and restrict
5 subsistence users' opportunity to harvest a deer. Thus
6 we would expect it to reduce harvest somewhat. It
7 would align Federal and State deer hunting regulations
8 for this portion of Unit 3.

9

10 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
11 support Proposal WP14-05 with modification to maintain
12 the current harvest season but change the harvest limit
13 to one antlered deer on the Lindenberg Peninsula of
14 Kupreanof Island in Unit 3. Reducing the harvest limit
15 seems reasonable since the population has declined with
16 little to no indication it is rebounding. The proposed
17 modification should maintain opportunity for
18 subsistence users while reducing harvest.

19

20 Thank you.

21

22 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
23 Chester. Any questions. Mr. Hernandez.

24

25 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Dennis. I
26 guess one of the questions I have is the way this
27 modification is worded, would this area be closed
28 altogether to non-subsistence uses in the way this is
29 presently worded. I started to ask this question
30 yesterday in an unrelated topic and Mr. Larsen kind of
31 indicated that due to the customary and traditional use
32 designations it would essentially close this to all
33 non-subsistence users.

34

35 I just need a little clarification on
36 whether or not the way this is worded this would be --
37 if we're going to be restricting the subsistence users,
38 are we eliminating all other non-subsistence users with
39 the wording of this proposal modification.

40

41 MR. CHESTER: This proposal does not
42 restrict or does not close the area to people without a
43 positive customary and traditional use determination.
44 The State has already closed the area to non-Alaskans.
45 This does not close the area to Alaska residents who
46 are not -- who don't have the positive customary and
47 traditional use determination.

48

49 However, I didn't really -- I think it
50 addressed it very briefly in the analysis, but I didn't

1 think that was going to be very effective because it's
2 almost all Petersburg residents and Kake residents that
3 use the area. Very few folks from other places use the
4 area. There's a table in there that shows that.

5
6 MR. ISAACS: I didn't get the last
7 part of your comment.

8
9 MR. CHESTER: Very few residents
10 outside of Petersburg and Kake use the area and there
11 is the table on Page 76, Table 3.

12
13 MR. HERNANDEZ: Right, Page 76. I
14 think this is where you address the non-Federally
15 qualified uses. Just above Table 3 there is a sentence
16 that says limiting the harvest of Federally qualified
17 subsistence users only would not likely have much
18 effect because few non-Federally qualified users
19 participate in the hunt.

20
21 And then I look at the table. Table 3
22 is estimated harvest and effort by community of
23 residence for the Lindenberg Peninsula. So it's
24 specific to Lindenberg Peninsula. I guess it is over
25 quite a long period of time, 1997 to 2011, I guess. So
26 these are like total harvests for that entire time
27 period.

28
29 MR. CHESTER: Correct.

30
31 MR. HERNANDEZ: So you're making the
32 determination from that table that even though there is
33 some deer taken by non-Federally qualified users in
34 this area, it's kind of an insignificance or not worth
35 addressing in the proposal. Is that what you're
36 essentially saying?

37
38 MR. CHESTER: Correct. I think the
39 numbers are so low that it just -- I mean we certainly
40 can do that, but I don't think it would really have
41 that much of an effect. It's certainly an option for
42 the Council to consider if they choose to do so.

43
44 MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you. I'll
45 just leave the question there. I guess I'd just say
46 during the deliberations we might want to discuss that,
47 but thanks for answering the question.

48
49 Thank you.
50

1 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Ms. Needham.

2

3 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
4 Dennis, I had a couple of questions and I m not sure if
5 they're directed at you or if I should direct them to
6 the State because they're data questions and some of
7 this information is coming from them. On Figure 3, the
8 Portage Bay pellet group surveys that were done, my
9 first question is is Portage Bay within the proposal
10 area and if it is, that trend on the upper line, am I
11 just misinterpreting it or does it look like it's more
12 of an increase rather than a decrease?

13

14 MR. CHESTER: Through the Chair.
15 Portage Bay is within the proposal area. It's on the
16 very north part of the Peninsula. The numbers for 2012
17 are preliminary from the State. They are a little bit
18 higher than what had been done in the past. I think a
19 couple things to think about here is that it was many
20 years since the last time something was taken, so it
21 was really hard to show much of a trend one way or
22 another. I included the data because that's what's
23 available. The accuracy of the numbers, you see the
24 error bars there, it's hard to read too much into that
25 level of difference really.

26

27 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Ms. Needham, follow
28 up, then Mr. Jackson.

29

30 MS. NEEDHAM: It's actually a separate
31 question. Thank you for that. On Page 68 in the first
32 paragraph it says Fish and Game considers the deer
33 population in Unit 3 to be well below carrying
34 capacity. How do we determine the carrying capacity?
35 Can you give what that is for this particular place?

36

37 MR. CHESTER: Through the Chair.
38 That s a good question. It's a very tough question. I
39 can't give you a number, no. I guess maybe the best
40 way is to be on the ground and see what the habitat
41 looks like. When you have forage that's pretty chewed
42 down, you're probably up there close to carrying
43 capacity. I haven't been on the ground in Lindenberg
44 Peninsula, so I can't speak from personal experience,
45 but I am trusting basically the reports and the
46 information I got that the various data, pellet counts
47 and any kind of harvest statistics and all that points
48 to the fact that the population is low.

49

50 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Mr. Jackson.

1 MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman. Mr.
2 Chester. This question is to the remark you made about
3 some Kake hunters hunt Lindenberg Peninsula. I know of
4 no hunters from Kake that ever go past Hamilton Bay.
5 I'm real familiar with everybody. The other thing is I
6 know you did Lindenberg Peninsula, but was there ever a
7 request to do the rest of Kupreanof or is this just a
8 Petersburg thing?

9
10 MR. CHESTER: Through the Chair. As
11 far as the Kake hunters, that s based on the harvest
12 reports, so that's all I can say to that. If you know
13 that nobody is going over there now -- you know, I
14 don t think -- based on the numbers, I don't think it s
15 an important area for Kake certainly. When you look at
16 the map, it's much easier for somebody from Petersburg
17 to get to the Lindenberg Peninsula than it is for
18 somebody from Kake.

19
20 MR. JACKSON: You know, I just
21 questioned it because you said Kake and, you know, me
22 living there for the last 62 years, I know of no person
23 that went and hunted Petersburg, you know, but maybe
24 there was one or two that claimed to be from Kake that
25 live in Petersburg. I don't know.

26
27 The other part of my question was why
28 wasn't the rest of Kupreanof looked at or is it just
29 the Lindenberg Peninsula because it's close to
30 Petersburg?

31
32 MR. CHESTER: The proposal was for the
33 Lindenberg Peninsula and historically I think it had
34 been included in the same regulations with Mitkof,
35 Woewodski. I'm kind of speculating at this point.
36 Probably in relation to the road systems with the
37 harvest and it's proximity to Petersburg, but maybe the
38 State could answer that because it's kind of a
39 historical fact.

40
41 MR. JACKSON: Thank you.

42
43 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Anyone else.

44
45 Ms. Needham.

46
47 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In
48 the analysis, was there anything that addressed if this
49 area is closed the potential for competition in
50 adjacent areas between other subsistence groups using

1 those other areas, the adjacent areas to the Peninsula?

2

3 MR. CHESTER: Through the Chair. I did
4 not address that in the analysis. It s certainly a
5 possibility. I think it was brought up in the public
6 meeting. Some of the folks from Wrangell were
7 concerned about if the Petersburg hunters couldn't go
8 to Lindenberg they would head down to Zarembo and other
9 places like that. It's kind of hard to analyze and
10 presuppose what folks are going to do.

11

12 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Mr. Jackson.

13

14 MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman. Mr.
15 Chester. Historically, and now we re talking the
16 things that I know about is the Petersburg hunters,
17 Wrangell, Ketchikan, they go to Unit 4 on Mr. Kookesh's
18 island to hunt. We see them between Seymour Canal and
19 Point Gardner and even guys from Ketchikan come up on
20 their seine boats during the fall time and they hunt
21 those places. So I'm just stating a fact that I know
22 about.

23

24 Thank you.

25

26 VICE CHAIR BANGS: We're looking for
27 questions for Mr. Chester.

28

29 (No comments)

30

31 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Seeing none. Thank
32 you.

33

34 Alaska Department of Fish and Game is
35 Mr. Larsen, with an E.

36

37 MR. D. LARSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman
38 and Board members. Again, my name is Doug Larsen with
39 the Division of Wildlife Conservation and Fish and
40 Game. Unlike the previous two proposals that you
41 deliberated on, this one we do see as a conservation
42 concern. Mr. Chester has certainly laid out the
43 information that's available in terms of populations
44 and so forth. Because it's a conservation concern, we
45 think that the original proposed language and the
46 change that would happen with a change to a one buck
47 two-week season is the most appropriate action that
48 would address the issue as it exists today.

49

50 In terms of a little bit of historical

1 perspective, the original proposal that's before you
2 puts the season and bag limit what it was prior to
3 population levels increasing. So essentially we're
4 going back to where it was when the population was very
5 much as it is today.

6
7 When the liberalization occurred to
8 what we have up to this point with the longer season
9 and the increased bag limit, that was done in concert
10 with an increase in the population. So again, I mean
11 it makes sense to address ups and downs as they occur
12 and that's something that I know this RAC has done
13 historically and the Board of Game as well.

14
15 When we went to the Board of Game with
16 our proposal, the same proposal, we went through a very
17 similar analysis of all the various possibilities that
18 we might look to do to address this issue. The one
19 that made the most sense, frankly, was the one that the
20 Board ultimately passed and the reason is -- again,
21 there was sentiment that we didn't want to curtail all
22 opportunity, but the real key was that we need to
23 restrict harvest, the number of animals that are
24 actually taken because the numbers are low. So every
25 animal that is taken out is one less animal that's in
26 the population to help that population rebound in the
27 future.

28
29 Mr. Chester mentioned that the State's
30 involved in an intensive management program and we are.
31 The Lindenberg Peninsula is within that area that we
32 are addressing. Now what that means, and this is a
33 question I think goes to Ms. Needham's question about
34 carrying capacity, at least I think it was your
35 question. One of the things that we need to do and are
36 doing is do an assessment of what the habitat can
37 support at this point in time. So, as Mr. Chester
38 referred to, that actually happens mostly through
39 looking at habitat condition and quantifying the amount
40 of foliage and shrubs available for deer.

41
42 The other way that can be used and is
43 used by us primarily with moose, although it could be
44 done with deer as well, is to look at the body
45 condition of the animals. I know all of you as hunters
46 know, I mean you can see a fat animal, a healthy animal
47 when you harvest it versus one that's not so much that
48 way. The same is true when we're looking at the health
49 of populations. You know, healthier animals generally
50 dictate or suggest that the habitat is supportive of

1 higher numbers.

2

3 So when we talk about collecting
4 information in terms of our intensive management
5 program, our intent is to continue to get that forage
6 and shrub quantification to see whether, in fact,
7 numbers can go higher than they are. Our sense right
8 now, just from a cursory review of the habitat, I mean
9 basically walking through the woods, looking at the
10 amount of forage that's there, looking at the amount
11 that's been browsed, our sense, in a general way, is
12 that, yes, we could support more deer in this area and,
13 frankly, that's very consistent with high predator
14 levels, which, as we know reduce prey levels.

15

16 So all things considered, it seems to
17 us that the most effective way to get this population
18 back on its feet in concert with future intensive
19 management efforts that we intend to undertake would be
20 to go to a shortened season certainly outside of the
21 period where it's easiest to harvest, which is, of
22 course, during November rut, but to keep it short and
23 keep the bag limit low.

24

25 Again, it would be reducing
26 opportunity, but it would be reducing opportunity to a
27 level that was previously implemented in response to
28 the very same situation that we're dealing with today
29 and down the road as that changes back to better
30 conditions, then I would hope that we would
31 collectively look to increase and liberalize both on
32 the season length as well as the bag limit.

33

34 Thank you.

35

36 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
37 Larsen.

38

39 Any questions.

40

41 Ms. Needham.

42

43 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
44 Mr. Larsen, the hearing that was held for the special
45 action request WSA13-BD-05-13, was Kake invited to
46 participate in that or they did not attend or was there
47 opportunity for them to weigh in? If so, is there a
48 general -- we have a summary of comments from people
49 who attended the Petersburg/Wrangell opportunity, so do
50 you have any idea where that community or members who

1 may have weighed in stood on that issue or on that
2 special action?

3

4 MR. LARSEN: Through the Chair. Member
5 Needham. I don't know specifically because that
6 hearing was set up through the Federal system and not
7 the State system. We participated in that hearing,
8 but, again, somebody from the Federal system could
9 better address that, but my sense is that it was a very
10 broad announcement. Certainly those within the
11 affected area would have been notified, I would assume,
12 and that they would have had the opportunity to come
13 and testify either telephonically or in person. Again,
14 I would defer to perhaps Mr. Larson, S-O-N, to share
15 more insight on that.

16

17 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Mr. Larson.

18

19 MR. LARSEN: Mr. Chair. Ms. Needham.
20 I was the hearing officer for the deer hearing and
21 there was teleconference capability provided. There
22 were a number of personal contacts. There was news
23 releases that were distributed to all the newspapers,
24 radios. It was widely disseminated to the tribes. The
25 results of that are contained within that summary
26 document that you see.

27

28 Thank you.

29

30 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Any other questions.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Mr. Larsen, do you
35 know what percentage this timber harvest is going to
36 affect winter habitat that's being done on the
37 Lindenberg Peninsula?

38

39 MR. LARSEN: Mr. Chairman. In terms of
40 what percentage of the available habitat, is that your
41 question, that would be affected?

42

43 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Well, as I
44 understood, there was some winter habitat that is
45 included in the timber sale and that is in the affected
46 area and I'm just curious as to does that play into
47 your analysis of -- the State's analysis of one of the
48 reasons why we need to cut back on the deer harvest.
49 Is that going to affect deer harvest or the deer
50 population?

1 MR. LARSEN: Mr. Chairman. I think any
2 time we reduce winter range that will ultimately have
3 an effect on deer populations. In this particular
4 instance, that's not factored in for now because that's
5 more of kind of what we talked about with Prince of
6 Wales. As stem exclusion occurs, that's going to
7 reduce the carrying capacity for deer and at some point
8 we may have to do more restrictive regulations in
9 response to that. The same I think would be true on
10 the Lindenberg in the instance that you're referring
11 to, but that doesn't play into this specific issue at
12 this point in time.

13
14 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you.

15
16 Any other questions for Mr. Larsen.

17
18 (No comments)

19
20 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Seeing none. Thank
21 you, Doug.

22
23 Okay. Is there any Federal agencies.

24
25 (No comments)

26
27 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Native or tribal
28 villages.

29
30 (No comments)

31
32 VICE CHAIR BANGS: InterAgency Staff
33 have any comments. Mr. Kessler.

34
35 MR. KESSLER: No, sir. Nothing.

36
37 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you. Is there
38 any written comments, Mr. Larson.

39
40 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair, we have no
41 written public comments.

42
43 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you. Any no
44 public testimony.

45
46 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. There's no
47 public testimony.

48
49 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Okay. What's the
50 wish of the Council.

1 Mr. Hernandez.

2

3 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.
4 Chairman. Could I have Dennis Chester come up again
5 and answer another question. I thought of something
6 else here before we start deliberations.

7

8 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Mr. Chester, thank
9 you.

10

11 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you. Dennis,
12 during the public testimony on the special action there
13 was a number of people that were concerned about the
14 designated hunter activity on the Lindenberg Peninsula.
15 I seemed to think that was a factor in some of the deer
16 population. I haven't been able to find it. Do you
17 have some information here on the designated hunter
18 participation rate on the Lindenberg Peninsula?

19

20 MR. CHESTER: There is none of that
21 information in the analysis. I did try and take a look
22 at some of that information from the subsistence
23 harvest database and there certainly is some use of the
24 designated hunter permit over there. I was not able to
25 tease out very well how much of a percentage or whether
26 it was a substantial portion of the harvest over there.

27

28 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
29 Chester.

30

31 Any other discussion.

32

33 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.

34

35 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Ms. Phillips.

36

37 MS. PHILLIPS: I have a question for
38 Mr. Chester. Thank you, Chairman Bangs. Mr. Chester,
39 the 1,000 foot beach buffer, is there a 1,000 foot
40 beach buffer on the Lindenberg?

41

42 MR. CHESTER: Under the Tongass Forest
43 Plan there should be a 1,000 foot beach buffer on
44 Federally managed lands. That doesn't necessarily mean
45 that there could be absolutely no activity. For
46 example, they could build a road to access if there's
47 no other options if it's a reasonable option to do
48 that. So it doesn't totally exclude development
49 activities from that area, but they should be pretty
50 minimal.

1 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.
2
3 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Ms. Phillips.
4
5 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. I guess when
6 was that harvested, that Peninsula, because I m reading
7 that prior timber harvest is affecting deer habitat.
8 Is that recent or is it -- so is that 1,000 buffer in
9 place? I know it s mandated by TLMP, but is it old
10 growth in that 1,000 foot buffer or is it second
11 growth, do you know?
12
13 MR. CHESTER: The 1,000 foot beach
14 buffer came about with the 1997 forest plan revision,
15 amendment, whatever it was, so prior to that there
16 could have been harvest within that beach buffer.
17 Under the current plan there should be pretty much no
18 harvest in that 1,000 foot beach buffer. But there is
19 timber sales going on. The Tonka Timber Sale was
20 recently approved, so there is currently timber harvest
21 going on on the Lindenberg Peninsula, but there really
22 shouldn't be anything new happening within that 1,000
23 foot buffer.
24
25 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. I guess I
26 want to know has there been timber harvest in that
27 1,000 foot buffer prior to the mandate of a 1,000 foot
28 buffer.
29
30 MR. CHESTER: I suspect there was. I'd
31 have to look at the activity maps. There certainly
32 could have been. I suspect there was.
33
34 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you.
35
36 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
37 Chester.
38
39 Any other discussion.
40
41 (No comments)
42
43 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you. Which
44 way does the Council want to go. What's the choice of
45 the -- Mr. Hernandez.
46
47 MR. HERNANDEZ: I guess I would move to
48 adopt WP14-05.
49
50 MR. JACKSON: Second.

1 VICE CHAIR BANGS: It's been moved and
2 seconded to adopt the proposal WP14-05. Discussion.

3

4 MR. ISAACS: Call for the question.

5

6 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Mr. Hernandez.

7

8 MR. HERNANDEZ: No, I've got some
9 discussion. I was just trying to think of where to
10 start here. I think it's a very complicated issue. I
11 know a fair number of people that hunt on the
12 Lindenberg Peninsula and I've talked to a number of
13 them. I generally got agreement that there s a
14 conservation concern there and I think most people that
15 I talk to do believe a reduction in the season is
16 necessary.

17

18 Also they seem to be happy with the
19 two-week one buck season, October 15th to the 31st.
20 There's a question about moving the proposed
21 modification by the Staff of August 1 to November 30th,
22 one antlered deer. I guess I have some question as to
23 whether or not that would achieve the goal of limiting
24 this harvest. I think it sounded like the State also
25 has some reservations about whether that modification
26 would achieve the goal intended.

27

28 Also talking to people that I know in
29 the Petersburg area, this question about the designated
30 hunter activity. I see there were a couple people that
31 brought that up in the public testimony as well, one of
32 whom was the ADF&G wildlife area biologist. On page 81
33 in his testimony says that loss of deer winter habitat
34 due to logging and excessive harvest by the Federal
35 designated hunters has contributed to the decline. I
36 think the Council might need to have a discussion about
37 that.

38

39 In the past, we've had several
40 different proposals dealing with designated hunters. I
41 know some people aren't very happy with it. The
42 Council has weighed in on that. We've pretty much
43 established that designated hunting is an important
44 part of subsistence activities and it's worth
45 continuing. However, in instances where we have a
46 conservation concern combined with an area that has a
47 lot of easy access by road, roaded access to a fairly
48 populated area where there is a lot of competition and
49 that is the issue with the designated hunter. A lot of
50 people, they don't seem to -- just due to the amount of

1 opportunity available to people to hunt the area they
2 feel that designated hunter gives some people an unfair
3 advantage to access the deer.

4

5 Then the ADF&G biologist seems to think
6 it's a factor in the decline, which I don't know if
7 that's necessarily the case, but in the original
8 proposal if the season were two weeks long and not
9 taking place during the primary hunting -- successful
10 hunting period of the rut in November, I would say that
11 would definitely accomplish the goal of eliminating
12 some harvest in the area. However, if the -- also I
13 guess I should mention that the factor of designated
14 hunting in a two-week season is not going to be a very
15 big factor. I don't think there would be really any
16 kind of excessive harvest under designated hunter in
17 that short of a season.

18

19 However, if you have a longer season
20 that extends into the rut, November, you're probably
21 going to have higher success rate of hunting, more
22 designated hunting and may not accomplish the goal. My
23 feeling on this proposal would be to vote in favor of
24 the original proposal without the modification for a
25 whole bunch of different reasons.

26

27 Thank you.

28

29 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
30 Hernandez. I'd like to make a comment. I've hunted
31 that area many times. I heard there was abuse of the
32 designated hunter program and I went to a couple of the
33 designated hunters that were suspect in my mind that I
34 was told and they admitted it was totally legal and
35 what they did is they got tags for their mom, their dad
36 and that was real easy for them to go over there and
37 hunt and get as many deer as they wanted.

38

39 With that in mind, there is a loss of
40 winter habitat. There's a big problem with wolf
41 predation. I think that's the key to the original
42 proposal by the State to change it, is so that they can
43 implement intensive management. I think although it
44 would cut back on the opportunity for subsistence
45 users, as we know they're primarily the only ones that
46 hunt that area, I would be in favor of the original
47 proposal without the modification as well.

48

49 It was brought to my attention that
50 maybe if the Council wished, we could put a two year

1 sunset clause or four years or whatever so that it
2 would go back to the original Federal regulations for
3 hunting and that would be an option to where we
4 wouldn't lose it indefinitely, but it would give us a
5 chance to come back in two years and look at it again.
6 That's just some options we have. That's my own
7 feeling about this.

8

9 I realize there is a problem there and
10 I think it shouldn't be wide open for that long of a
11 season for the reasons that Mr. Hernandez said, that
12 during the rut they're real vulnerable there and I
13 think we need to do something.

14

15 Thank you.

16

17 Is there any other -- Mr. Isaacs and
18 then Ms. Phillips.

19

20 MR. ISAACS: Mr. Chair. It sounds like
21 you already voiced the alternate proposal.

22

23 VICE CHAIR BANGS: I'm just offering
24 some thoughts that we could amend this proposal if we
25 wanted to. Mr. -- Ms. Phillips I think is next.

26

27 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. -- me?

28

29 VICE CHAIR BANGS: No. Ms. Phillips.

30

31 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair. I have a
32 question. I also support the original proposal. What
33 I would like to know is can we amend it to shut down
34 the designated hunter for that area?

35

36 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Mr. Hernandez.

37

38 MR. HERNANDEZ: I would say Patty that
39 if we went with the Staff s modification to keep the
40 length of the season or extend the length of the season
41 August 1st to November 30th, if we were to vote in
42 favor of that, I would say it would probably be a good
43 idea to talk about eliminating the designated hunter.
44 However, if we go with the two week season, I think
45 that kind of would offer very little opportunity for
46 having excessive harvest under the designated hunter in
47 only a two week period, so it probably wouldn't be
48 necessary to even have that discussion. That's just
49 kind of my feeling on it.

50

1 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
2 Hernandez. One other thing I think you touched on,
3 that this two week period they're awfully hard to find
4 in the two weeks of October.

5
6 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair. I
7 appreciate that, but I don't think my question was
8 answered. Could we shut the designated hunter program
9 off for the Lindenberg Peninsula.

10
11 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Mr. Larson.

12
13 MR. LARSON: You're going to have to
14 give me a minute to think about this. I'll confer and
15 get back to you. How does that sound? Give me two
16 minutes.

17
18 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Okay. Hold that
19 thought and then Mr. Douville has a question or a
20 comment.

21
22 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Bangs.
23 So which motion applies here, the modified or the
24 original?

25
26 MR. HERNANDEZ: The original.

27
28 MR. DOUVILLE: Is that what's on the
29 floor?

30
31 MS. PHILLIPS: Yes, the original.

32
33 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Yes.

34
35 MR. DOUVILLE: I would have a tendency
36 to support the modified version. I believe the amount
37 of hunting and the amount of deer that come off of
38 there is probably pretty small compared to other
39 factors. Even the Department will say that weather and
40 wolf predation are the biggest factors. A restriction
41 like this to me is like putting a Band-Aid on something
42 that needs stitches. The wolf predation problem is
43 probably the biggest factor and needs to be addressed.
44 Restricting hunters is not a significant issue in this
45 problem on this Peninsula in my opinion.

46
47 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
48 Douville.

49
50 Mr. Adams.

1 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: That was an issue I
2 was going to bring up earlier, but we got caught up in
3 some other discussion here. The proposal Mr. Hernandez
4 wanted to support it appeared through the discussion
5 that it was the original proposal. However, as I look
6 down here, it says the Southeast Regional Council
7 recommendation is to modify it, so I'm just kind of
8 wondering, you know, which one are we working on here.
9

10 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Mr. Hernandez then
11 Mr. Isaac.

12
13 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
14 Bert, I'm glad you mentioned that because in our
15 proposal booklets on all of these proposals it does say
16 that the Southeast Regional Council made a
17 recommendation. In this particular case, it says to
18 support with the modification. We have not made any
19 recommendations on this proposal prior to right now. I
20 think that s a misprint.

21
22 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Mr. Hernandez, I
23 agree. The previous proposal has the same thing and we
24 had never seen the proposal except in our booklet. It
25 should say OSM if I'm not -- Mr. Larson.

26
27 MR. LARSON: I was hoping we would get
28 through -- I was very happy to have the first two
29 proposals go through without this discussion, but now
30 that it's broached, in fact this is a mistake. Please
31 don t take it out of context where it has Southeast
32 Regional Council recommendation. That should be OSM's
33 recommendation and it's truly just a misprint. We're
34 not presupposing what exactly your action will be, so
35 don't take it as such.

36
37 Thank you.

38
39 And I do have some thoughts on Patty's
40 question when you're ready for it.

41
42 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Just a comment. I
43 thought, you know, that -- I lost my train of thought.
44 It must be getting late in the day. But, anyhow, the
45 modification as indicated here is a misprint and we are
46 taking that up right now, so our recommendation will
47 come a little bit later on or after this thing has
48 passed. Just a thought.

49
50 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Well, actually we're

1 taking up the original proposal. The modification
2 isn't in the picture yet. Thank you.

3

4 Mr. Hernandez.

5

6 MR. HERNANDEZ: I was just going to
7 clarify also that my -- when I introduced the proposal,
8 I said that we would adopt it in its original form. So
9 if we want to go with a modification, we'll have to
10 make that as an amendment.

11

12 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you for
13 clarifying that. Mr. Isaacs.

14

15 MR. ISAACS: According to parliamentary
16 procedure until we dispose of the original proposal,
17 then we could go to the modified one.

18

19 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Well, I think what
20 we would do is amend the proposal.....

21

22 MR. ISAACS: Or amend.

23

24 VICE CHAIR BANGS:with the
25 modification.

26

27 MR. ISAACS: But right now we're trying
28 to deal with both of them simultaneously, which is.....

29

30 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Well, we're
31 discussing the proposal and we can discuss the
32 modification, but it's up for discussion.

33

34 MR. ISAACS: And that s what s
35 confusing.

36

37 VICE CHAIR BANGS: I can understand how
38 you re confused, but that's the way -- we discuss the
39 proposal, we can discuss any amendment we want with it
40 and that s where we re at. Any other discussion. Ms.
41 Needham.

42

43 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
44 kind of agree with Mr. Douville in that I d like to
45 think about this modification that OSM has offered
46 because I believe that the analysis that was done in
47 this proposal, if the recommendation was to actually
48 maintain the harvest season, that what was taken into
49 consideration was the conservation concern and I felt
50 that there was not a conservation concern if they just

1 reduced the harvest but not the season. That s the
2 first thing we have to ask ourselves when we address
3 these proposals and then we have these other criteria.

4
5

6 So assuming that the modification
7 addresses that conservation concern wholly, although I
8 want Mr. Hernandez to know that I have heard what he's
9 testified on, I think the effects of this proposal on
10 subsistence users within the proposal area and adjacent
11 to the proposal area that there's a potential for a lot
12 of increased competition between users, not just
13 subsistence users but sport users and I also believe
14 there's a potential for a lot of competition in
15 adjacent areas from the subsistence users from here
16 that are going there that haven't been necessarily
17 considered or talked about.

18
19

20 So I think there's a lot of potential
21 impacts of this project by closing down -- like you
22 said, fixing a big problem -- it's not as big of a
23 problem as we're trying to fix. So I'd like to hear a
24 little bit more about considering the modification and
25 I'd also like if Mr. Jackson has something that he can
26 weigh in on from the community of Kake, which is within
27 the proposal areas and the potential effects. I'd like
28 to hear a little bit from him, but if he doesn't know,
29 he doesn't have to feel pressured.

30
31

32 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Ms.
33 Needham. Just before this I'd like to get Mr. Larson's
34 clarification of Patty's question and then Mr. Jackson.

35
36

37 MR. LARSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
38 Thank you for allowing me just a few minutes to get my
39 thoughts together. My initial thoughts was this fairly
40 simple question that has not necessarily a simple
41 answer. Whether or not you can take this proposal and
42 include a modification to restrict designated hunting
43 has two answers.

44
45

46 One is whether or not that kind of
47 activity is within the scope of the original proposal
48 and subject to adequate public notice. I do not think
49 that it was. I think that when we're talking about a
50 designated hunting program that is integral to this
program, if we're talking about restricting it or
closing it, that is, in this case, at least is outside
the scope of the public process and it would not be
allowed. I would counsel you very strongly against

1 that.

2

3 That being said, if there was public
4 notice and if this was an option for your discussion,
5 we get back to the same question about equal treatment
6 of qualified residents in that -- and the Council had
7 this discussion earlier about a season for specific to
8 both disability-wise persons or persons of a certain
9 age and disparate treatment and I think that that
10 discussion is relevant in this case as well.

11

12 In addition, generally speaking, if you
13 look at the way the Board has addressed issued on how
14 to restrict harvest, restricting designated hunting is
15 not their preferred way. So you can restrict seasons,
16 you can restrict methods, you can restrict means.
17 There are harvest limits. There's lots of ways of
18 restricting opportunity with the goal of restrictive
19 harvest, but generally speaking it is not done by
20 restricting designated hunting.

21

22 Thank you.

23

24 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
25 Larson.

26

27 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you.

28

29 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Mr. Jackson.

30

31 MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman. Ms.
32 Phillips. The question that I asked earlier was
33 directed because I thought it was a misstatement about
34 Kake because no one that I know of uses it customary
35 and traditionally. They don't go past the Portage Bay.
36 I guess if they had any contact with people from Kake,
37 I don't know, Mr. Larson.

38

39 I speak basically for myself that I
40 know all the hunters that go and they usually go to
41 Admiralty Island and/or around Kake. It s just a
42 misstatement of words and I didn't see this RAC thing
43 until he mentioned it. The other thing is, and I've
44 been thinking about this, they say the predation is
45 reducing amounts of deer that are around the areas.
46 You know, they talk about bears and wolves, but I see
47 another part and nobody talks about this.

48

49 The moose that are coming in on
50 Kupreanof Island are eating the same forage and food

1 and they are taking way more than the deer are and the
2 deer are moving. This is something I think maybe you
3 guys have more experience around the Stikine. But when
4 a moose comes onto the island and starts eating its way
5 through or a bunch of moose, we've been seeing a lot
6 more moose, and now there s an introduction of elk that
7 are coming over from Etolin Island. So it's not just
8 predators, like wolves and bears and wolverines, that
9 are coming to our island now, it s the other animals
10 that eat the same forage.

11
12 But, no, I wasn't directing -- you
13 know, it was just a misstatement about the Kake people.
14 I agree that we should probably accept the proposal
15 with the modifications. I don't know. I need to hear
16 more. But I know some of the people that testified on
17 this that work on the Peninsula that are loggers. I
18 see their names and they say there's more deer now.

19
20 Just yesterday somebody seemed to
21 testify that 7 to 12 percent of the harvest would
22 affect the deer population. I mean the amount of
23 harvest they were going to do on the Lindenberg
24 Peninsula. So I'm not really sure about Kake being
25 studied because I think that this might come later. I
26 don't know how to request that. I guess basically I
27 was just asking why did they just do Lindenberg
28 Peninsula and not the rest of Kupreanof.

29
30 Thank you.

31
32 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
33 Jackson. I'd like to say in my opinion of accepting
34 the modification will do little or no change in deer
35 harvest because of the designated hunter. I know that
36 the hunters that go there will take as many deer as
37 they want. The only way that we can reduce -- in my
38 own beliefs, the only way we can reduce the take of
39 deer is to take the deer hunt out of the rut and reduce
40 the time period and the bag limit.

41
42 That's my opinion.

43
44 Any one else.

45
46 Ms. Phillips and then Mr. Hernandez.

47
48 MS. PHILLIPS: Yes, Mr. Chair. The
49 Staff report and Fish and Game staff talks about the
50 conservation concern and that's where my priority lies

1 right now. I feel I have a responsibility on this
2 Council for the sustainability of the deer on the
3 Lindenberg. So we went to extraordinary measures on
4 the Neka, that corner of northeast Chichagof. So
5 sometimes we have to make those sort of decisions for
6 the good of the population so that we can have those
7 opportunities or our children can have those
8 opportunities.

9

10 So I would request that we give this
11 serious consideration to adopt it as originally
12 proposed.

13

14 Thank you.

15

16 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Ms.
17 Phillips. Mr. Hernandez.

18

19 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.
20 Chairman. I was just going to respond to Mr.
21 Douville's observation about the wolf predation
22 probably being the driving factor in the conservation
23 concern. It certainly is a major component of what's
24 happening over there. I'd have to agree. I think in
25 this particular case, talking to a lot of people that
26 use that area, they really do seem to think that the
27 intensity of the hunting that happens there, given that
28 it's such a small area, close to town, that the hunting
29 effort is a factor all right in that deer population.

30

31 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Don.

32

33 Anyone else.

34

35 (No comments)

36

37 VICE CHAIR BANGS: I would entertain a
38 call for the question or more discussion.

39

40 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I call for the
41 question, Mr. Chairman.

42

43 VICE CHAIR BANGS: The question has
44 been called. Harvey, can we get a roll call, please.

45

46 MR. KITKA: Tim Ackerman.

47

48 MR. ACKERMAN: Yes.

49

50 MR. KITKA: Frank Wright.

1 MR. WRIGHT: Yes.
2
3 MR. KITKA: Patricia Phillips.
4
5 MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.
6
7 MR. KITKA: Michael Douville.
8
9 MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.
10
11 MR. KITKA: Harvey Kitka, yes. Bert
12 Adams.
13
14 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes.
15
16 MR. KITKA: Floyd Kookesh.
17
18 MR. KOOKESH: Yes.
19
20 MR. KITKA: Donald Hernandez.
21
22 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.
23
24 MR. KITKA: Kenneth Jackson.
25
26 MR. JACKSON: Yes.
27
28 MR. KITKA: Aaron Isaacs.
29
30 MR. ISAACS: Yes.
31
32 MR. KITKA: John Yeager.
33
34 MR. YEAGER: Yes.
35
36 MR. KITKA: Michael Bangs.
37
38 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Yes.
39
40 MR. KITKA: Cathy Needham.
41
42 MS. NEEDHAM: Yes.
43
44 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Harvey.
45 The proposal passes as written. Okay. Next on the
46 agenda is Statewide Proposal WP14-01 and I believe Mr.
47 Jack Lorrigan is going to give us a report.
48
49 MR. LORRIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
50 I forgot to mention that there was a couple comments on

1 this proposal from the consultations. The first one
2 I'll report on is from August 14th. The caller
3 commented -- I believe it was from Kotzebue. This one
4 is to require regularly checking of traps statewide.
5 They feel it's not appropriate for their area and
6 there's not a problem in their area with this. There
7 was support from other callers on this to oppose it.

8
9 The second comment was from a village
10 near Bethel. They were supporting the proposal, but
11 they didn't clarify what their support was. That's all
12 I have to add on that.

13
14 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
15 Lorrigan.

16
17 Any questions.

18
19 Yes, Mr. Larson.

20
21 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. There may be
22 Trevor Fox from the Office of Subsistence Management
23 available on the telephone. He is the original author
24 of the analysis and is a subject matter expert on the
25 aspects of this proposal. If there are technical
26 questions specific to the analysis, Trevor will be
27 available there to answer your questions.

28
29 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
30 Larson.

31
32 Are you there, Trevor?

33
34 MR. FOX: Yeah, Mr. Chair, I'm here.
35 I'm happy to provide a quick summary of the analysis if
36 that's the wish of the Council.

37
38 VICE CHAIR BANGS: That would be very
39 helpful. Thank you.

40
41 MR. FOX: Okay. Can everybody hear me
42 okay?

43
44 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Yes.

45
46 MR. FOX: Okay, great. For the record,
47 I'm Trevor Fox. I'm a wildlife biologist with the
48 Office of Subsistence Management here in Anchorage.
49 Proposal WP14-01, the executive summary starts on Page
50 82 with the analysis beginning on Page 84.

1 This proposal was submitted by Kevin
2 Bopp of Nome and it requests the establishment of new
3 statewide provisions for Federal trapping regulations
4 that require trapper identification tags on all traps
5 and snares, establish a maximum allowable time limit
6 for checking traps and snares, and establish a trapping
7 report form to collect data on non-target species
8 captured in traps and snares. Again, this would be a
9 statewide provision.

10

11 The proposed requirements could lead to
12 more humane trapping methods under Federal regulations,
13 however these regulatory provisions would not likely be
14 manageable on a statewide basis due to vast differences
15 in land ownership, population concentrations and
16 habitats. Regulations of this nature would be better
17 suited in response to issues on an area-specific basis,
18 like similar restrictions currently under State and
19 Federal trapping regulations.

20

21 Alignment issues would require a
22 substantial increase in law enforcement and public
23 education efforts, also requiring trappers to check
24 traps during inclement weather could lead to health and
25 safety issues. Also, in many instances, Federally
26 qualified subsistence users could simply trap under
27 State regulations to avoid these additional proposed
28 Federal restrictions.

29

30 While the information gathered from a
31 new harvest report form on non-target species caught in
32 traps and snares could provide useful information, it
33 would be an unnecessary requirement for Federally
34 qualified subsistence users. The report would require
35 additional time commitments for the Federal users and
36 Federal staff, which is currently unwarranted. General
37 reports would be more useful in areas with specific
38 issues with the capture of non-target species, such as
39 areas with threatened or endangered species or
40 significant user conflict issues.

41

42 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
43 oppose WP14-01.

44

45 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

46

47 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Trevor.

48

49 Any questions for Mr. Fox.

50

1 (No comments)
2
3 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Hearing none. We'll
4 go to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.
5
6 Thank you, Trevor.
7
8 MR. FOX: Thank you.
9
10 MS. YUHAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
11 Jennifer Yuhas, Alaska Department of Fish and Game
12 liaison. The Department agrees with the OSM analysis
13 and supports their conclusion to oppose this proposal.
14 That's the extent of the Department comments since
15 Mr. Larson, with an O, and I keep miscoordinating a
16 little bit when it comes to the AC comments. I just
17 wanted to provide for your discussion and apply this to
18 the other proposals you already discussed.
19
20 The reason that you don't have any AC
21 comments in your packet for any of these right now is
22 due to the meeting cycle. With the RACs, you meet
23 twice a year and our ACs usually conclude for the
24 summertime and are just resuming, so they haven't had a
25 chance to look at these and provide comments. The
26 Southeast AC will meet after you and will probably take
27 into consideration some of your deliberations before
28 they comment on any of these proposals, but it's not
29 that the ACs on the State side didn't care to review
30 these. They just haven't had the chance since they
31 weren't due until April and the analysis wasn't ready
32 for their meeting when they concluded for the summer.
33
34 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Jennifer.
35
36 Any questions.
37
38 (No comments)
39
40 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Federal agencies.
41
42 (No comments)
43
44 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Native, tribal,
45 villages.
46
47 (No comments)
48
49 VICE CHAIR BANGS: InterAgency Staff
50 comments. Mr. Kessler isn't here.

1 (No comments)

2

3 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Is there any
4 advisory group notes that you received, Mr. Larson?

5

6 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. There are, as
7 indicated by Ms. Yuhas, the Advisory Committees, if
8 that's what you're asking for, are really out of sync
9 with this cycle, so we do not have any and nor really
10 do we expect any at this stage. I cannot speak whether
11 or not they will meet or consider these prior to the
12 Board meeting, but there are none available for this
13 Council.

14

15 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Or no written
16 comments.

17

18 MR. LARSON: There are two written
19 comments. If you look in your book on Page 90. They
20 are both in opposition to the proposal. One is from
21 the Ahtna Incorporation, their Customary and
22 Traditional Use Committee, and one is from Miki and
23 Julie Collins from Lake Minchumina.

24

25 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
26 Larson. We don't have any public testimony, as far as
27 I don't have any blue cards up here.

28

29 So what's the will of the Council.

30

31 Ms. Needham.

32

33 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
34 Is it appropriate at this time to get a summary of how
35 the other RACs that have previously met have ruled on
36 this.

37

38 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Mr. Larson, do you
39 have an idea.

40

41 MR. LARSON: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair. I
42 do not have a document that tells us what the North
43 Slope did or the Western Arctic, which I think those
44 are the two committees that have already met. Maybe
45 Pat would know, but I don't really know.

46

47 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you.

48

49 Ms. Petrivelli.

50

1 MS. PETRIVELLI: I know that the North
2 Slope and the Northwest Arctic both opposed these
3 proposals. The only other Council that's met since
4 then is Kodiak Aleutians and they're meeting now, so I
5 don't know if they've gotten to this proposal yet or
6 not.

7
8 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you. What's
9 the desire of the Council. I'd entertain a motion.

10
11 Mr. Hernandez.

12
13 MR. HERNANDEZ: I'll make the motion to
14 adopt Wildlife Proposal 14-01.

15
16 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Do we have a second.

17
18 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I'll second it.

19
20 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
21 Adams. The motion has been made to adopt the proposal
22 and it's been seconded.

23
24 Discussion.

25
26 Mr. Hernandez.

27
28 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.
29 Chairman. I would vote against this proposal. It
30 doesn't address a conservation concern. It would place
31 some imposition on existing subsistence uses that
32 doesn't really seem to be necessary at this time, so
33 I'd vote no on this one.

34
35 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
36 Hernandez.

37
38 Any other discussion.

39
40 MS. PHILLIPS: Call for the question.

41
42 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Patty.

43
44 The question has been called for.

45
46 Harvey.

47
48 MR. KITKA: Tim Ackerman.

49
50 MR. ACKERMAN: No.

1 MR. KITKA: Frank Wright.
2
3 MR. WRIGHT: No.
4
5 MR. KITKA: Patricia Phillips.
6
7 MS. PHILLIPS: No.
8
9 MR. KITKA: Michael Douville.
10
11 MR. DOUVILLE: No.
12
13 MR. KITKA: Harvey Kitka votes no.
14 Bert Adams.
15
16 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: No.
17
18 MR. KITKA: Floyd Kookesh.
19
20 MR. KOOKESH: No.
21
22 MR. KITKA: Donald Hernandez.
23
24 MR. HERNANDEZ: No.
25
26 MR. KITKA: Kenneth Jackson.
27
28 MR. JACKSON: No.
29
30 MR. KITKA: Aaron Isaacs.
31
32 MR. ISAACS: No.
33
34 MR. KITKA: John Yeager.
35
36 MR. YEAGER: No.
37
38 MR. KITKA: Michael Bangs.
39
40 VICE CHAIR BANGS: No.
41
42 MR. KITKA: Cathy Needham.
43
44 MS. NEEDHAM: No.
45
46 MR. KITKA: Mr. Chair, WP14-01 fails.
47
48 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Harvey.
49 Let's take a short break. Bake in 10 minutes or so.
50

1 Thank you.

2

3 (Off record)

4

5 (On record)

6

7 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Call the meeting
8 back to order. The next item on the agenda is the
9 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Plan. Terry Suminski and
10 Ben Van Alen have a presentation for us.

11

12 MR. VAN ALEN: Thank you, Chairman.
13 Members of the Council. I'm Ben Van Alen, subsistence
14 fisheries biologist in Juneau with the Forest Service.
15 I'm just going to do a review of results in the past
16 fishery monitoring program projects that were mainly
17 keyed in with sockeye throughout the region.

18

19 There's been distributed a table. It's
20 a two-sided page. On one side it says sockeye
21 escapement estimates by the Fisheries Resource
22 Monitoring Program projects. I'm just going to be
23 reviewing some of the highlights from that information.
24 It is an important benefit, let's say, of the Federal
25 takeover of the subsistence is that there has been some
26 money made available for stock assessment of resources.
27 In our case, assessments of eulachon and sockeye or
28 salmon, mostly sockeye. This data is very important
29 for building public support for our management program.

30

31

32 Our stock assessment methods are
33 getting better. I caution and I think we're aware that
34 the best way to close a fishery is to put a leaky weir
35 on it and, to a lot of extent, our ability to get
36 reliable and very useful estimates is very good now.
37 Our data has been helpful to manage less conservatively
38 in some cases and our data is and will be needed to
39 shape outside fisheries, you know, commercial fisheries
40 to better meet subsistence priority obligations.

41

42 Prior to the Federal subsistence money
43 being available, there really wasn't much for salmon or
44 sockeye stock assessment projects except in the
45 mainland systems where there's directed gillnet
46 fisheries on particular stocks and this is a table I
47 referred to and out of all these years of studies we've
48 had funded now since beginning in 2001. We have a lot
49 of reports that are available.

50

1 I'm just going to proceed through. I
2 organized this little presentation in alphabetical
3 order so you could follow down on this table list. We
4 see in a number of places on the table that we have
5 very low estimates of escapement. The escapements were
6 very low in a number of systems in this year 2013.
7 There's a little more than 1,000 sockeye that escaped
8 into Falls Lake. You see our basic operation at Falls
9 Lake.

10
11 There's a trap at the head of a fish
12 pass. All the fish are marked and then they swim
13 through two video shoots. A lower net weir and an
14 upper net weir and then off into the lake where they
15 ripen and then spawn on the beaches and inlet streams.
16 That's a basic design of that net weir that we just saw
17 in that picture. We're making due, having them fit it
18 where they can at the outlet of lakes. Here we have
19 one net weir over the logs and one net weir at the
20 outside of the logs.

21
22 There's a marked fish. That fish had
23 its adipose fin removed by the weir crew as it passed
24 through the trap and those two still had their fins.
25 Oh, here's another marked fish. So in some cases we're
26 using the fish video systems to do the sampling for us,
27 to help us determine what proportion of the fish are
28 marked and we get our estimate of escapement using that
29 information.

30
31 At Hatchery Creek, the next system on
32 the list, it was a fairly decent escapement this last
33 year, 6,500 fish. Those bolded numbers in the table,
34 all the numbers that are underlined are validated
35 escapement estimates. At a weir, you only count what
36 you see, so the validated ones are ones that are
37 validated with mark recapture studies. Also ones that
38 might have been validated with redundant fish video
39 system.

40
41 That s Tars, who is very active in the
42 hatchery project. There's our net weir where we sample
43 for marked fish right above the picket weir you see
44 below the bridge there at Hatchery Creek.

45
46 At Hetta, very low escapement this
47 year. The lowest that's been observed. There it is
48 again. As mentioned, I believe it was two days ago,
49 Tony mentioned that the brood year '08 was not that
50 great. Anyway, it was a very low escapement this year.

1 Last year we did a quick test of a net weir. It turned
2 out the net weir was right up close and personal to the
3 picket weir and it didn't work so well, but there's
4 potential to continue using the sampling of for
5 marked/unmarked to validate that weir count.

6

7 Here's Kanalku Weir. Generally, the
8 escapements, except in '09 and '10, haven't really been
9 much to brag about. They are less than what we would
10 imagine the lake could support. Here's that fish blast
11 that was talked about yesterday. So that was one blast
12 in September, earlier this month. The camera gets
13 knocked over there. Anyway, that's a visual of what
14 was done to widen and deepen the jump pool at the base
15 of the falls.

16

17 At Karta there wasn't a project this
18 last year and not a project proposal turned in for the
19 upcoming cycle, but the use of the estimates that were
20 available for the years of funding.

21

22 At Klag, this has been a project again.
23 We have 15 years, is it, I think of escapement
24 estimates thanks to this project and it's been very
25 helpful to monitor the return of sockeye. In this
26 case, it's kind of indexing the return of sockeye in
27 western Chichagof Island, north of Sitka.

28

29 This is a picture that Jennifer
30 provided me this year, a picture of the weir and the
31 work crew. At Klawock, there's been a weir in there
32 for many years generally associated with the hatchery
33 that we see in the background there. The past three
34 years has been very low escapements in there. It's
35 also three years where there hasn't been hatchery
36 returns returning to the hatchery and it is related --
37 I don't want to go into that, but it is a system that
38 literally is traditionally the largest subsistence
39 harvest in the whole region occurred in Klawock. I'd
40 imagine harvest this year as last year are not that
41 great and there's going to be more concerns regarding
42 the health of that population.

43

44 At Kook Lake we've had a number of
45 years of validated weir counts. We had a picket weir
46 and we've since moved on through to basically a full-on
47 swim through video system, two net weirs and the fish
48 swim through whenever they want all season long.
49 Here's some of the counts. We see a fairly protracted
50 run, inlet stream spawners, beach spawners. Some years

1 there's more fish early and late and it generally is
2 the result of the fishery shadow from the same fishery.

3

4

5 We'll see how this works here. Let's
6 see how it didn't work. Oh, well. Nice try. I had a
7 picture -- a video of some old used fish we were trying
8 to get scales from and it was a very poor escapement
9 this year, the lowest we'd seen at Kook Lake.

10

11 Here we are at Neva Lake. Again, very
12 low escapement this year. We've also gone from a
13 picket weir to a double redundant weir. In fact, this
14 year we took the trap out. It's a full swim through
15 system where the fish swim through the lake whenever
16 they want. It turns out to be most of those fish swim
17 under the cover of darkness into the lake. Literally
18 90 percent moving at night, so we're trying to work
19 with the fish, not hold them back at all.

20

21 This system and other systems had very
22 low water this year. There was a fair bit of pre-spawn
23 mortality. Here's a fish that had its eyes plucked out
24 by an eagle. It's still in there trying to do his
25 best. A number of pre-spawn mortalities in the system.

26

27 Redoubt Lake is the home of the world's
28 largest net weir. In the foreground there, we're on
29 the lake side and in the distance is Redoubt Bay, the
30 mighty Pacific Ocean, so you see our net weirs there
31 where again it funnels fish through a video shoot and
32 then the picket weir is actually in three parts down
33 there at the outlet. This year for the first time we
34 put a video shoot in the face of the weir. Allowed
35 fish to swim up and down stream. The first fish we
36 counted was a steelhead. Anyway, I consider that
37 advancing the science thanks to this project.

38

39 At Sitkoh Lake, again, many years of
40 indices. We've got a lot of good data for the year.
41 It turns out this year we just did our second of four
42 trips last Friday and escapement is turning very low.
43 It's about half of the lowest. Half of what we saw in
44 2004 right now. It's too early to really say, but it
45 doesn't look like a very strong escapement at all this
46 year. I should have put 2013 now that I look at that.

47

48 If we have funding, we might do remote
49 monitoring in there. In other words, have dual net
50 weirs like we tested here in 2012. A fish will swim

1 through, we'll get a validate or redundant counts of
2 them and we'll be able to monitor that through a
3 cellular network. So we'll be able to sit at our desk
4 or in this room right here and be able to see if our
5 project site is as we left it.

6
7 We've also done other work at Italio
8 River last couple of years. Redundant net weirs.
9 We've estimated escapement of sockeye into there in the
10 last -- this year and 2011 and some years in the early
11 2000's there was fairly high seine effort in
12 Upper Chatham and our information is tied in with what
13 are the escapements after they swim through the
14 fisheries. This is an example of years 2011 and 2013.
15 A very high effort in the passing stock fishing areas.

16
17 That's all I have. Thanks. Any
18 questions.

19
20 MS. PHILLIPS: Can you let the slide
21 show keep playing.

22
23 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Mr. Ackerman, you
24 had a question.

25
26 MR. ACKERMAN: Sure, Mr. Chairman.
27 Yes, pretty interesting to see all this. The net weir
28 -- or not the net weir, the steel weir that's run by
29 the State up there in Chilkoot has become a premier
30 bear viewing area. All the dead sockeye wash up
31 against the face and some of the half alive ones wash
32 up against the face, so the bears are always coming and
33 going, feeding off of that. After the sockeye are
34 pretty much done, then they pull all the pipes out and
35 let it run its natural course and the bears go back to
36 their business.

37
38 But, yeah, it's pretty interesting to
39 see the other kinds of weirs there and just imagine
40 them and a bear being mixed up together and seeing if
41 you have any damage done by any of the brown bears or
42 anything like that would be interesting. Thanks.

43
44 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Did you have a
45 question, Mr. Ackerman?

46
47 MR. ACKERMAN: Yeah, just an
48 observation.

49
50 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Any questions for

1 Mr. Van Alen. Yes, Mr. Isaacs.

2

3 MR. ISAACS: Two questions. What is
4 the scale scraping primarily used for?

5

6 MR. VAN ALLEN: From the scales you can
7 determine the age of the fish. How many years the fish
8 spent in freshwater and how many years it spent in the
9 ocean. With that information and estimates of
10 escapement and harvest of the fish you can essentially
11 reconstruct the run. You can estimate of the fish that
12 spawned, let's say this summer 2013, how many fish were
13 produced by that. They might come back as jacks or two
14 ocean or three ocean fish. Anyway, you can build
15 what's called a brood table and reconstruct the run.

16

17 It's all important where you can look
18 at the relationship between how many fish spawned and
19 how many come back. So it's critical information. Not
20 so much for many locations where we don't really know
21 what the commercial harvest is, but some locations like
22 Redoubt Lake it's been very helpful for us to
23 understand what range of escapement is likely to
24 maximize the production of fish over time.

25

26 MR. ISAACS: Okay. The other question
27 -- and this question is asked by many, many, many
28 people in Klawock because they remember the first weir
29 that went in, which was right above the first falls.
30 Those people were literally angry about it, not knowing
31 what the purpose and advantages of it were. But that's
32 part of my question, what is an overall advantage? We
33 remember when Steve, whatever his last name is, ran the
34 hatchery and he was always in trouble, not only with
35 the State, but with the locals. So, overall, what is
36 the overall advantage of the weir in Klawock?

37

38 MR. VAN ALLEN: I really appreciate the
39 question. To some extent, the whole reason why we're
40 having most of this fishery monitoring projects and
41 that would be estimating the number of fish that are
42 harvested by subsistence users in the terminal areas
43 and the bays and in the streams and estimating how many
44 fish make it back to spawn because that's literally
45 what we're managing for. We're managing to make sure
46 that we're able to -- that we have the numbers of fish
47 making it back to the bays and streams to meet
48 subsistence needs and spawning needs.

49

50 So, if nothing else, we are getting

1 estimates of escapement. If we see they're variable
2 but steady, that's okay. If they're trending down and
3 down and down, that would raise a flag of concern by us
4 that maybe there's too much harvest of the fish in
5 outside waters and that needs to be moderated in order
6 to get enough fish back to meet subsistence and
7 spawning needs. So it's basically a gauge for what
8 we're managing for.

9

10 In your questions and comments relate
11 very much to what Tim Ackerman's questions and comments
12 is. I think we can do it better and I think we're
13 demonstrating that. We are able to run weirs better.
14 In other words, the business of putting up a picket
15 fence and blocking the fish passage and allowing them
16 only to pass when we want to, which happens to be
17 during daylight hours, we're evolving away from that.
18 We're now in a number of locations allowing the fish to
19 swim on through whenever they want, day and night.

20

21 In fact at Kook and Neva we're not
22 evening stopping. No trap or anything. We've gone
23 from having weir sites with bears, living with bears at
24 the weirs, to not even seeing a bear all summer in
25 going to that manner of having a swim through system.
26 So I think it needs to be reconsidered wherever we have
27 weir sites that are holding fish back, creating bear
28 feeding stations, we probably should do something
29 different.

30

31 MR. ISAACS: Mr. Chair. Can I ask one
32 more question?

33

34 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Go ahead.

35

36 MR. ISAACS: I haven't read anything, I
37 haven't heard anything as to the effect of the
38 earthquake in Japan and in talking to several people
39 that are working with the fish programs I'm told that
40 the sockeye route does go by Japan and eventually into
41 Alaska. If this is correct, that would be good
42 information for the local people. If there's a low
43 escapement, they'll want to know why.

44

45 MR. VAN ALLEN: I can't really comment
46 directly on that, but I think we all need to be
47 cognizant of all the factors that can affect the
48 survival of our resources, our fish in this case, so
49 that's something we all need to be aware of. It's not
50 something that like right now the Forest Service's

1 program or Fish and Game's program that we're actively
2 sampling or monitoring those fish for maybe
3 radioactivity, but I think the points you're bringing
4 up is that we have to be aware of all factors that
5 could affect the survival.

6
7 MR. ISAACS: Yeah. Part of that same
8 question is that years ago one of my elder uncles told
9 me that -- he said whether you believe this or not,
10 Aaron, he said the fish we catch off Granite Point and
11 Cape Addington our fish are going to Canada. He said
12 our fish that we catch in Craig/Klawock area up around
13 the small rivers come through Warren Island, Warren
14 Channel, and I've always thought about that, you know,
15 how accurate that is, that the fish going by Granite
16 Point and Addington are on their way to Canada.

17
18 MR. VAN ALLEN: Yeah, I think we've put
19 together literally over 120 years now a pretty good
20 understanding of what the ocean migration routes are
21 for salmon, particularly the onshore return, so we know
22 a lot about how the fish entry goes into Southeast
23 Alaska and very aware of like the high harvest or take
24 of salmon bound for -- in this case, you're talking
25 sockeye bound for Fraser River, Nass and Skeena and
26 that's all a big piece of the Pacific Salmon Treaty.

27
28 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Ben.

29
30 Any other questions.

31
32 Ms. Phillips and then Frank.

33
34 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. I see on
35 this Table 1 -- are we asking questions about the table
36 or about the video or both?

37
38 MR. VAN ALLEN: Mr. Suminski is going to
39 talk specifically about 2014 funding projects and
40 priority for those. Any other general questions you
41 can ask either of us.

42
43 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
44 The slide show showed Hetta and Klawock as having
45 significant reduction in returning salmon. You said
46 that there's known ocean migration routes for salmon.
47 Where are those fish going? I mean why haven't they
48 come back and are you doing scale sampling of the
49 commercial catch that could identify those as Hetta or
50 Klawock fish?

1 MR. VAN ALLEN: I'd have to say it is a
2 little bit more general, but basically the adult salmon
3 on their onshore return, their spawning migration, are
4 coming out of the Gulf of Alaska. I should have a map
5 right here of Southeast, right, but if you could
6 imagine kind of a big arrow come out of the mighty
7 Pacific, it's kind of in a southeasterly direction.
8 They're migrating in off the ocean as southeasterly, so
9 they're kind of peeling off as they go, so they're
10 literally coming down.

11
12 Let's say we're talking fish returning
13 to northern inside waters of Southeast Alaska. Most of
14 them enter through Cross Sound, Icy Strait, through
15 Chatham and they peel off up to Lincoln and they peel
16 down to Taku Inlet and all other places and then the
17 next main entryway, you know, are Cape Ommaney, so
18 that's where you get a lot of fish that spawn in the
19 central Southeast Alaska area. Obviously Noise Island,
20 Addington, those are traditional hot spots.

21
22 Very important migration are passing
23 stock fishing areas and, indeed, there's a lot of
24 Fraser bound sockeye that swim through there in some
25 years. Obviously pink salmon from Masset and Skeena
26 and Nass as well as all the southern Southeast Alaska
27 swim through there. So I don't think we have to go
28 very far past just looking at a map for us to
29 understand basically where these fish migrate and then
30 what fisheries they're subjected to.

31
32 Your comment was that where there was a
33 very low run of sockeye to Hetta and to Klawock this
34 last year. I'd have to say there was a low escapement
35 and probably a lower subsistence take in the bays
36 there, but I really can't say much about the harvest.
37 What I do know this year was that there was much more
38 seine effort in what's called District 4 and District 3
39 in the Noise Island, Dall Island and inside areas this
40 year than it has been in the last about 10 years or so.
41 So there was certainly a lot more caught in the
42 traditional seine fishery this last year.

43
44 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Ben.

45
46 Mr. Wright.

47
48 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
49 was looking at this paper here and it shows main inlet
50 stream and then it has numbers 1,840, main inlet stream

1 3,438 and then outlet stream 233. Those three numbers,
2 can you explain that, please.

3

4 MR. VAN ALLEN: I was involved with a
5 collection of those. What it is is I'm trying to
6 compare apples and apples. So if we wanted to look
7 what is the trend in escapement. How do I compare
8 escapement indices from one year to the next. So if it
9 turns out there was similarly timed trips into
10 Hoktaheen Lake into the main inlet stream and in each
11 of those trips in 2001, '02, '03 and '04, we estimated
12 how many sockeye salmon were in those years at that
13 time and so I gave those numbers. So we can conclude
14 from that roughly that 2003 had a lot more fish than
15 the other years and maybe that 2004 was the weakest
16 escapement of those four years. So it's just wherever
17 I was able to pair the data up.

18

19 The next one is indexing the stream.
20 Well, in 2001 they only made one trip in there, but in
21 the other years we made three or more trips in there,
22 so we had a good, reliable index of the total
23 escapement that spawned in that inlet stream for that
24 year, so I was able to present those numbers and,
25 again, it shows definitely 2003 was the highest and
26 2004 was the lowest. So that's just comparisons.

27

28 The other place we found fish that
29 spawned in Hoktaheen is between the two lakes and
30 that's the lower number, the outlet stream. Again,
31 that was not a whole lot of fish, 250 fish or so, but
32 that's actually -- we don't have a lot of those numbers
33 on this table anymore. Those are indices of
34 escapement. It's not actually an estimate of the total
35 escapement into the lake. I have no idea what that is.

36

37 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Ben.

38

39 Do you have a follow up.

40

41 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.
42 Chair. It says no project, so there wasn't anything
43 going on out there this year. Will there be anything
44 going on out there? Because, you know, that system
45 always gets hit by Hoonah, Pelican, all the communities
46 within the Icy Straits area.

47

48 MR. VAN ALLEN: The quick answer is
49 probably there will not be under the Federal
50 Subsistence Program just because there was no project

1 proposal submitted for this last series of funding,
2 which might start next year. So not for the next four
3 years there probably won't be unless we had a windfall
4 of new monies or something.

5

6 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Ben.

7

8 Mr. Hernandez.

9

10 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you. In
11 conjunction with your weir projects, are you collecting
12 DNA samples that can be used for identifying where
13 these fish are caught?

14

15 MR. VAN ALLEN: Yes, we have and we
16 still are. In fact, just last Friday I collected more
17 DNA from Kook Lake. So the Fish and Game has asked us
18 several times over the years to collect information,
19 DNA samples, and we have. I believe the same has been
20 done -- there was a question yesterday if Kanalku had
21 been sampled. I'm sure it's been sampled. I'd be
22 really surprised if it hasn't as well as all these
23 other systems we've been working at.

24

25 I've actually sampled for three years
26 genetics at Kook Lake and at Neva Lake, which I think
27 is real important because there's inlet stream spawners
28 and there's lake spawners and that's the way it is in
29 most systems and they're completely independent.
30 That's like two species of salmon sockeye into a lake
31 and they're completely different genetically too, but
32 maybe distinct enough for that lake from others.

33

34 So we are working every year to refine
35 that genetic baseline, specifically guided by Fish and
36 Game and we're trying our best to do it. That's one
37 reason I was very concerned this year at Kook Lake with
38 escapement of 1,000 fish. We had a hard time getting
39 the samples that we were asked to get and we didn't get
40 them. We didn't get the 200 samples that they asked us
41 to get. So we'll have to get more sampling done next
42 year.

43

44 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Ben.

45

46 Ms. Phillips.

47

48 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
49 One of the dangers of being a long-standing Council
50 member is I remember fragments of long ago

1 presentations. Did Redoubt Lake -- wasn't that like --
2 what do you call that, fertilized in some way to
3 increase the number of fish survivability and are you
4 still doing that?

5
6 MR. VAN ALLEN: Yes, Redoubt Lake has
7 been fertilized for many years and it is still going on
8 and we do have enough information now where we're
9 really comfortable. If we keep the escapement between
10 like 7,000 and 27,000 fish and we keep fertilizing the
11 lake, we'll have the largest returns.

12
13 Actually, if you look at the escapement
14 estimates you'll see we have in some of -- we just went
15 through a cycle of some of the weakest escapements of
16 returns to the system as a result of over escapement,
17 having too many fish in that lake. That lake is a
18 little different than many other lakes, oligotrophic
19 lake. So anyway we have a problem developing at
20 Redoubt and that's we're not catching enough sockeye.

21
22 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Follow up, Patty.

23
24 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
25 Can that similar success of fertilizing a system is it
26 being applied in other systems or can we apply it in
27 other systems?

28
29 MR. VAN ALLEN: Yeah, I think it works
30 particularly well in this kind of a lake. It's a big,
31 U-shaped lake with 100 liters of fresh water on top of
32 anoxic 166 meters of brackish water. What happens in
33 that lake is the nutrients literally settle out and are
34 lost from the natural nutrient cycling that you have in
35 most lakes. So this lake in particular, and Hugh Smith
36 Lake, are lakes like that in the region that are big
37 and that will probably benefit from any level of
38 fertilization that you do.

39
40 But I don't think it would be wise to
41 us to think that fertilizing normal lakes would yield a
42 success. Typically it's the spawners that return those
43 marine dried nutrients and adequately provides the
44 nitrogen phosphorous that the lake needs to maintain
45 full productivity.

46
47 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Any other questions
48 for Mr. Van Alen.

49
50 (No comments)

1 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Mr. Suminski, did
2 you have a presentation?

3
4 MR. SUMINSKI: Good afternoon, Mr.
5 Chairman. Council members. For Ben's review of where
6 we've been with the Fisheries Resource Monitoring
7 Program, we have an action item for you on the future
8 of the program. The Monitoring Program is designed to
9 provide information needed for management of Federal
10 subsistence fisheries. We would like your
11 recommendations on the 2014 Fisheries Resource
12 Monitoring Plan, which has been recommended to you by
13 the Technical Review Committee. That plan begins on
14 Page 91 of your Council books.

15
16 We've been consulting with the Council
17 on the priority information needs to develop the
18 request for proposals for the Southeast Alaska area,
19 which is shown on Page 96. In November of 2012, the
20 request for proposals was advertised. Project
21 proposals were due to the Office of Subsistence
22 Management in April of 2013.

23
24 We received 12 stock status and trends
25 proposals. In June, the TRC or Technical Review
26 Committee met to evaluate the investigation plans for
27 strategic priority, scientific and technical merit,
28 investigatorability of resources and partnership and
29 capacity building, and formulated a recommendation for
30 review by this Council. More information on the
31 evaluation criteria can be found in Pages 92 and 93 of
32 your Council books.

33
34 After reviewing the 12 investigation
35 plans, the Technical Review Committee recommended
36 funding all but the Eek Lake project. A table of the
37 projects which are prioritized in descending order can
38 be found on Page 97 of your books. I won't read
39 through them. You can look at them in your books, but
40 that's what we're going to be looking at is that
41 prioritization of the projects. Each individual
42 project in the Southeast Alaska region is summarized in
43 your books starting on Page 97.

44
45 After the Council provides its
46 recommendation, the Federal Subsistence Board will
47 decide on the final monitoring plan. Approved projects
48 will begin in the spring of 2014, depending on
49 available Forest Service funding. Again, this is an
50 action item. We're seeking your input on this plan and

1 specifically are the projects listed in priority order.

2

3 If you have any questions, I'd be happy
4 to address them.

5

6 Thank you.

7

8 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you Terry.

9 Any questions for Mr. Suminski.

10

11 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.

12

13 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Ms. Phillips.

14

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

16 Mr. Suminski, I see that you have -- some of these
17 projects say index next to them. Aren't those long-
18 term, consistent patterns of information that we should
19 consider continuing? What does the term index mean on
20 this list, on the Table 1 list it shows Hoktaheen
21 index, it shows Hetta index, Kook Index, Sitkoh index?

22

23 MR. SUMINSKI: Ms. Phillips, through
24 the Chair. I think you're looking at the projects that
25 have already been done. I'm sorry. What we're looking
26 at is the list of project proposals that we've
27 received. That's on Page 97 of your book. So those
28 are the ones we're asking if the Technical Review
29 Committee has put these in the proper priority order
30 for eventual funding. Did you find that?

31

32 MS. PHILLIPS: Yes, but could you
33 explain to me what index means.

34

35 MR. VAN ALLEN: A great index would be a
36 number that when there's more fish, the number's higher
37 and when there's fewer fish, the number is lower and
38 it's of no real conversion into actual numbers of fish.
39 In most cases, it's termed at least as many as, but
40 it's basically a number that you would get each year
41 that is measured in the same manner year to year so
42 that you can tell if a run is going up or down or
43 variable but steady, whatever.

44

45 I think of all the projects that are
46 proposed that have been submitted for funding all of
47 them are basically escapement in numeration projects,
48 project where we're wanting to get an accurate estimate
49 of the actual escapement and that would be with a weir,
50 weir mark recapture, redundant video, some method like

1 that.

2

3 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Any other questions.

4 Mr. Isaacs.

5

6 MR. ISAACS: I'm looking at this
7 sockeye escapement estimates for fisheries and the last
8 column shows only 1,600 sockeye escaped Klawock weir
9 system versus 21,000 in 2003.

10

11 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Is that a question?
12 Do you have a question?

13

14 MR. ISAACS: Yeah, he answered it.

15 Thank you.

16

17 MR. VAN ALLEN: That's correct. That is
18 the current weir count. That is an invalidated weir
19 count. I believe it's pretty accurate. It's one of
20 the best weirs in Southeast in terms of money spent in
21 engineering to install it. We have not been -- meaning
22 our program has not helped support funding for
23 operation of the weir, but we had in the past, but that
24 is their count. I'll have to say it's even worse than
25 that number that I gave you. Thirty-three percent of
26 those fish are jacks this year. Last year 15 percent
27 were jacks and the year before it was 10 percent were
28 jacks. Jacks are sockeye. They do spawn as adults do,
29 but still they're not fecund females as you'd hope that
30 half the fish will be.

31

32 Anyway, so I'm just saying that we do
33 have what appears to be a real concern about that level
34 of escapement, especially what we've seen the last
35 three years, to be able to support the customary and
36 traditional subsistence fishery in the area with the
37 ongoing commercial fisheries that also occur, so it is
38 definitely a flag of concern and you're bringing that
39 forward. Thanks.

40

41 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Ms. Phillips.

42

43 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
44 Mr. Suminski. This RAC has supported projects that
45 have traditional ecological knowledge component. So
46 number one, the Unuk, talks about -- at least the list
47 on Page 97 shows the Unuk River and it doesn't show,
48 you know, a traditional ecological knowledge component
49 and yet we have a long-term pattern of historical
50 observation in the Wagner family from Metlakatla and it

1 would be neat if you could include them in that sort of
2 -- you know, going on the system and doing some
3 monitoring with them present.

4
5 The other thing is from the Table 1
6 list I see that there's organized villages that are
7 partnering with -- what do you call that, the primary
8 cooperators. So I would personally give preference to
9 projects that have the tribal component added as
10 partners in those fisheries resource monitoring
11 projects.

12
13 Thank you.

14
15 MR. SUMINSKI: Through the Chair. Ms.
16 Phillips. The Unuk project was submitted mainly as a
17 stock assessment project. There was really no
18 identified traditional ecological knowledge. We
19 actually got no proposals for those types of projects.
20 But it's absolutely part of the project and the
21 management of the Unuk River to include users like Mr.
22 Wagner. Once the population regains enough to start
23 fishing again, we will work closely with the Metlakatla
24 Tribe and other users of the resource and the State, of
25 course. Given the difficulties of where the Unuk River
26 is and how difficult it is to get to, we definitely
27 depend on the users that actually have cabins up there
28 and to help us monitor that situation.

29
30 Also I think you were talking about
31 projects where the principal investigator or basically
32 the whole project is done by a tribal organization.
33 Our best examples of that are Hetta and Klag. You
34 know, Hetta with Hydaburg and Klag with the Sitka
35 Tribe. I think you might hear some more public
36 testimony on those. You can see in general the way
37 these priorities worked out is the Unuk we have -- it's
38 the one situation where we do have real conservation
39 concern where we just didn't get good returns for years
40 in a row. So that's why that was ranked fairly high or
41 the highest.

42
43 A lot of those other top priorities
44 have to do to inform the Board and this Council on the
45 extraterritorial jurisdiction petition. So that's, in
46 general, how they were prioritized. It's a tough call
47 because we do have some excellent projects that aren't
48 ranked real high, so they're all good projects. It's
49 just a matter of how far that money is going to go.
50 That's why the prioritization that you do today is

1 important.

2

3

Thank you.

4

5

VICE CHAIR BANGS: Any other questions.

6

7

MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.

8

9

VICE CHAIR BANGS: Yes, Ms. Phillips.

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

Thank you.

MR. SUMINSKI: Through the Chair. Ms.

Phillips. Those are fairly recent developments with

this year's escapement, so that was not something that

was considered when the TRC looked at prioritizing

these projects. So, yeah, that's a very valid point.

VICE CHAIR BANGS: Any other questions.

1 (No comments)

2

3 VICE CHAIR BANGS: I have one question.
4 I'm sorry if I missed it, but we have absolutely no
5 secured funding yet. There's been no funding promised
6 to any of these projects.

7

8 MR. SUMINSKI: Mr. Chairman. That s
9 correct. We re not sure if the government is going to
10 be open for business at the end of the month. So it
11 all depends on what Congress appropriates.

12

13 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you. Yes, Ms.
14 Phillips.

15

16 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
17 Mr. Suminski, which ones are the ETJ projects? I see
18 Kanalku and Falls. Is there another one?

19

20 MR. SUMINSKI: Numbers two, three, five
21 and six, which is Kanalku, Falls, Kook and Sitkoh.

22

23 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Anything else for
24 Mr. Van Alen and Mr. Suminski. Yes, Mr. Isaacs.

25

26 MR. ISAACS: On Page 96 it shows which
27 projects funded under the Fisheries Resource Monitoring
28 Program and in the last sentence or last paragraph it
29 says in 2014 there will be no continuation projects.
30 All ongoing projects will end in 2013. 2014 funding
31 will be applied to new research projects. Nowhere do I
32 see where there's any more projects in Klawock River.

33

34 MR. SUMINSKI: Mr. Isaacs, through the
35 Chair. There is a project proposed for Klawock
36 starting in 2014. That's on the list of the.....

37

38 MR. ISAACS: I'm looking at the wrong
39 list. Okay, thank you.

40

41 MR. SUMINSKI: Yeah, that's on the top
42 of Page 97. So those are proposed projects that we're
43 hoping to fund next year.

44

45 MR. ISAACS: We're way down on the
46 bottom.

47

48 MR. SUMINSKI: Yeah, unfortunately.
49 And just to be clear, you are correct. All the
50 projects that we have ongoing now will come to an end

1 at 2013, so we're starting with a clean slate for 2014.
2 So all these projects will have to be funded out
3 of.....

4
5 MR. ISAACS: I like Brother Kookesh's
6 comment. He said I'm in front. I'm leading.

7
8 (Laughter)

9
10 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Mr. Kookesh.

11
12 MR. KOOKESH: So the Kanalku, Kook and
13 Sitkoh after this year they go away? Is that my
14 understanding?

15
16 MR. SUMINSKI: Through the Chair, Mr.
17 Kookesh. They wouldn't necessarily go away. That's
18 just the previous project cycle is coming to an end and
19 we're reevaluating, starting with a whole new slate of
20 projects. Many of these are continuation projects
21 you'll notice of previous projects. Yeah, we're just
22 starting with a new slate of projects.

23
24 MR. KOOKESH: Maybe I should have
25 phrased that are we coming to a conclusion on them in
26 terms of are they ending, in terms of being final?
27 That probably should have been my question.

28
29 MR. VAN ALEN: Yeah, we just had a full
30 year cycle of projects for, let's say, Kook and Kanalku
31 and Sitkoh, Falls Lake, so those projects ended this
32 year, this season. We'll be preparing final reports
33 that summarize the results from this year as well as
34 past years. So final reports will be coming up and
35 you'll get them probably by May or so for each of these
36 projects. So anyway there will be a conclusion, but
37 like most stock assessment work, there is no end point.
38 We would do more and more if we had additional funding.

39
40 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you.

41
42 Mr. Adams.

43
44 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I'd just remind the
45 Council that there is a dance performance that's
46 supposed to start here at 4:00 p.m. Thank you.

47
48 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Bert.

49
50 Any other questions.

1 Mr. Isaacs.

2

3 MR. ISAACS: Real quick. When these
4 funds become available from the State, which
5 organization in the community is the lead organization
6 to respond to those needs and receiving funding?
7 Because in Klawock we have city council, Klawock IRA,
8 it goes on and on.

9

10 MR. SUMINSKI: Mr. Isaacs, through the
11 Chair. These will be funded through Forest Service
12 funding through the Department of Agriculture. Each
13 project is different of how the funding is distributed
14 between the different organizations that are included
15 in the project. If you look a little further back in
16 the book, let's just pick one here, so like the Klawock
17 Lake, executive summary for the Klawock Lake project is
18 on Page 111. In this case, the principal investigator
19 is the Forest Service, but there's also a co-
20 investigator of the Klawock Cooperative Association.
21 We'd have to look into the investigation plan to see
22 what the actual distribution of funds are.

23

24 MR. ISAACS: And the Forest Service
25 will be dealing with the tribes.

26

27 MR. SUMINSKI: Correct. And there's
28 quite a few projects like that where the tribe -- we've
29 worked with the tribe for a long time and they're most
30 comfortable providing staff and materials and other
31 things, but they prefer to have the Forest Service be
32 the principal investigator that's responsible for the
33 reporting and other things like that that they either
34 don't care to do or they're not really set up to do
35 yet. We've always strived to have the tribes take
36 projects over as much as possible, like in the case of
37 Sitka Tribe and Hydaburg.

38

39 MR. ISAACS: Okay. Thank you.

40

41 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you. Will you
42 both be here tomorrow if we have further questions?
43 It's 4:00 o'clock, as Mr. Adams pointed out, and we
44 have some other people to give some information. Keep
45 going? Okay. Is there any other questions for -- Ms.
46 Phillips.

47

48 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Chairman
49 Bangs. Mr. Suminski, I see for the Kook and Sitkoh it
50 talks about how both these projects can be monitored

1 simultaneously, but the funding level, we're going from
2 6,500 to 2,700 to 7,600, 1,100 and now you're asking
3 for 169,000. That was for Kook. If you look at
4 Sitkoh.....

5
6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Those are
7 escapements.

8
9 MS. PHILLIPS: Oh, is that escapement?
10 Oh, okay. But it says funding request. Oh, I see. I
11 misunderstood that. So are you in the same ballpark
12 area -- I mean you're asking like 169,000. Is that
13 what it's been costing to do those sort of monitorings?

14
15 MR. VAN ALEN: Yes. We've been
16 basically -- that funding level is reflective of what
17 it's been costing the projects each year in the past.
18 In the example that you brought forward, the proposal
19 is to do Kook and Sitkoh by the same project personnel,
20 so Sitkoh won't cost as much if done together.

21
22 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Okay. Anything
23 else.

24
25 (No comments)

26
27 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Okay. Thank you,
28 Terry and Ben.

29
30 MR. VAN ALEN: We'll be here tomorrow.

31
32 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thanks. So are we
33 going to have to move the tables at all or what's.....

34
35 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. They're not
36 here yet.

37
38 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Okay. So we have
39 another presentation for more informational gathering
40 on the weir projects. Ms. Needham and Tony
41 Christianson, do you guys have a little presentation
42 for us.

43
44 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Good afternoon. I'm
45 Anthony Christianson. I'm not here as an FSB member.
46 I'm here as a principal investigator on a project
47 that's listed in the priority list here. I guess I'm
48 here to kind of talk about the project and the
49 importance of it. This is probably my third time in a
50 row at the RAC meeting. Just to express how important

1 it is to the community, we continue to come and promote
2 the project and continue to try to elevate that project
3 and keep it where it should be in the funding.

4
5 This last few years of running the
6 project it's been highly successful. As we start to
7 look at the table and the ranking of it and hearing
8 some of the feedback even from the Council here, I
9 especially appreciated Patty's statement about tribal
10 involvement and mentioning two projects again, Terry
11 mentioned it too, Hetta and Klag.

12
13 Reaching a level of capacity to manage
14 these projects on our own to do what the system was
15 designed to do, to bring local management to the local
16 level and to put people to work on the ground in our
17 communities getting valuable information for long-term
18 resource management planning and trying to change how
19 people fish and how we engage with the other agencies
20 that are in charge of fishery management. That's only
21 been made possible by the Federal subsistence program
22 and the FRMP funding.

23
24 I guess I'm highly concerned that Hetta
25 Lake is ranked number seven. I'm very disturbed by
26 that ranking knowing that there is going to be a
27 shortfall in funding, if any. You hear the term 500,
28 600, 700,000 and I start to question what the ranking
29 and what the criteria is for that. Looking in the
30 book, there's like four or five things that rank, so I
31 could see the difficulty in that decision making.

32
33 I also understand there is a big issue
34 on the table with the petition with Angoon and all of
35 the surrounding systems there and the need to gather
36 that information. Again, I've got to express my
37 concern about our project as they worked to build their
38 program up and to put into place a network of agencies
39 and people on the ground that could work on an annual
40 basis to protect the stock for all user groups. That's
41 what we've accomplished. It kind of is unsettling to
42 me to be ranked on that level seeing as we have
43 elevated our project to make change. Not only locally,
44 but with the area biologist.

45
46 We have this year held back a
47 commercial fishery because our stock was so low for a
48 period of two weeks thanks to the area biologist here
49 in Ketchikan and the commercial fishery division and
50 how to open dialogue and changed markers, moved lines

1 and eliminated some potential interception of our
2 sockeye. All I can continue to do is pray that the
3 government does kick some funding down if we maintain
4 at this current level of seven, which to me looks like
5 it's going to probably drop our project out of the
6 race.

7
8 It s been 10 years of building this
9 capacity, changing the local community and putting in a
10 system so that Hydaburg doesn't have to file a
11 petition. That's where I feel -- I mean I came over
12 here skipping and doing the bunny hop and then I start
13 talking and feeling it out and then looking at it and
14 couldn't sleep last night after I seen where we were
15 sitting in the priority list after hearing some of the
16 budget concerns and knowing the rapport that we've
17 built with the other agencies.

18
19 I guess I m here to plead to the
20 Council to maybe reconsider looking at that prioritized
21 list and putting in some additional criteria to look at
22 the projects, look at the information and look at the
23 capacity that s been built throughout the years that
24 we've engaged in this resource monitoring program.

25
26 Again, I understand that the people who
27 look at the program and the people who have to look at
28 the proposals and the information needs across the
29 region are valid. Every single one of the projects is
30 a priority project. So to take nothing away from the
31 other projects, every one of them is important, every
32 community has that need to fill their subsistence with
33 sockeye. It's something that we have to do culturally.
34 It's an inherent right.

35
36 I've said this before. This program
37 was designed to build the local capacity of tribal
38 organizations. If you look at that, there are two
39 tribes in the region that have worked diligently to
40 build their capacity to engage in fishery management
41 and to be seven and eight on the list really feels like
42 we fell short of the expectations set before us. We've
43 done the diligent work, we cooperate with all the
44 agencies and that's where we end up.

45
46 So I'm here to whine to you guys a
47 little bit about that.

48
49 (Laughter)
50

1 MR. CHRISTIANSON: I mean I don't know
2 how else to put it. Give me a crying towel here. I
3 mean this is a pet project here that locals benefit 100
4 percent from the income that comes to our community.
5 Oh, my partner here got one for me. A hundred percent,
6 you know. It goes to local employment, local people
7 doing the job and engaging with the people who make a
8 difference in the fishery management field. We don't
9 have to build that program. We don't have to establish
10 area committees. We don't have to find out if the
11 community is on board or not. We're on board, we're
12 doing it and we're doing it successfully and we want to
13 continue to do that.

14
15 If we don't have that funding, there's
16 a lot of information that's going to go away, a lot of
17 level of trust that's been established is going to
18 dissipate and we're going to be looking at not knowing
19 and unavailable to engage with the area biologist on
20 how to reduce that interception. We know it happens.
21 We know what these historical patterns are, we know
22 where the fish swim, we know when they open up District
23 4, District 3. When it's open two days, don't expect
24 fish to show up for two days after that. It's just a
25 known thing.

26
27 So, again, I'm just going to plead to
28 the Council to reconsider looking at that list. We
29 really appreciate the effort by this Council to
30 prioritize eulachon and sockeye as the primary resource
31 in the region and hopefully we can elevate those
32 projects on that list that have truly worked hard to
33 engage the locals and build a tribal capacity. I think
34 that's what this program was intended to do and I would
35 hate to see us falling that far down the list.

36
37 I think Cathy had a few things to add.

38
39 MS. NEEDHAM: I think you covered them.

40
41 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Oh, she said I
42 covered them.

43
44 MS. NEEDHAM: Good afternoon. For the
45 record, my name is Cathy Needham and I'm here to
46 represent as a co-investigator for the Hetta Lake
47 sockeye project. I'm also the project biologist on it.
48 Tony asked me to make a few points about what loss of
49 funding of this project is going to mean and he
50 definitely covered them, but I would like to reiterate

1 his points with a couple of examples that we put
2 together.

3

4 One of them is that the community not
5 just loses this capacity, but the tribe loses its
6 infrastructure that it has built within its natural
7 resources department. I'm not saying that all of the
8 tribes programs are going to weigh, but one of the
9 reasons why the programs have been able to be expanded
10 and been funded to do projects that are adjacent to
11 what's going on in Hetta that incorporate all of their
12 traditional lands is because they've had the FRMP
13 project in the past and that budget continues to
14 provide a basis for that. So taking away project
15 funding I think could potentially hurt the tribe and
16 that infrastructure for that department.

17

18 In addition, Tony mentioned that the
19 community and the tribe itself has built a relationship
20 between -- or the tribe has built a relationship
21 between the community and the management agencies.
22 This relationship has taken almost 10 years to collect
23 long-term data that can be used in making in-season
24 management decisions as well as long-term management
25 decisions about harvest patterns and how things go.

26

27 I'd like to just point out a quick
28 example that Tony related to in terms of our 2013
29 sockeye season. This year, because we had an FRMP
30 project and only because we had a weir in place, we
31 knew in season that sockeye escapement was pretty much
32 non-existent for the first part of the season. We knew
33 that early on and we would not have known that if we
34 didn't have a weir there. So we report weekly these
35 numbers back to both the Alaska Department of Fish and
36 Game and a bunch of other interested parties, includes
37 Office of Subsistence Management and the U.S. Forest
38 Service. So there's a lot of dialogue and interaction
39 that goes on in season about this in terms of
40 addressing those concerns for that small number.

41

42 As the pink salmon were building up in
43 Cordova Bay, Fish and Game was ready to open that up
44 for commercial seine fishing, but because they get our
45 numbers in season, they called us and they said what do
46 you expect, you have longer-term data, do you think
47 you're going to get more fish in August when you
48 typically get more fish because we know how things are.
49 We basically told them at that point in time no because
50 we knew that we were going to expect a lower year class

1 return because they're five-year fish. So we didn't
2 think we were going to get a huge boost, but we felt
3 that more fish were coming.

4
5 Because Hydaburg has been so intimately
6 involved with this fishery, they know that fish come up
7 and move north through Cordova Bay and go up past Hetta
8 and then come down the shoreline. When that commercial
9 fishery is open, fishermen sit right on that shoreline
10 for pink salmon and potentially intercept sockeye. At
11 that time, because of the relationship between Hydaburg
12 and Fish and Game and that working relationship, they
13 called and Hydaburg put in the request that Fish and
14 Game defer commercial fisheries both spatially and
15 temporally to minimize potential interception to try to
16 get as much escapement in as possible.

17
18 Fish and Game accepted that
19 information, not only the in-season data that we were
20 providing, but Hydaburg's local knowledge of what was
21 going on. Again, we wouldn't have had that in-season
22 information if we didn't have the weir and we wouldn't
23 have known to have -- and, you know, the season was a
24 big pink season and there were a lot of pink salmon in
25 Cordova Bay from flyovers.

26
27 So basically I think that provides a
28 really good real world example of why this particular
29 project is needed. The loss of the program I think
30 would mean that Hydaburg no longer has a stake hold in
31 helping make those local management decisions.

32
33 Thank you.

34
35 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you. I have a
36 question for Tony. Has the cooperative association
37 researched into alternative funding through grants or
38 any other funding sources?

39
40 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Yeah, we have and
41 that was kind of what Cathy was explaining about. The
42 FRMP project is the core fishery funding we get. The
43 spinoff from that is all the other funding that we have
44 done. The last three years we've been applying outside
45 and looking for additional partners, seeing shortfalls
46 in funding, but there isn't a fit for this specific
47 type of work or probably OSM would have found that
48 funding and started funneling those opportunities to
49 the tribes.

50

1 So what we've started to do is branch
2 off into other areas of fishing and start applying for
3 the Alaska Sustainable Salmon Fund grants to catalogue
4 streams, do additional assessment work, create
5 partnerships with private entities and non-profits to
6 bring additional workers on board and boost the
7 program's overall goal, is to create a tribal
8 management fishery program that helps locals be
9 employed and engaged in that work.

10

11 So besides the 150,000 a year or
12 whatever it is for the Hetta Lake project, we're
13 probably pulling in an additional 70 or 80,000 in some
14 type of support that kind of helps -- the process helps
15 the fishery program along, but we haven't found an
16 additional pot of money that would come in and put a
17 weir in place and continue to gather the type of
18 information that we're getting.

19

20 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you.

21

22 Any questions.

23

24 (No comments)

25

26 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you very much.

27

28 Oh, Mr. Adams.

29

30 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I don't have a
31 question, but just a comment. I'm really disappointed
32 in the lack of funding for your project because I've
33 always bragged about your involvement down there and
34 how you were making it a tribal initiative and so
35 forth. I do wish you luck that you'll be able to keep
36 that project going from whatever funds you might be
37 able to gather up. I don't know if we can be of any
38 help here, but I think a matter of discussion, you
39 know, maybe later on in the meeting. But thank you
40 guys for your report. I sympathize with you.

41

42 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Can I respond?

43 Well, I appreciate that sympathy and statement. You
44 can help here. You guys are ultimately in charge of
45 who prioritizes this list and how that criteria is
46 utilized and what's important for the region. So that
47 was why we felt it might be beneficial for us to at
48 least plead our case here, give you some of the facts
49 on the ground, knowing that you have a real big
50 elephant in the room with the petition and stuff and

1 seeing that need and information and baseline dataset
2 for that, but I kind of equated it to let's rob Peter
3 to pay Paul here, okay.

4
5 Then what we re going to end up with is
6 another petition because I was ready to file with
7 Angoon four years ago when they started their petition,
8 but because we had some good escapement, we were
9 developing good relationships, we opted to step back a
10 hair and let things mature through and see how the
11 process was going to follow through. That was the
12 community speaking, not myself. I'm speaking on behalf
13 of the community.

14
15 So that s kind of how I see this
16 process, is we're going to take from one priority and
17 shovel it to another priority and somebody is going to
18 be left out. I m feeling like that step-child right
19 now. Sorry. I'm frank about how I speak, but that's
20 what -- you know, in a best case scenario, we're
21 funded, we re recommended the fund. It's not, you
22 know, like they didn't recommend to fund us. It s just
23 I've been in this game for 10 years and when you re
24 number seven, you're not getting funding. I don't care
25 if they give us \$800,000. When you're taking the
26 largest share of the project, you're probably going to
27 get eliminated.

28
29 It just doesn't sit well and I've got
30 to express that with whoever reviewed it and with the
31 Council here and hopefully get some feedback. And that
32 doesn't even go into the Eek project, who was the only
33 project listed that didn't get recommended to fund
34 because Hetta is on the list and it's a lower strategic
35 priority. I can tell you right now this year it was a
36 higher strategic priority than Hetta because we got
37 1,200 fish out of Eek and 600 out of Hetta, so it was
38 actually strategically a higher system this year for
39 us.

40
41 So even if there was a next step, I
42 would also consider just to put Eek back on the list.
43 It doesn't hurt anything if it's number 12. It's still
44 not going to get funded, but we have been in the
45 position where two years ago in the cycle recommended
46 the fund, two years later recommended not to fund.
47 Same project, same proposal, same baseline information
48 needs. So just more words.

49
50 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you.

1 Mr. Douville.

2

3 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr.
4 Chairman. This is just a recommended list and in the
5 past the RAC has been bullied into going along with the
6 list, but I expect this time that we are going to take
7 a more active stance and make our own recommendations
8 on it. We've had these lists before, like I've said,
9 and we've had some pressure to go along with what was
10 there, but in this case I think we need to take a more
11 stronger stance on how the list is formulated and
12 ranked.

13

14 Thank you.

15

16 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mike.

17

18 Anyone else have any questions for
19 Cathy or Tony.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you very much.
24 We have one more public testimony in regards to the
25 fisheries monitoring program.

26

27 Jessica Gill.

28

29 MS. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
30 Council. A lot of my feelings reflect what Tony and
31 Cathy had mentioned. I am the principal investigator
32 on the Klag Lake sockeye assessment project for the
33 Sitka Tribe of Alaska. If we lose this funding, we
34 would lose the capacity for -- like we run this project
35 and I think it's great and it's something that the
36 Sitka Tribe can be proud of. If we lose this funding,
37 we lose the capacity and we lose our stake hold in the
38 resource. We fish at Redoubt, Neka Bay and Klag Bay.

39

40 Those are the top three systems for the
41 Sitka Tribe. Most of the time Redoubt is more
42 important. More harvest occurs there, but 2008 through
43 2011 harvest at Klag Bay was four times that at Redoubt
44 despite the fact that there was only an average of 96
45 permits fishing at Klag and 139 fishing permits fishing
46 at Redoubt. Additionally, harvest has increased in
47 Klag Bay. From 2001 to 2008, harvest averaged 2,555
48 fish with exploitation rates of 17 percent. From 2009
49 to 2013 harvest increased to 5,036 fish and an
50 increased harvest rate of 32 percent. So that's pretty

1 dramatic considering the returns have remained the same
2 through those periods.

3

4 I think it's important the project is
5 -- because the management actions that can be taken
6 with regards to the escapement being monitored at the
7 weir. In 2002, 2003, 2009 and 2010 emergency orders
8 closed the subsistence fishery. 2003 they reopened it
9 after adequate escapement was found through the weir.
10 So I just want to throw that data out there and
11 hopefully you guys can move it up on the priority list.

12

13 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Jessica.

14

15 Is there any questions.

16

17 Mr. Kitka.

18

19 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

20 Jessica, I'm one of the Sitka residents that does a lot
21 of harvesting at Klag Bay. Just for the record, I just
22 wanted to know if the -- knowing the difference in the
23 way Klag Bay is, is there a difference in how they
24 spawn within that area different than other lakes?

25

26 MS. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Kitka.

27 Through the Chair. There is a difference. At Redoubt,
28 the fish don't really tend to hold in the marine
29 waters, but at Klag Bay they do until the water levels
30 increase, then they can pass, which allows them to be
31 really susceptible to beach seining, which is the main
32 harvest practice up there. One day in 2013 over 783
33 fish were harvested and three times this year over 700
34 fish were harvested just in one day. So if there's not
35 any rain, the system can be hit pretty hard and it's
36 kind of dangerous. We can overharvest really easily
37 without knowing.

38

39 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Follow up, Harvey.

40

41 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Jessica. I had
42 one other part of that question on where they spawn
43 that is different. I know some of the former people
44 that worked out there. They told me that the Klag Bay
45 river system is different because they don't really
46 spawn so much in the lake, but they spawn in the
47 rivers, which is just basically rock, there's no
48 gravel.

49

50 MS. GILL: That's correct. The lake

1 itself up at Klag Lake is actually kind of small and
2 they don't spawn in that lake. They spawn up past the
3 lake, which is different from a few other systems
4 throughout the area.

5
6 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Any other questions.

7
8 (No comments)

9
10 VICE CHAIR BANGS: I just have one. Is
11 there any kind of personal use or subsistence fishery
12 on those stocks?

13
14 MS. GILL: In Klag Lake? Not in the
15 lake itself, but in the outlet stream there's beach
16 seine, gillnet and sport fishing, so rod and reel.

17
18 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Okay. Thank you.

19
20 Any other questions.

21
22 (No comments)

23
24 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Jessica.

25
26 MS. GILL: Thank you, guys.

27
28 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Mr. Isaacs.

29
30 MR. ISAACS: Just a quick question. On
31 the selection of the projects, who makes a
32 determination of where the projects will be on the
33 sockeye enhancement projects?

34
35 VICE CHAIR BANGS: I believe we make a
36 recommendation and then the Federal Board makes that
37 decision. Mr. Larson.

38
39 MR. LARSON: Yes, Mr. Chair. The list
40 you have in front of us was developed by a Technical
41 Review Committee. They provide that list to you. It
42 is up to this Council to review that list and make your
43 best judgment about what is your priorities. The
44 recommendation going to the Board, who has the ultimate
45 authority to spend the money, will have not the TRC's
46 recommendation, but they'll have your recommendation.
47 That's one of the projects that you're going to do at
48 this meeting is to review that list and re-prioritize
49 if you think it's appropriate or not.

50

1 MR. ISAACS: Just a quick comment
2 again, Mr. Chairman. Those of us that live out around
3 Prince of Wales on the east side Prince of Wales know
4 that there's two major streams on the east side of
5 Prince of Wales, Klawock River being one and the other
6 being Sarkar, Deweyville. Ever since I was a youngster
7 we fished sockeye up in Deweyville also and there are
8 times when Deweyville provides just as much sockeye as
9 Klawock River.

10

11 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
12 Isaac. I think we're going to have the dancers coming
13 in now. I think we'll recess for the day. Does 9:00
14 o'clock tomorrow sound good to start. I guess we'll
15 recess and it sounds like they're warming up.

16

17 I don't think we have to move anything.

18

19 Thank you everybody.

20

21 (Off record)

22

23 (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

