SOUTHCENTRAL FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

PUBLIC MEETING

VOLUME II

Crowne Plaza
Anchorage, Alaska
March 12, 2014
1:00 p.m.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ralph Lohse, Chairman
Judy Caminer
Greg Encelewski
Andrew McLaughlin - Telephonic
Mary Ann Mills
Michael Opheim - Telephonic
James Showalter
William C. Shuster
Gloria Stickwan

Regional Council Coordinator, Donald Mike

Recorded and transcribed by:

Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2
Anchorage, AK 99501
907-243-0668/sahile@gci.net

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Anchorage, Alaska - 3/12/2014)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'd like to call this spring meeting of Southcentral Alaska Regional Advisory Council back into session.

And at this point in time, I'd like to thank Andy for making it, and I sure appreciated you being on the phone yesterday. I know what it's like to try to have a phone conference. They're a pain in the neck, but thank you for being there with us.

Okay. At this point in time, Donald.

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yesterday I didn't realize Mr. Michael Opheim from Seldovia was on line. So we may want to double check if he's on line.

Mr. Opheim, are you on line today.

MR. OPHEIM: I'm on line today, sir.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. And this is from Seldovia.

MR. MIKE: Yes.

MR. OPHEIM: Yes, sir.

MR. MIKE: Yes, a member from Seldovia.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Thank you. Now, Donald, one question. Do we need to go back through and establish a quorum or we established our quorum yesterday and that's good enough.

MR. MIKE: Yes, Mr. Chair. We called the meeting to order and we established a quorum.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Okay.

With that, Council members, the first item of business that we have is to review and approve

the minutes from our last meeting. A motion is in order to approve the minutes, and then a second and then we can have some discussion them. Do I hear a motion.

MS. STICKWAN: I move to.

MS. MILLS: Second.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. It's been moved by Gloria, right, to adopt the minutes from our last meeting. And it's been seconded by Mary Ann.

So with that, Council members, you know your minutes are not in the book. Your minutes are on that separate piece of paper that were handed out. And these are the minutes from the November 5 through 7, 2013 meeting that we had right here at the Crowne Plaza.

MR. SHUSTER: Yeah, I have one question on WP14-08. Is that for Cooper Landing? It didn't say, the wildlife proposal.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: WP14 -- what page is -- okay. Right, there we go. I've got it. I think that was the Cooper Landing one if I remember right.

MR. SHUSTER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It doesn't say that, but we could look back at WP14-08, and I'm pretty sure that that was the Cooper Landing one, because that was the one on caribou.

MR. SHUSTER: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We took a lot of action on a lot of proposals in that meeting.

MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, Donald.

MR. MIKE: Just for the Council's clarification, we had a three-day meeting last fall, and there's a lot of wildlife proposals, and there's a lot of information that was presented to this Council. And this summary of the minutes is just the main actions taken by the Council.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right.

MR. MIKE: And there's a lot of information on the transcript, and I tried to summarize it as best I can.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Donald.

Do I have anybody that has any corrections or additions.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Greg.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah. It's just a trivial thing, but under review and adoption of the minutes, it's got Mr. Henrichs moved, seconded, called by Mr. Encelewski. I guess that's cool. It just sounds a little funny to me. Moved to adopted, seconded by. You might want another word in there. As long as we understand it, I guess it's good.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: It's on the second page, review and adoption.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, I see what you mean. Instead of saying second called by Mr. Encelewski.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: It should say seconded by.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It should be seconded by.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Just strike the called (indiscernible - mic not on).

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, let's knock the called out of there.

Well, it's definitely reflected the actions that we took on the proposals accurately.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: I'm ready to go.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You're ready to go.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Call the question.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If there's no additions or corrections other than the one that we've had, the question's available to be called.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Call the question.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question's been called. All in favor of adopting the minutes of November 5 through 7, 2013 Southcentral Subsistence Regional Advisory Council meeting, signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by saying nay.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries.

Okay. With that we'll go on to our agenda. And we've already taken care of WP14-11. We have the potential for customary trade report by Pippa if we would have had a proposal in front of us on it, but since we didn't have a proposal that dealt with customary trade, we talked about -- Pippa and I talked about the fact that we could probably dispense with that report until we have something in front of us on that.

So now we have a call for fishery regulatory proposals, and that's by the Staff. Karen.

MS. HYER: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and Council members. I'm going to just talk about the Federal Subsistence Board call for regulatory proposals. And you can find it starting on Page 78 of your book.

So the important thing to note here is that the call is open, and the deadline is March 28th, so it's not long from now. And so if you want to submit a proposal for any changes or new fish regulations, now is the time to do it.

And this just talks a little bit about the submission proposal, and it gives our address and our web address as to where to submit.

And then if you turn to Page 80, you actually see the proposal form. So those are the things that you have to fill out. And I just wanted the Council to know that if they have any regulatory proposals, we do have Staff available to help, too, with wording. So they can contact our office. And actually George Pappas is the acting fisheries lead, so it would be somebody on his Staff.

So are there any questions.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.

MS. CAMINER: Maybe I'll turn it around a little bit. I don't know how many of our members know if their communities or organizations might be considering proposals, submitting proposals, but, I mean, George, you know the regulations very thoroughly. Are there -- do you have suggestions that the Council might consider for where changes might improve opportunities for subsistence fishing in our region.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: George.

MR. PAPPAS: Through the Chair. Thank you, Judy. Yes, Jeff and I were prepared to speak on a couple of Board of Fisheries issues that passed that potentially could impact the Kenai Federal subsistence fisheries.

The one, Proposal 192, in the Kenai River sportfishery modified the slot limit on the State regulations from 46 to 55 inches, which you have to release. And those regulations in theory has protected 68 percent of the five ocean fish, and 42 percent of the five ocean females, and 8 percent of the four ocean females. They changed it to 42 to 55. They actually made the slot limit larger so it will protect even more fish. And that would protect 92 -- when you drop the slot limit down to 42 inches, it will drop it to -- excuse me, it raised the protection level to 92 percent of five ocean fish, 91 percent five ocean females, and 49 percent of four ocean females will be protected by that slot limit.

Now, our regulations state, we have a

slot limit from 46 to 55. And we adopted that based on the information provided to -- the Federal Subsistence Board adopted that based on the information provided to the Board of Fish, and the same information was presented to them. They supported that.

Now the Board of Fish is seriously concerned about the conservation of Chinook statewide. They modified the regulations. Our regulations don't automatically default to that, because we have it stated in our Federal regulations. So if you're interested in matching the State's move from 46 down to 42 inches on the lower end of the slot limit, this would be a good chance to put a proposal in. And our in-season manager, Jeff Anderson here from the Fish and Wildlife branch here at Kenai. Currently the permit information, no one has participated in that Kenai Federal subsistence king salmon fishery, so we don't have any effort or harvest for you since inception of the program.

So it's up to you, if you want to follow the State regulations, and provide a little more protection. The examples I have for other regulations statewide, there are places in Alaska where Federal subsistence regulations are more lenient than State regulations where a slot limit they allow, like in Southeast, the difference in the minimum size you can keep on a steelhead is about two inches on the Federal side than the State side, and still provides over 50 percent protection to the fish down there, but it allows just a little bit more opportunity for Federal subsistence users. It's up to you. I just wanted to bring this up to you since this is in your region.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: George, can I ask you a couple questions again. Would you repeat the previous slot limit and the current slot limit they have adopted and our current slot limit.

MR. PAPPAS: Okay. The previous slot limit under State regulations is -- you have to release fish between 46 inches and 55 inches in length.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's to release those fish between that.

MR. PAPPAS: Yes. You can't keep

anything between 46 and 55. That was the.....

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: 46 and 55 was released. Okay.

MR. PAPPAS: Correct. That was the State's former slot limit, that is our current slot limit still in regulation.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right.

MR. PAPPAS: Now, the State's new slot limit regulation, you have to release every fish between 42 and 55 inches. So they dropped the bottom end of the slot limit four inches, which protects a fair percentage more fish in the Kenai early run that is of kings.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So basically then our current slot limit would be more lenient than the State's slot limit.

MR. PAPPAS: That is correct, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But our effort has been non-existent?

MR. PAPPAS: That is correct, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So as long as the effort's non-existent, the change in slot limit doesn't protect any more fish.

MR. PAPPAS: That is correct, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Well, I just needed that clarified.

Wishes of the Council. What does the Council -- Greg.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I have no wish or desire to change the slot limit. In fact, I don't agree with slot limits, but there is not effort, because, you know, the whole fishery shouldn't be fished, and there's an emergency order not to fish that early run anyway, so I don't really see that we need to

change it myself personally, but I don't necessarily agree with it anyway, but that's just my thoughts. And I do know that the Council's going to be putting in -- from Ninilchik area, will be putting in some new proposals this year.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other comments.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'll make a comment then from my standpoint. personally I don't see any reason to change it just to mirror the State if it has no effect. And I don't see any objection to the fact that the subsistence would be slightly more lenient, even if there was some effort, than the State is because of the amount of fish, the amount of effort that's going to be put into it. Even if subsistence use multiplied 500 percent, you still don't have enough use to, you know, make any difference. But we do have -- but it does make an impact when you have a lot of users like you do in the State fishery.

Andy.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yeah. Mr. Chair. I made a comment I think at the Homer meeting a while back, just because a subsistence resource is not having a use in a current year or previous current years, subsistence use can switch from generation to generation. Just because it's non-existent at the moment doesn't mean it wouldn't be in the future.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So is it the wish of anybody on the Council to put a proposal in to change the slot limit.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none, George, can you go on to the next one we talked about.

MR. PAPPAS: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I believe it's Proposal 43. Under the State regulations, this is on the State regulations at Upper Cook Inlet Board of Fisheries meeting, something new happened. For the first time in Alaska, a barbless hook regulation was developed for the Kenai River fisheries as a conservation measure. It's a paired measure with the commercial fisheries and the dipnet

fisheries. If you get to the point where the sportfisheries in he Kenai River are catch and release only for kings, then they can restrict it to barbless hooks. And we don't have -- that's the first time in the State that they've actually put barbless hooks forth and actually put it in regulation.

Now, the unique situation here is the Federal subsistence fisheries have defined multiple hooks and bait for our fisheries. There's a question about barb versus non-barbless hooks in the State versus Federal regulations, because many times in many parts of the State, Federal subsistence regulations reference State regulations if we don't have any standing. Now, we do have something standing in the Kenai, but since you're the first Regional Advisory Council to have a barbless fishery in your area, this may be a good platform to put a proposal in to the Federal Subsistence Board, a statewide proposal to define hook as a hook with or without a barb, so Federal subsistence users statewide can have their choice. If they want to fish with barbless hook or a barbed hook, it's up to them. And additionally if this type of proposal went through, and hook was defined with or without a barb, that would eliminate a lot of comments from the Federal program to the State program every time a barbless proposal comes forth in an area where we don't have regulations standing to say you can or cannot use a barb.

So it's very simple. I talked to the solicitor, said this is a very simple fix. So if you're interested, this would be the platform to put it forth with, because you're the first Council to actually see barbless hook regulations in the State.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So if I understand correct, if we define hook as barbed and barbless on a statewide regulation, then even if some other area in the State puts a barbless hook regulation, subsistence users will still be able to use a barbed hook.

MR. PAPPAS: That is correct, Mr. Chair, if it is defined in our regulations, it would supersede State regulations. If it's not defined in our regulations many times reference or default to State regulations.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Comments from Council members. Greg.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Well, I'll make a comment, and make it very clear if I can. One of the reasons for us to have the additional hook, it was the only way they could come up with a meaningful subsistence preference on the Kenai. We wanted a net, and one of the new proposals will be to go to that. I know that.

But the problem is, if it truly will help to define it as a barbed hook, I mean, I don't see where there's a problem, you know. But I just want everyone to be very clear, that was the little preference that we had was to have the more advantage was bait and a treble hook or a barbed hook.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Any other comments. Judy.

MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair. It does sound like a clarification that could be beneficial to all subsistence users, so I think it would be great if you are able to put something forward or if you need our name on it or anything.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: This would be an opportunity for us as a Council to put forth a proposal to the Board at this point in time. We have that opportunity right now. The call for proposals is out. And if we think this is worthwhile, we as a Council can make a motion to submit a proposal to define hooks as barbed or barbless, and we could, you know -- so that there would be -- that would be the Federal definition of hook. And that way -- so we can do that. If somebody on this Council wishes to put that kind of a proposal forward. If nobody does, then we'll have to hope somebody else does it.

MR. SHUSTER: I'll make a motion that -- I'll make a motion for that.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You make a motion that we define hooks in Federal regulation as barbed or barbless.

MR. SHUSTER: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I have a second.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and seconded as a Council that we are going to submit a proposal to define hooks in Federal regulation as barbed or barbless.

Discussion.

MS. MILLS: Question.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do you want Judy.....

MS. MILLS: I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's fine.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Whoa, wait a minute.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's fine. Judy had some and Greg had some, and then we'll have the question.

MS. CAMINER: I was just going to put a little bit on the discussion. That from what George has presented to us it sounds like a very worthwhile suggestion, and something that could help subsistence users throughout the State, so I would support the motion.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And Greg.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah. I just want to make a comment through the Chair to George. My only concern is we define it as barbed or barbless, okay. I don't want to get in there that, you know, we're -- we'll end up having to use barbless. I mean, to me, I want it to be very clear that they choice. So I think that was our intent here, because I want that subsistence users to have whatever he needs to catch that fish without playing with it.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: George.

MR. PAPPAS: Thank you.

You stole my thunder.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. I don't see any conservation concern in this, and I also think that this is beneficial to subsistence users.

The question's been called. All in favor signify by say saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by saying nay.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries.

Donald, we'll need to write up a proposal that we can submit to the Board.

Do you have anything more for us, George.

MR. PAPPAS: That's a negative.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Members of the Council.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. And then it's the responsibility of us as Council members, we've got until -- what was it the 28th, Karen?

MS. HYER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The 28th.

MS. HYER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: To go back to our communities and that, and if there is any fisheries proposal that needs to come forward, help people or tell them that there is a deadline on it. And any Council member can also put a proposal in. You just can't sign it as a Council member. You have to sign it as an individual.

Thank you.

And I don't think you're out of here yet, Karen.

MS. HYER: No.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think you've still got more to go.

MS. HYER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that's the priority information needs.

MS. HYER: Right. So next we're going to talk about priority information research needs. And we just finished a cycle with the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program. And the last time we were before you, we were talking about projects and what your priorities were to fund the projects, and the funding -- the projects that were funded were the fishwheels, and then Tanada and Long Lake, which are long-standing projects in your area.

And we will start that cycle again officially in the fall, but what we want to do now is have a discussion. We found this helpful with some of our other Councils to just start the discussion a little bit earlier, so when we come in the fall with what we think should be the priority information needs, they're not new to you. And so you have a couple chances to discuss them. And so that's basically what this is about. It's just my opportunity to listen to you, and you to give me some ideas of what you think might possibly be information needs in your areas.

So with that I will stop and I'll take questions or suggestions.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And, Karen, an I ask you one question. What is the odds of our funding going up for the next cycle.

(Laughter)

MS. HYER: Of going up?

(Laughter)

MS. HYER: Well, you know, I have a master's in statistics, and the one thing they pound

into your head is do not make any sort of prediction outside your data, and I don't have data for that.

(Laughter)

MS. HYER: So I'm going to decline to make any sort of prediction. But we -- yeah, I think I'll just stop there.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, I think you do have data for that. If you put it all on a graph, it would be pretty -- the trend would be pretty obvious.

MS. HYER: It is a trend there. Yeah.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But anyhow, what I was getting was that's one thing we need to take into consideration, because our funding -- we almost couldn't fund the ones that we thought we really wanted this year. And if we're going to prioritize our information needs, we're going to have to also take into account the amount of funding that probably will be available for them.

MS. HYER: Mr. Chairman. If I might clarify a little bit. Right now this is just information gathering, and the way the process works is we put out this call for proposals, and people submit projects. And then we come back to the RAC with the projects and they let us know, of those projects what are really important. And that's the time to really think about what we have on the table as far as funding. But right now it's simply information gathering. But I would be interested in what you consider your highest priorities there.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Karen, do you have a list of what we've considered our highest priorities in the past?

MS. HYER: Yeah. Generally it's been Chinook and escapement projects in your area, and we've had that validation project with the fishwheels that was a priority that -- and I think we've answered that question. And then sockeye has been somewhat second to Chinook. But mostly it's been abundance estimate type work.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And a lot of it has been tracking, long-term tracking of trends in the

sockeye escapement through the weir systems that we've had.

MS. HYER: Correct. And understanding where the fish are going and what their proportion are on the spawning grounds and things like that.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have any genetic studies going on.

MS. HYER: There are no genetic studies funded through us at the moment, and I can't think of one that we've had in the past in Southcentral. I can't say that we haven't, but I just can't think of one.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Okay. Judy.

MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair. And I don't think I have my RAC book from last time, but that's when we were looking at the various studies that were up. And with the current funding, it seems like the three long-term studies, that's about it. But we have identified other needs. I mean, particularly, Greg, on Kenai Peninsula having to do with C&T. I mean, several proposals were submitted and they were deemed not technically adequate. And I know that's a problem these days, because you don't have as much staff to help partners put together adequate proposals.

So we have identified our information needs before. I guess really the bottom line we'll come to, someone, and I'm sure the RAC can make a recommendation on this next time, but someone, whether it's the TRC or the Board needs to decide, do those long-term studies continue, or can we switch to some of these areas where we have long felt there's information needs as well.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Judy. Yeah, this is the opportunity for members of the RAC, if you can think of an informational need in your area or on a system, that you -- to just bring that informational need, am I correct, Karen?

MS. HYER: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We can put that up as a priority or a point of interest from this Council, and that way we may get some proposals on it.

MS. HYER: Correct

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So if you, as a Council member, can think of an informational need that you could see in your area or know of another informational need, this is a good time for us to put it on the record.

Greg.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah. I would like to put on the record that we need more study, and this is once again on the Chinook, but specifically to the Kasilof River on the Federal waters. And I know there's some data been collected, some other stuff, but we don't totally understand that real well, and I think that we could maybe partner with the tribes or something. And that would be a good study for maybe a small amount, I don't know.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Would that be just anything on the Chinook, or would that be escapement or run timing or numbers of different stocks that go in there or what?

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah. And, you know, escapement, run timing. I mean, basically I want to know, you know, we've got a lot of planted fish in there I call hatchery fish, and we're limited now -- I think they're going to allow them to fish hatchery fish this year, no wild stock. A lot of those rivers down there has lost all their wild stock, and so I would like to see somehow to determine what's going on. And I don't know if I could be more specific than that, Ralph, but that's kind of my concern. I'm afraid it may go the way of the other rivers.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So if we have Kasilof Chinook, then proposers could come up with studies that -- and then we could look at the studies that they would come up with.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: That would be pertinent, yeah.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mary Ann.

MS. MILLS: Yes. I'd also like to see a baseline study on the Kenai River.

REPORTER: Your microphone, ma'am.

MS. MILLS: Pardon me?

REPORTER: Your microphone.

MS. MILLS: Oh, I'm sorry. I would also like to see a baseline study on the Kenai River. This has never been done. And with the impacts of the Chinook, and also I'm interested in how much of the wild species is, you know, being impacted by, you know, whether it's hatchery fish or whatever. But there has never been a baseline study. And what I'd like to see is something similar to what Eyak has done in their rivers and tributaries.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So there we have the two major rivers on the Kenai Peninsula. And it's pretty obvious that we would like information on them.

Gloria.

MS. STICKWAN: We sent in a project last year, and it was rejected. But I would like to see that project to be considered as one of the projects, as a priority. That was to gather data that was done in the 70s by biologist Ken Roberson (ph). We wanted somebody to go and interview him and to get all the historical data, because in the 70s he used to go to all the streams and got research data on where the fish were going in the 70s, and then that was stopped. And now we only have like one or two fisheries in the rivers that are, you know, being -- they check on them, but they don't do all the rest of the streams. We don't have any data on them. So I would like to see that for historical, you know, data to be gathered.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think that's a very, very good one, because Ken was one of the last guys that actually went on every creek by foot. And so that would be a historical study of data that was collected by a previous fishery manager, Ken Roberson.

MS. HYER: Mr. Chairman. Council members. I'd just like some clarification. Are you talking about presence of salmon? Do you know what kind of data he collected?

MS. STICKWAN: No, I don't. I just know that he went and he counted the fish in that area, and he has a record of it. We can only get it by talking to him, by asking him how he did it and where he went, and, you know, that's the only way we can get it. Unless we talk to Fish and Game, and I don't know what they have there.

MS. HYER: Okay. Yeah. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Council members. I may follow up with you later to get more specifics.

MS. STICKWAN: It was a project we presented last year and it was rejected.

MS. HYER: Okay. I will follow up on it.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Bill.

MR. SHUSTER: Yeah. On the Kenai Peninsula, the Forest Service did some improvement of two streams that I know of, Resurrection Creek and Dave's Creek. And they were to improve for Chinook. And I don't know if there's been any return to those rivers and seeing just how good the restoration projects have actually done, and I think it would be worthwhile to look at them to see how many sockeye -- or, not sockeye, Chinook are using that, because that would be good on continuation of other projects to see whether they want to continue that sort of project elsewhere.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Bill. I actually think that's one that we could even spread out a little farther, because basically what you're asking is a study that checks on the effects of restoration projects, and you mentioned Resurrection Creek and Dave's Creek, but I think we've had other Forest Service and other Federal projects that have been for restoration, and it would be interesting to see whether any of them have been affective and what has been the most effective, because then we could use that data for other improvements.

Any other from your area or from something that you know of that you can see as a priority.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none, Karen, do you think that that gives us a little bit of a baseline right there along with our previous priorities?

MS. HYER: Mr. Chairman. Council members. This is a great start. And as I said, this is a work in progress, because we'll take this back and we'll flesh it out, and then we'll talk to some of the fish managers, and maybe have some more dialogue with you. And so in the fall when we come we have something that really reflects what you're interested in.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Karen.

MS. HYER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I just want to make one comment on what Gloria said, and it's something that I've seen before. You know, a lot of times we have a tendency to do new projects, but we have a lot of data sitting out there from some of our I'll use the word older fish biologists, that were pre-computer that spent their time actually on creeks counting fish, looking at fish. And I know Ken Roberson was one of them. I mean, his life was to go look for creeks that had fish and see how many were there and what they were doing. So I really -- somehow that data needs to be put in a form that current fish managers have good access to it, and I think what she's talking about is, you know, possibly -- it's almost like TEK, but it's not, you know, but it would be putting information available that could be used.

Greg.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Donald wanted to just check with Mike on the telephone, if Mike Opheim may have anything.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Donald.

MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair, I just want to express that Michael Opheim, he's a Council member here, if he have any project idea for this Council's discussion.

Thank you.

MR. OPHEIM: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes. Yes, Mike.

MR. OPHEIM: Yeah. I think the only project that I could think of for Seldovia area would be there's a lake here that gets used for subsistence fishing for silver salmon, and that's a pretty small system, pretty small run, and a lot of people are easily accessing it. It would be great to have a baseline done for that particular system to see, you know, how sustainable is that. It's been getting hit pretty hard for probably the last 10 years.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. That's the first one that we've had on coho. And that's one of the things, as we see the growth in, and I'll use the word tourist fishery, for lack of a better, the Cabella's fishery, which seems to affect coho salmon pretty drastically in the fall. That's a study like what he's talking about there. That's a study we could even use in the Cordova area. I mean, any place that's road accessible or easily accessible is really getting hit hard for cohos in the State at this point in time. And so some studies on coho escapement, survival and things like that, I think would be well worthwhile. And the question would be that these have to be on Federal land, you know.

Karen.

MS. HYER: They not only have to be on Federal land, but they have to provide information for Federal subsistence management.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right.

MR. OPHEIM: Yeah. I think that's where Seldovia gets the red-headed stepchild right there, is I don't believe it is Federal land.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. But you brought up a very good subject, and I think that that's going to be an increasing priority need in the future, because it's on the Kenai, it's in the Mat-Su Valley, it's up in the Copper Basin, and it's found in the Cordova District. As we have that increase in the fall, B&B, Cabella-type fishery, we have a larger and larger impact on our cohos.

So thank you for that.

Andy.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yeah. That -- through the Chair. That brought up an idea. In Prince William Sound I could say historically I do know that people from Chenega Bay and Tatitlek have utilized Jackpot primarily in proximity to Chenega Island, Eshamy, and Coghill, but less so Coghill, because it's far away now. And in the past 10 years, they actually have switched use over to Marsha Bay, which is a terminal harvest fishery thing that PWSAC does, and at some point if that terminal harvest fishery -- they can't get up the waterfall, they can get them very easily there, but it's also for commercial fishing interest. And if that goes out the door, I would bet that Chenegans will switch sockeye use back over to those two natural reproducing streams, Jackpot and Eshamy, and that would be a good thing to at least establish some baseline, if it's not already there. But I'm not sure about the Federal lands surrounding that or not. I'm quite sure Jackpot is, I'm not sure about Eshamy.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And Eshamy has a long-term weir on it, so Eshamy's one of the most studied systems over there. But that's by Fish and Game.

Bill.

MR. SHUSTER: On the restoration habitat, I just realized the Forest Service is considering habitat restoration of Cooper Creek as a result of the Chugach Electric power plant, working on the dam up at Cooper Lake. And so that project would be a direct impact on a project that is in the next couple years I think. Do you know the year for that.

MR. STOVALL; Hi. This is Robert Stovall with the Chugach National Forest, the deputy district ranger.

I am following that project. I'm the primary point of contact for the Stenson Creek diversion project. It is a project to divert water into Cooper Creek via Cooper Lake, and to increase the water temperature, preferably that would increase the habitat value for Cooper Creek for coho salmon as well as red salmon and king salmon. So that project started last year. It's due to be completed this year. They have to go through a series of monitoring afterwards to determine -- and they're doing pre-monitoring and post-

monitoring of the creek temperatures as we speak.

As part of that is a restoration project at the lower end to provide additional sinuosity in the stream itself to enhance salmon habitat also. And that is still being planned. It's in the process of going through NEPA right now.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Karen, do you think that we -- you know, we know what the funding situation is, but this does put some concerns of the Council members on the table, along with our previous concerns. If we get a call for proposals on some of these, then we'll be able to evaluate the proposal when it comes before us.

Does anybody else on the Council feel like we needed to add any more to this.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: With that, thank you. Do you have anything more for our presentation.

MS. HYER: Yeah. I just want to add a couple things about funding. Actually our funding level for the FRMP has been flat. It hasn't been decreasing. And we have proportions that we use as guidelines from the Board. But what happens is sometimes in certain regions there won't be enough -- or there will be a lack of proposals, and so it's a guideline, some money will switch around. So it doesn't mean that there won't be more money for new projects in this region. It just depends on what we have submitted in the overall picture. So I would encourage you, if here are any other ideas that come up, please contact our office, too, as we work through this process.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

Judy.

MS. CAMINER: I'm glad you mentioned the apportioning between regions, because it just reminded me, in the January Federal Board meeting on the Fisheries Management Program, one of the things I mentioned was that those allocations amongst the

regions were done before the Federal Board had responsibility on the Kenai Peninsula. And I encouraged the Board then, but I think maybe that should be one of our items in our annual report, look at those allocations again given a huge workload if you will with the Kenai and Kasilof, et cetera.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

With that we're going to go to review and approve our draft annual report. And at this point in time it will also be a good time to remember some things like you just mentioned, Judy, that we could add to our annual report, or take into consideration what we learned yesterday.

So your annual report is on a handout in front of you.

MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, Judy.

MS. CAMINER: I guess as people are reading the draft annual report, also take a look at Page 83 in our book for I see it's been perhaps more clearly delineated than before what format we should use in our annual report. So not just describing what our concern or issue might be, but also do we want the Board to take action, what do we want that action to be, and give them explanation as to why we would want that action. So we can fill it in a little bit more as we go through topics.

I did write down a number of topics from yesterday which we can go through perhaps after we go through these.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Judy. Well, let's take a look at our annual report.

The first thing that we have on it is Katie John Appeal. And in this one here we are talking about an issue that affects subsistence users, and we are asking the Board for an action, and that is, you know, to stay in the court part of it. So if anybody sees a different way to write, the Council encourage the Board to stay in the Federal court to protect rural residents of Alaska from the Katie John appeal sought by the State. If the appeal is successful, it will

adversely affect subsistence users in rural Alaska.

Does anybody have anything that -- Mary Ann. I guess I need to take my glasses off so I can see.

MS. MILLS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I do have a comment on the Katie John appeal. And my suggestion is very close to what Alaska Federation of Natives is suggesting. We did have a subsistence meeting, summit a few months ago, and it was decided probably the best way to approach this is to try and do it administratively. If we could get the Secretary of Interior to step up and stop -- and, you know, help us with the -- it's the waters that's in issue, the State wanting to take jurisdiction over the waters. If the Department of Interior can do a fix, I think that would be better than going -- or we think it would be better than doing into the court of appeals, and to just go use that avenue only if it's necessary, but to try to remediate the problem through administration, whether through the -- probably through the Department of Interior, because we know that if we do go into court, you know, and then it depends on the State and what they're going to do, that if we go through the Federal court, our chances of winning might be fairly slim versus having an administrative fix which I think is possible.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mary Ann, maybe you can explain something to me, because I'm kind of lost right there. If the Federal Government does it administratively, and the State still takes it to court, then it would be my impression that if the court goes along with the State, the administrative action of the Federal Government would be of no effect.

MS. MILLS: Correct. And it depends if the State would accept the administrative fix in this case. And so rather than jump into court, to see if the fix would be agreeable so we could bypass that. It's going to be very expensive to go into court, and, you know, I tell you, we've put in a lot of money trying to remediate subsistence in the court, and this is -- I think if we could either go through the President through executive order, or through the State, that -- rather than -- or not the State, but the Department of Interior, it would lessen the cost and the time and we are just hoping that the State will,

you know, back off. Whether or not they do, you know, I'm not sure. But it was pretty aggressive on the State's part.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So would you think of adding to this one that the Department of Interior seeks administrative action to address the problem, but if the administrative action doesn't succeed, that they do stay in as -- you know, that they do pursue it in court.

MS. MILLS: I think we need a lot of support. And I'd like Greg -- Greg also attended these meetings, and he might have some other comments he'd like to make.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Greg.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah. Through the Chair. Yeah, I'd like to make a couple comments just to maybe clarify some of this stuff Mary Ann talked about.

I think what we have here is good. I mean, we're asking in our report to encourage the Board to stay in the Federal court. Also, there may be an administrative thing, so, Ralph, I think what you're stating is good.

The issue, you know, I can't give too much information, but the issue's going to be fought very hard and very aggressively. And if it is appealed, you know, there's a very good chance that it could end up as a tie. One of the judges may have to recuse himself anyway, you know. I'll just tell you that the Alaska Federation went very detailed on this, and they're going to fight it aggressively. So I think our support to administratively or court fight would be great.

But this could definitely change the whole outcome of the subsistence program. I mean, we're pretty much done.

Without saying too much, I guess that's kind of where we're at.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Judy.

MS. CAMINER: Well, I'm sure Steve and

Carl can help, too, because the reason I'm looking a little puzzled, Mary Ann, is because the way I understand it, this has to do with a lawsuit over the current regulations. So an administrative change in the regulations have to do with what waters are included within our program and Federal subsistence management. So an administrative change to those regulations, maybe there was precise, you know, wording that came out of your meetings that maybe, you know, we can share later, something like that, but I would be more in favor of kind of leaving it at general support of go the legal route.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Steve.

MR. KESSLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members of the Council. Steve Kessler with U.S. Forest Service and the InterAgency Staff Committee.

It seems to me that perhaps the Council is unaware of the status of the Katie John case at this point. And I don't have all the dates right now, but you might remember that the case went to the district court. The district court ruled in favor of the Federal program, that the regulations were appropriate.

That was then appealed by the State, and I believe on both sides if I remember correctly, to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals agreed with the Federal program, and left the Federal regulations intact as they are.

The State then filed with the Supreme Court a writ of certiorari, which I don't know much about that, but Carl's the attorney. He probably could tell you more about that. And so they filed and said they want the Supreme Court to review the decision of the Ninth Circuit.

And in February of this year, 2014, the Government responded to that writ of certiorari and it's a very interesting read. I don't know if anybody's seen it. I have it on my computer over here. I could forward it over to Donald and he could distribute it to you.

It's interesting that in the writ of certiorari that the State sort of changed their case. I mean, the way I understand it, the State sort of changed the case to say that the Federal Government

shouldn't be using the process of reserved water rights at all. That wasn't part of the case previously in the district court or the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

And so then the Government's response to the State was that this is inappropriate. The time to have taken on that issue of whether reserved water rights is correct is 10 years past due. And you may remember that at the time Governor Tony Knowles decided that we're done after talking with Katie John and others, and decided to not move forward to the Supreme Court.

So that's the status right now is it's in front of the Supreme Court. The State's case is there. The Government's response is there. And there's nothing I believe that can be done to stop that process. And if the Supreme Court accepts it, that's going to be very interesting. If they reject it, I think that's the end of it.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mary Ann.

MS. MILLS: Yes. That's what I was wondering, because I have not heard that they accepted it into Federal court. So is that still pending?

MR. KESSLER: Well, my understanding, and again, you know, it could be Carl knows more about these things than I do, but my understanding is that it was -- it did go to the Supreme Court. The State petitioned the Supreme Court through what's called this writ of certiorari, to take on this case. And the Government has responded to that. Now, I don't know what the timelines are now. Remember, the Government's response was just this February, so that was last month. And so I don't know, you know, how long the Supreme Court has to deal with that. I'm not even sure if the State gets an opportunity to respond to the Government's position. I've never dealt with that level. But, I mean, that's where it is, is the last action was the Government's response. I'll send it to Donald.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So if it goes to the Supreme Court, and that's the if at this point.

MR. KESSLER: It's at the Supreme Court.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's at the Supreme Court, but if the Supreme Court accepts it.

MR. KESSLER: Correct.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I mean, it's at the Supreme Court, but it's not on the calendar.

MR. KESSLER: Correct.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right. Greg.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah. And, through the Chair, that's exactly what we're talking about. We know where it is, and, correct, we're up to speed with what you said. But if the Supreme Court takes it, that's when we need this.

MS. MILLS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's what I was thinking. But at that point in time, you're past the point of doing anything administratively. Because if it goes to court, then it's at the Supreme Court. Any administrative actions can be canceled or not. So I think that what we have here is pretty good.

How does the rest of the Council feel on that.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Steve.

MR. KESSLER: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anybody have any additions or changes they'd like to make to number 1.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Let's go to number 2, support the FRMP. The Council continues to support the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Plan. Results from these funded projects have provided biological and subsistence use data identified by inventory and monitoring needs. Technical data has been used by the RACs to base sound recommendations for the Federal Subsistence Board's consideration.

Do we see any additions or changes that need to be made to that. Judy.

MS. CAMINER: Yes, Mr. Chair. And I can work with Donald on the wording then, too, but what I was mentioning before, that we would ask the Board to examine a reallocation among regions given the additional responsibilities of this region.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: For the Kenai.

MS. CAMINER: That were conveyed with the Kenai, right.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Does that sound acceptable to everybody, that we'll ask the Board to reconsider allocations because of our involvement on the Kenai Peninsula.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Sounds good.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Sounds good. Do we have a consensus on that. No objections.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Let's go on to 3. Support Wildlife Research Monitoring Program. The Council is in support of a wildlife program similar to the FRMP. The FRMP has produced biological and subsistence use data for the Councils to refer to, and has enabled them to base their recommendations of proposed fisheries regulations for the Board's consideration based on completed FRMP projects. The Council would like to see a similar program initiated related to the wildlife portion.

Bill

MR. SHUSTER: Mr. Chair. Is there money for that.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, not at this point in time.

(Laughter)

MR. SHUSTER: All right.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: That was a good

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But what we're saying is that we would like to see something like this initiated, and that's a legitimate thing to say. Judy, were you going to say something on it?

MS. CAMINER: First Carl.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Carl, did you have something to say on that.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, Mr. Chair. I'll call the Council's attention to Page 90, which is the second page of the fiscal year 2012 annual report reply from the Federal Subsistence Board, and where in that annual report the Council raised this very same issue.

So I would question as to how you would change your request or your recommendation based on the Federal Subsistence Board's reply.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Judy.

MS. CAMINER: Well, based on our meeting yesterday with Southeast, I thought it was -- one of the items that came out was that we would ask the Board to write a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture to continue or enhance the funding for fish and wildlife monitoring, because of the successes we've had there, and valuable information.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And so we can just say that we request the Secretary of the -- how did you put that, Judy.

MS. CAMINER: That the Secretary -- that a letter be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture about the fisheries and wildlife program.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And the need for funding.

MS. CAMINER: And the need and value. Value of the existing program, need for additional funds given the new issues that we constantly face. Well, likewise to Interior, yes.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair. I would just recommend, because essentially what you would have in

your current draft would be a reiteration of the same issue from last year, so I would just recommend a different suggestion that might at least get the ball rolling on some type of wildlife research funding, and take into account also the Board's response to the more generic statement from last year's annual report.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Greg. I'm sorry, I didn't see you.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah. Through the Chair.

Carl, a question for you. What do you suggest. I mean, obviously they didn't read it, so -- or didn't do it or pay attention to it, so, I mean, what do we do to get their attention? How would we reword it? We want the same result.

MR. JOHNSON: Well, through the Chair. I would suggest that perhaps Donald work with the Southeast Council coordinator, Robert Larson, and maybe even with some Forest Service Staff to kind of get a better understanding of how they use their wildlife research funding, and then to come up with some concrete suggestions in addition to the letters previously mentioned by Member Caminer on what to start. Because a lot of times if you get a generic statement in your annual report, you're going to get a generic reply from the Board. So if you start with specific suggestions and start small, then that may get you more of a concrete response.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. Good. Sounds like a plan.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Carl.

Judy.

MS. CAMINER: This is a question for Fish and Wildlife,and I don't mean OSM. Way back when the Fish and Wildlife, the region, used to have a wildlife studies program. And so I'm wondering if that has gone by the wayside, because of funding, or whether those allocations are still made within Fish and Wildlife Service for wildlife studies that code be beneficial to this program. So that may be something we could address if that pot of money still exists, if you know.

MS. KENNER: Ms. Caminer, through the Chair. Hi, this is Pippa Kenner with OSM.

Those funds were used through Section .809 of ANILCA, and I cannot tell you what level of funding we once had and what level of funding we have now. However, OSM at any one time often had one or two, and maybe even sometimes three, wildlife projects going on with those funds. And I know now we are maybe finishing up one or two. But I'm not aware of any .809 projects going on right now, and that would be because there hasn't been funding.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Carl, you know, I realize that, you know, that this is asking for something that we've -- this is putting on the table something we put on before, but I remember a parable from a long time about a widow in front of an unjust judge, and she kept going back to him, and back to him, and back to him, and finally he said, I'm tired of this. I'm just going to give them what they want, just to shut her up. And that came from a pretty impressive teacher a long time ago. And sometimes I wonder if it doesn't hurt on something like this that we feel strong about. I mean, so they have to make a generic response to it, they don't have any funding. But maybe one of these days they will have funding, or maybe one of these days they'll say, where can we find some funding to shut these people up.

And so I don't have any objection to put -- myself, I don't have any objection to putting something forward if it's important to the Council. And getting the same reply in return, because what we're doing is we're keeping it on the burner.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Exactly.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Greg.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Through the Chair. I would concur with that, because that was kind of my point exactly. Once we change it to a whole new venue, then we'll get, number 1, rejection on that. At least we've got a couple on this one.

(Laughter)

MR. ENCELEWSKI: And we'll have a place to start.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So what is the wish of the Council on this one. Do we leave it in our annual report, knowing that at this point in time with the kind of funding that is available we'll probably get the same kind of answer, but at least we keep it in front of them, or do we delete it.

MR. SHUSTER: Keep it in.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Is that the consensus of the Council, to keep it in.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, Mr. Chair. I would like to see it kept in. I'm not opposed to some minor tweaks as long as it doesn't change the content, the major.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Carl.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, Mr. Chair. And don't take me wrong, I was definitely not suggesting to take it out, but keep in the same general message, but then add new requests for specific suggestions for a course of action, then that gives them something different to respond to, but still the same idea.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I thought Judy's idea of a little addition to it was a good one, where, you know, request the Secretary of the Interior to seek additional funding. Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Agriculture.

MS. CAMINER: Right.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pippa.

MS. KENNER: One suggestion is our new assistant regional director, Gene Peltola, at the Y-K Delta meeting when asked this question had a similar response, but the Council might not be aware of how the Office of Subsistence Management has actually cut internally positions and programs in order to keep funding the FRMP and we are no longer to cut -- we cannot cut any more. I mean, I think there is a general consensus that the program does need to keep some minimum level of staffing in order to serve the needs of the Council and our other responsibilities. So maybe some comment to that would be appropriate.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Pippa.

And that's why I think that if we're going to ask for anything, we have to ask that they seek additional funding, not take it out of current programs.

Okay. Do we have a consensus on this. Bill.

MR. SHUSTER: Question. Would it be worthwhile to give them a couple projects, saying these are the sort of things we're looking at, like could it get funded.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, yeah, we could put some priorities out. But if we're going to do it like the Fisheries Resource Management Program, then we have to put some priorities out, and have somebody else come up with projects and look at the projects I would think, if we're going to do it on the same -- you know, in the same format.

But it sure wouldn't hurt. Do we have any critical wildlife issue currently in Southcentral that could use a project like this right now that directly affects subsistence.

Gloria.

MS. STICKWAN: The Mentasta Herd has declined down to 300. That could be researched. Chisana Herd could be researched.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The caribou in the Mentasta and the Chisana herds.

MR. SHUSTER: The Kenai moose and the population has dropped way down. They think maybe it is predation, but they don't know. It's habitat and fires. And looking into that would be probably pretty good for the land management agencies. Maybe they'll put them in direction where they might have helped the habitat.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Greg, anything.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Well, I agree with Bob there -- Bill, rather. You know, those are important things. I would rather not dilute it specific to come up with a special thing right now until we had some time to research what may be our best effort. We're

saying we support a program similar to it, and I'd like it to stay that way.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Carl.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I think this is also worth noting another -- if you're making a comparison to FRMP, the FRMP gives this Council and the other Councils the opportunity to regularly identify priority research information needs for fisheries, but no such mechanism exists for wildlife research needs. So that could be another thing that the annual report could identify, and that is that could be another value of establishing such a program regardless of the level of funding, is that it could be information this Council could provide to agencies that are already conducting funding, a statement of your specific needs as subsistence users for your region on wildlife research, and a regular mechanism for doing that. So you could make a generic statement like that as to the additional value of such a program without having to specifically identify such research needs right now.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Carl. I think that to me makes a lot of sense, is that if we support this program, then what we're supporting is the idea of ground roots user identification of priority needs. And this program would bring that out. Whether or not they were funded or not, the needs would be brought out.

And do you think you can work that into that, Judy.

MS. CAMINER: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.

MS. STICKWAN: We have a proposal, too, that's for Unit 11 moose. That's in the southern portion we're proposing. And there's no moose studies in that area currently, and that area could use some research studies. And Barbara could talk to that maybe if she wants to further explain our proposal, or if you want her to.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, I don't think we're going to have any problem coming up with research

needs. It's going to be a little hard to prioritize them, but if there was some funding there, there are a number of things in our Southcentral that sure would be worthwhile having. And like she said, the Unit 11 moose for example.

But I think if we keep it generic like you were talking about, and I think Judy's been writing our notes down on that, and she can get together with Donald and they can come up with a way to keep the idea that we're supporting of this program, and these are some of the benefits we see of it, and we'd like them to seek further funding for it.

Is that a good consensus with everyone.

MS. STICKWAN: This would be our anticipated needs, because we do have a proposal that's going before the Federal Board. We need to have that research study done.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. In response of proposals that will be in front of the Federal Board.

MS. CAMINER: Right.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Shall we go on to number 4. Representation from other Regional Advisory Council. The Southcentral Council appreciates the participation of members from the Southeast Council and welcome their participation in bringing a perspective on issues related to both Regional Councils. The Council encourages representation from other RACs that share resource-related issues to the Southcentral region, and sending representatives to other RAC meetings.

And I think we can identify, you know, specifically state a few benefits that come out of this. And I think we talked about some of them yesterday. Do you have any in your notes, Judy that were benefits that we saw by having either joint sessions or other RAC members, perspective was one of them. And just, I don't know.....

Any comments on this one. Judy.

MS. CAMINER: Well, Mr. Chair, not so much I guess from my notes yesterday, but, I mean, certainly the exchange of information is valuable, and

trying to have younger people at the meeting, whether it be students or young people in general. So we could work that into it as well.

And I know we also discussed the idea of more than one member going, or alternates. I think that gets a little complicated in terms of budget and those kinds of constraints, but I guess maybe continuing to encourage these joint meetings, either full joint meetings, or at least having some of the representatives attend other meetings helps to make kind of a more well-rounded overall program, instead of one that's scattered amongst 10 regions.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.

MS. STICKWAN: I think seeing their position tomorrow on the rural determination, of how they would like to see it changed, might give us insight in how we possibly might want to change it, just to hear what they have to say.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other comments on that one.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Then we go to joint RAC Chair meeting. And the Council requests the Board to consider a joint RAC Chair meeting. The joint meeting will allow RAC Chairs to discuss concerns they may share on administrative and resource management issues. The Councils can bring issues forward -- forward potential agenda items at it biannual meetings and present to the Federal Subsistence Board for consideration.

And the last part there, I'm trying to figure how that fits into the -- I like the first part of it.

MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, Donald.

MR. MIKE: Yeah, I brought that up in case -- when the Councils discussed this potential for a joint Chairs RAC meeting, at its fall and winter meetings, they can bring up potential agenda items for

the Federal Subsistence Board to consider.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. But now are the Councils bringing forth issues for the Chairs to take to their joint meetings, or are they bringing forth issues that should go straight to the Federal Subsistence Board?

MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair. The first statement you mentioned.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So we could say the Council Chairs can bring forth issues to forward -- can bring forth issues that result in potential agenda items at its biannual meetings of the Federal Subsistence Board for consideration and approval.

Judy, can you help clean that up a little bit, do you think.

MS. CAMINER: Well, Mr. Chair, I think perhaps I came into the meeting yesterday just as you were in the middle of discussing this. So just so I get a clearer idea, I know you were discussing perhaps having an all Chairs meeting right before this April's Board meeting.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Uh-huh.

MS. CAMINER: Am I correct on that, because that would be kind of difficult to then incorporate into the Board meetings.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right.

MS. CAMINER: So I'm wondering if we ought to propose the timing of this meeting so that not only is there adequate notice for this meeting, but adequate ability to provide the information to the Board. But again I didn't hear the whole discussion.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Carl.

MR. JOHNSON: Well, Mr. Chair, the way I took that discussion yesterday was just more of the generic concept, not specifically that we would be able to schedule such a meeting for this particular Board meeting in April. In fact, I doubt that highly.

But I'd like to say by analogy, you know, one of the things we do at OSM to prepare for each meeting cycle is all the Council coordinators and leadership team meet to identify what are going to be the joint agenda items that should be addressed by all the Councils. But if we want to stress the notion this is a bottom up subsistence management program, then it could be useful to get such similar feedback from the Councils themselves as to what they think are issues of joint concern that all Councils should be addressing.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Carl. And that's why to me this is two issues right here.

I would say to me the joint RAC Chair meetings were sufficient right in the front. The Council requests the Board to consider a joint RAC Chair meeting. The joint meeting will allow RAC Chairs to discuss concerns that they may share on administrative and resource management issues. And I think that would be sufficient in itself as far as the joint RAC Chair meetings.

Now, if we want to then go on and say that Councils should bring -- you know, that would be another thing that we could put in here if we thought, and I don't know what we would call it, but it would be potential agenda items can be brought forth by the Councils for biannual meetings. And that would be a call to the Council to bring forth potential agenda items for biannual meetings. And that to me would be a whole separate -- if we wish to do that, would be a whole separate item in our permission for the Councils -- or not permission, but whatever you'd want to call it for the Councils to put forth items for the biannual meetings, you know. I don't know how to say it myself, but you see what I'm getting at.

Greg.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, Mr. Chair. I would suggest you just drop it right at the end of the administrative and resource management issues. That's what you're trying to do is to get the Chairs to get together and share administrative and resource management issues. Our Council naturally is going to elevate our issues to the Chair or whoever, or joint Councils, so I don't think you need to cloud it up

with, you know, submitting stuff to it. I mean, that's just my opinion.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Greg.

How about the rest of you.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have a consensus just to stop right after issues, and we can do some more discussion on that other one at another time, and figure out how to work something out on that. Or at this time if we want.

Carl.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair. There's no reason why a joint meeting of the Council Chairs discussing issues of concern could not itself generate agenda items that all the Councils -- to go back to all of the Councils.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right.

MR. JOHNSON: And therefore dropping off that last sentence would not impair the ability of there to be some mechanism in place to have agenda items brought up from the Councils to appear on all the Council agendas.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Even if that sentence wasn't there.

MR. JOHNSON: Correct. Because whatever comes out of that meeting certainly would be communicated back to OSM.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right. Okay. Let's go on to the next one.

Tribal government versus tribal organization. The Federal Subsistence Program when conducting consultation should considered distinguishing the difference between tribal government versus tribal organization. The two entities represent two different functions and should be consulted separately when consulting occurs on issues affecting the organization, and I would say organization or tribe. The tribes represent individuals within the

community and the tribal organizations in most cases represent communities in the region addressing health and social issues.

But don't the tribal organizations -- yeah. Okay. You guys have better insight into that. How would you write that, Greg.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: How would I write it? I'd write it exactly the way you wrote it and be done with it.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: It pretty well covers it. It's basically they're separate entities. I mean, we could split hairs, but I think the intent is there.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Mary Ann.

MS. MILLS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. You know, the tribal governments are a sovereign governmental entity. There's three sovereigns. There's the Federal Government, the State, and the tribes. And oftentimes it gets confused, not only by people in the general population, but also among our people. And so the responsibility of tribal governments is no different than the responsibility the State or the Federal Government has over its citizens. And we also represent our citizens and our communities in health and social issues as well.

The difference between a tribal government and a tribal organization is the tribal organization is always chartered under the State of Alaska, and the tribal governments possess the sovereignty. And so it's important to distinguish between the two functions in that way.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that's why I had problems with the last sentence.

MS. MILLS: Yes, I do.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Because the tribal governments also represent the communities in regional addressing health and social issues, but the tribal organizations, which is the economic part of it, are

the ones that deal in giving these services, right? Or am I wrong.

MS. MILLS: Not always.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Not always.

MS. MILLS: Correct. And we do -- sometimes tribes will give resolutions to establish a tribal consortium, and sometimes they have their own clinics. For instance, in Kenai we run our own clinic, our tribal government.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The tribal government.

MS. MILLS: And so, you know, my distinction, you know, where I want to make sure it's very plain, is that when you're talking about an organization, you're talking about an organization. And sometimes the organizations are for profit ANCSA corporations, and sometimes they're not, depending on what they're organizing under. But tribal government is a government that has governmental powers and sovereignty powers, and so consultation with another government is -- should be more powerful, because you have your citizenship, and your governing power, your sovereignty.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Greg.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah. If I could speak to that just a second. I think Mary Ann brought a good point. I don't know, I should have read it in a little more detail. I was trying to move on too fast.

But where it says the tribes represent the individuals within the community, a tribal organization in most cases represents communities in a region, addressing health and social issues. I think that could all be dropped. We don't need to talk, we need to represent what they do. The point is well taken, Mary Ann. You have a tribal organization that has sovereign , it's has its immunity, and it's one organization -- I see exactly where she's -- it's one government you're dealing with. So it's just -- we want to make sure they get consulted separately than -- you know, we have CITC that represents a whole bunch of users. A lot of subsistence users. There's different groups, but just so you have that distinction.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, that's kind of what I was thinking Greg. That's why I was having problems with that last sentence, because it's a mixed bag on that last sentence. But the tribal government is a sovereign government.

MS. MILLS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The tribal organization is an organization.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Exactly.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Organized for a purpose, whether it's to run -- whether it's to make money or whatever, but it's an organization.

MS. MILLS: Excuse me. And it is chartered under the State and therefore they must go by State law, where the tribal governments are not chartered. We are Federally-recognized as a sovereign. So it's a huge difference between the two.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So then how about this, Mary Ann. How about if we say, should consider distinguishing the difference between Federally-recognized sovereign tribal government and tribal organization. In other words, that would emphasize the fact that when you're dealing with tribal government, you're dealing with a sovereign, you know. And that way it would be more powerful, and then drop that last sentence.

Greg.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, that would be great. And that would to me, it eliminates, you know, under the tribal consultation any questions. You've got 223 tribes, 221 tribes, you can check the box, you consulted with them. There's zillions of tribal organizations and non-profits.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.

MS. STICKWAN: We have a newly formed tribal conservation district. It was recognized by the Secretary of Interior. We have a government-to-government relationship with Agriculture, Department of

Agriculture. These conservation districts are being formed slowly throughout the State. From our area we have -- it's different in the State of Alaska, and I'm not sure if it's nationwide, that we are the first one to form, all of our tribes have formed one conservation district. We've banded, our village councils have banded together and formed one tribal conservation district. And we have a non-profit, we're going to be forming a non-profit to oversee, you know, this -- it's going to be forming to oversee our programs. So I like the word of tribal organizations to be kept in there so that we won't be excluded.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Greg.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yes, it is keeping it in there. It's distinguishing between the two. It's keeping separate, the way I read it, tribal -- well, I think you went in there and put tribes are governments, versus tribal organizations. So all the conservation district, and they are being formed fairly rapid, would be an organization that would stay on here.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And it would stay. But it just takes a different level of consultation. It's not left out. It's just the tribal governments are government-to-government.

MS. STICKWAN: Right. Right.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: I'm not going to argue that, but may or may not lift up.....

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. I mean, no, you and I won't argue about saying we should.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But anyhow -- okay. So we will drop the last part. We will add sovereign tribal governments up at the top. And that takes care of the ones that we already had.

Do we have any additional ones that we wish to put in. And I know Judy had one that she thought was pretty important.

MS. CAMINER: Yes, Mr. Chair. I was just making a few notes yesterday when we were meeting with Southeast, and we mentioned -- we heard a briefing

on the Magnuson-Stevens Act, the fisheries, and our original request about wanting a subsistence seat on the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council. So it sounded like Southeast and we yesterday were kind of leaning towards this needs to be something that goes in our annual report, request that the Board ask the Secretaries to then write to the Secretary of Commerce about this and/or I guess individually people could speak to some of the people in our delegation about this, but that would not be something we write here. But in any case, we could ask the Secretaries to put our concern forward and express why.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think that's a real good one.

Greg, what do you think.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: I think it's great.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So we're going to request the Board to seek the Secretary of the Interior's aid in getting a member of the subsistence community on the National Marine Fisheries Management Council.

MS. CAMINER: North Pacific.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And you can figure out how to write that out, Judy.

MS. CAMINER: Yes, we can. Yes.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Greg.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, after I got to actually see the pictures and the names and the appointments, it's even more important that we do this.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Any others at this point in time.

We have another -- we've got 10 more minutes until we have a time certain.

MS. CAMINER: I can add to it.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You've got another one, Judy.

MS. CAMINER: Well, I'll just mention it and see if people wanted in.

Actually one thing I forgot when we were talking about attending other RAC meetings, one other thing that was mentioned yesterday was perhaps funding or the ability for RAC members, one RAC representative to attend either a Board of Game or a Board of Fisheries meeting if that were needed. So that could or could not be something we add to our annual report.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Through the Chair. Mr. Chairman.

I think, Judy, you're requesting they fund them to go to a Board of Fisheries meeting, you're kind of giving them a punishment sentence.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I know they haven't funded it in the past. I know that as the Chair, I have attended Fisheries Board meetings, and it was a long time in the past when we were dealing with the Kenai. And the Board gave us an extra five minutes to talk, you know. And that was basically what it boiled down to. It's going to be pretty hard I think to convince them to fund somebody to go there for an extra five minutes to talk.

Donald.

MR. MIKE: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair and Council members.

When we have Board of Fish or Board of Game proposals that the Board of Game or Board of Fish address, and the Council have an interest on, and normally we'll send a representative to those meetings, and the Board of Game and the Board of Fish have seats available for our members to sit on the committee.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. And I think that's already in place.

Carl.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just because it related to your discussion on the issue of a subsistence seat on the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council, I wanted to bring to you attention something I just handed out to you. And this was discussed yesterday, and I was asked to bring some copies of this.

In their annual reports last year, the Western Interior and the North Slope identified issues that should be elevated to the Secretarial level. So what I've provided you is a copy of the letter that the Federal Subsistence Board sent to the Secretaries to elevate those issues. And it includes the copies of their annual report replies, and then also the response from the Secretary, just so you could see that this mechanism is in place, and an example of how it's been done recently vis-a-vis an annual report from a Council.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Okay. With that, Judy, have you got some more for us.

MS. CAMINER: Just a couple questions to see if we want to say anything about this. Rural determination. Clearly we had a lot of comments at our last meeting, but it seemed like one of the highest priority ones was the frequency of the review, and I didn't know if we wanted to put that in here, or if that will be covered separately through the process.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Myself, I think that will be covered separately.

Carl, what do you think on that. Is that something we need in our annual report, or is that something that we'll be dealing with when we deal with rural determinations.

MR. JOHNSON: I would wait to see what comes through the recommendations to the Federal Subsistence Board. And then the Council will then have an opportunity to comment on what specific proposals the Board may forward to the Secretaries. You know, right now the Councils and the public have already provided their input, and we'll definitely sort through all that, and then at some point in time there will be some kind of a recommendation. So I would just follow

that process that's already in place.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Carl.

Anything else, Judy.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With that.....

MS. MILLS: Well.....

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mary Ann.

MS. MILLS: There's another concern that I have, and that's the terminology of traditional and customary, because they are legal -- it is a legal terminology that I believe is being recreated by the State. And my fear is that the Federal Government will use these legal terms that really -- the way the State is redefining traditional and customary is not the way that it is described in the dictionaries or in the Black's Law Dictionary, which is a legal dictionary. So I have concern with the re-definition of customary and traditional. It's passed through the people, not through the land. And that's primarily my concern.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Were you thinking of having that in the annual report or was that just a concern you were bringing before us.

MS. MILLS: I think it should be addressed maybe in the annual report, because it is legal terms. Legal -- it has -- customary and traditional has a legal definition that has changed in the way that it's being viewed under ANILCA. And under ANILCA I believe the Federal Government is maybe choosing to use the definition as defined by the State, which gives traditional and customary to the land rather than to the people. And that's my concern is I don't believe they're using those terms correctly.

MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.

MS. CAMINER: But are we not in the process when we -- and we'll talk with Southeast tomorrow about their suggestions about the current use of customary and traditional in the Federal program, so -- and we've already commented on that. At our last meeting we came up with some specific language, but we'll have an opportunity to talk that over tomorrow with them as well. So I would suggest waiting until we finish that perhaps.

And I have one last question. Sorry this is taking so long.

There was a really great discussion yesterday amongst members about how long it takes for appointments and for the charters, and so that might be a really good annual report issue. And I know it would be very cumbersome to change the process, but if we don't start, it probably may not ever happen, but just the huge inconvenience for OSM, for the members for notifications, et cetera with the current timeframes.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Put a one-liner in there.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, we could.

Carl, can I ask you a question. If I gathered right from yesterday's meeting, there was like eight of them that you guys had already completed your work, but you were waiting for the Secretary of the Interior to sign off and send them back, if I -- and I don't mean to put you on the spot, but was that correct?

MR. JOHNSON: That is correct, Mr. Chair. While the terms of the seats that expired in 2013 expired on December the 2nd, out of 44 names forwarded to the Secretaries for appointment last ear, we're still waiting for final decisions on eight of them. And that's eight of six of the 10 regions.

So it's definitely very helpful when things are going on that are out of our, as in OSM's, control, for the Councils to express their views and feelings on those issues, because then it gives additional weight to our voice expressing concern about those same things.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So could we say something like what we would like to see, as we'd like to see the process of appointments streamlined and expedited, you know, or something to that effect? In other words so that things don't sit and weight. Would something like that -- I mean, like Greg said, a one-liner.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I was thinking of a one-liner, you know, to expedite and be efficient in the process. And to appoint us and pay us or we retire.

MS. CAMINER: Oh, yeah, being paid was another.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Well, that's what was brought up.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So we'd like to streamline and expedite the appointment and payment process.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anybody else got a comment on that. I think that between Judy and Donald, they can put up.....

MS. CAMINER: Come up with quite a few things, yeah.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, you can come up with a paragraph to put in for that one. But, I mean, is that a reasonable topic for our annual report. If that's in agreement with everybody, we'll put it in.

Gloria.

MS. STICKWAN: Yesterday they talking about keeping the people in place until their terms are just -- through the letter.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. That way -- yeah, that would be a good one to include.

Andy.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yeah, I was going to bring the same thing up. The vacancy sitting there

empty, you might continue them until that gets filled.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right. Carl.

MR. JOHNSON: And if I may suggest, Mr. Chair, the suggestion would then be to request that the Federal Subsistence Board request the Secretaries to amend the charter as soon as possible to provide for that, and that the request come from the Board.

I think, too, it's also important for you to stress how you feel the importance in the role of the Councils in how late appointments impair the Councils to perform their important function.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That if the Councils are as important as they say, vacancies are a real detriment.

Okay. With that, let's take a break. We have a time certain thing at 3:00 o'clock, and I think I saw the presenters walking around here some place. And it's already 3:03. Let's give ourselves five minutes to go get rid of your coffee, grab a cup of coffee. And I hope our presenters don't run out on us just because we're going to ask them for five minutes.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Everybody take a seat where you can -- well, I guess we don't have a screen down for this one, do we.

MR. MIKE: No. Find your seat, please. We're starting.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Here we have the Alaska Energy Authority going to speak to us, and I think it's on the dam, right?

MR. DYOK: Yes. Good afternoon, Mr. Chair and Council members. My name is Wayne Dyok. I'm the project manager for the Susitna Watana project.

I had a PowerPoint presentation, just a

brief one, to go over where we are on the project, but I think that since we're not equipped very effectively to do that, I'll just email that to you. And then I'll quickly, you know, summarize, you know, where we are in the process, specifically how it might be affecting subsistence users. And then open it up, you know, for questions.

As I'm sure you're aware, the Alaska Energy Authority was chartered with trying to ensure that the State has 50 percent renewable energy by 2025. And a couple years ago we conducted a study and determine that having a large hydro product was the most effective way to get to this 50 percent renewable goal, and subsequent to that, the Alaska Energy Authority determined to moved forward with the Susitna Watana product as the vehicle by which we would meet that goal. And it will essentially provide half of the energy that 80 percent of the State's population would need within the railbelt.

So in 2012, right at the end of 2011, we produced what's called a pre-application document for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. And that started what we call FERC licensing process. We went through a scoping process to identify, you know, the key issues. Fisheries, wildlife, subsistence, all very important issues. And then we spent most of 2012 just developing, you know, study plans to allow us to work with the public resource agencies and FERC to establish a plan, and then we also did some studies in 2012.

But for the most part we really effectively started our studies, the formal studies last year, and produced an almost 7,000-page document that we filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission on February 3rd of this year. And essentially what it does is it presents the results of 58 of our studies, but it doesn't explain how we're planning to move forward with studies this year and next year.

I think those reference documents are of enormous value, and I'll be happy to talk a little bit about those. I would hope that our colleagues at Fish and Game and some of our consultants who are doing some of the subsistence work have had the opportunity to talk with you, you know, more about those in the course of your three days here. I'm not exactly sure, but I'm here to -- I can answer some questions on that.

One of the things that has happened though is we had requested additional funding to do studies in 2014, but we hadn't made enough progress on getting approvals from the landowners, and so the Governor in his December, you know, budget, he had proposed instead of the $110 million that we requested, a $10 million budget, you know, for us for fiscal year, you know, 15.

Since then the Governor has submitted an amended budget for FY 14 funds for an additional $32.7 to allow us to, you know, move forward with some studies, but also perhaps more importantly to make sure we have all the approvals necessary to, you know, access lands owned particularly by Cook Inlet Region and the Cook Inlet Region, Inc., you know, village corporations. We are continuing to, you know, work with what's called the Cook Inlet Regional Working Group to obtain those permits. And that $32.7 million is contingent upon, you know, getting the permit approvals. We're still in need of having the legislature acting upon that as well. So there's actually a total of $42.7 million that are out there that the legislature needs to act on.

In the meantime, we do have $172 million that has been authorized. And most of that work really has been going towards, you know, the environmental studies. And these are pretty much, you know, baseline studies that we've been doing.

So we have approximately as of the end of 2013, $30 million worth of funding that's not committed that we're going to be dedicating, you know, some of to, you know, studies this year.

I think some of the important, you know, findings from last year were related to our salmon escapement study, which I think was a pretty exhaustive study of mostly Chinook salmon, but we did look at tagging all five, you know, salmon species, and I think Fish and Game has gotten for the Susitna River it's most complete data set ever for looking at salmon, you know, where they spawn, what the spawning conditions are like.

We've also, you know, last year did a fair amount of work looking at resources like water quality, ice, geomorphology, so that we can put all those together at some point and understand how the

project might affect, you know, the salmon.

So we have distribution and abundance information on not only salmon, but also on resident, you know, fish species. And that I think is great baseline information for you to work with, and I would encourage you to look at our reports.

So we've also been doing some significant wildlife studies in concert with Fish and Game. And I believe they may have, you know, talked with you about some of those in your past meetings. But essentially we've radio collared moose, you know, caribou and ptarmigan, and have been monitoring them for the past, you know, couple of years, so we have great information on that.

Of the monies that we have let, we felt it's very important to continue with those studies, so we're taking monies out of that 30 million to make sure we finish those radio collar studies. And also we have allocated money to work with Fish and Game and with our contractor, LGL, to do the third year of the salmon escapement studies. We wanted to -- we did a -- our first year wasn't as comprehensive as last year. Last year was very comprehensive. We got excellent information, and we even put in some weirs last year to verify some of the counts of salmon that we had. so n ow we have a pretty good idea of the efficiency of the observers who have been doing these index counts for many years. And I know that Fish and Game is actually, you know, using this information to help them develop their management plans. So we felt like that was an important study to have continuity, so we're planning to do that, you know, this year.

We would like to do a little bit more study this year, but we have to be careful on the study, because FERC's not going to give us what's called a study plan determination until January of next year, because most of the field work was actually going to be deferred to 2015. What we want to do, what we think we can do that's going to be of most value to the project in 2014, including as I said, the salmon escapement studies, and, you know, completing the work with Fish and Game on the wildlife studies.

So those are the main things we're going to do, as well as do some, you know, modeling work, looking at how putting all this together and

trying to understand how the flows in the river, the water quality, and the timing of the fish, how all that works together so we have a better understanding of the physical, you know, processes and the relationship with how ultimately the Susitna Watana project would be affecting the fishery, as well as ultimately the riparian, you know, vegetation and the animals that use the riparian habitat.

So that's our goal this year is to continue working on those with the monies that we have, and to the extent that we get approval from the legislature for the 42.7 million, to continue to work with the landowners to access, you know, their lands and complete some of these -- not complete, but to continue on some of these other studies to get what we think is going to be valuable information for understanding, you know, the environment out there, and then ultimately designing a plan, developing a plan for the product to make sure that we have both a construction and operation plan for the hydro product that would be in harmony with the environment. That's really our goal.

So with that, maybe I'll just open it up for questions that you might have.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Thank you for that presentation. So basically what I was looking for a little bit was the kind of timeline. So at this point in time what we're doing -- we're still doing environmental studies, and until the environmental studies are completed, there won't be any construction permits issued or anything on that order. And so what kind of a timeline are you anticipating?

MR. DYOK: Mr. Chairman. The original plan was to file a license application to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission in September of 2015 We have now pushed that application back to December of 2016 based on the fact that we're going to have to do a fair amount of environmental studies in 2015.

I would estimate that it's going to take the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission at least 18 months after that to conduct its NEPA analysis, so even though they've already done the scoping, they'll take our license application, they'll determine whether it's sufficient for purposes of preparing their NEPA document. They'll come out with a draft, and

ultimately a final license application. Until that final license application comes out, they won't be able to issue a licensing decision. So maybe 18 months to 24 months after that. I hope -- I'm more optimistic I guess that it will be closer to 18 months, because I think this extra year will give us a better -- it's more time to give them a more complete, you know, application. So at the earliest, we would be looking at having that approval, as well as we're anticipating other approvals, you know, from the State, and from the Corps of Engineers on the .404 permit sometime there. So the earliest we would start construction would be around 2018, and then it would be a 7-year construction project. So the project would be on line in 2025 if we stayed on that schedule.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So that's the goal, is to have it on line by 2025, which is the State's goal to have 50 percent renewable power.

MR. DYOK: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Questions.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Mr. Chairman. Through the Chair, Wayne, I really don't have questions for you. And the reason I don't, because, you know, we work very detail with you on this project, so I would encourage the rest of the Council member to ask, but I'm good.

MR. DYOK: Mr. Chairman. If I could just comment that it's been a pleasure working with Mr. Encelewski on coming up with the permits to access Alaska Native lands, and I have really enjoyed the opportunity to work with him. It's a very complex issue though. I just want to make it clear to everyone, that we are very respectful of the ownership of that land, and we want to continue to work in a very efficient manner with the most respect that I could speak to.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Donald.

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I recognize this project is important to the people in the region, and how it affects the communities and the resources. But I had this presentation set up in hopes that this Council would

like a detailed presentation in their fall meeting. If it's the wish of the Council, we can have it on our fall agenda and have a time certain so that the Alaska Energy Authority can make preparations for the presentation.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Donald, because that was the one thing that I was thinking is that from this Council since it deals with subsistence, and it sounds like our studies are about half done at this point in time, they're not completed, but it would be really interesting to this Council to see some kind of conclusions, or at least, you know, what kind of impacts are expected on subsistence type resources. In other words, what are the fish that are available, what kind of impacts is this dam expecting to have on fish, what kind of modifications are going to be put in to maintain the fish, what kind of impact does it have on the caribou. And that, you know, it's a fairly large scale body of water going to be up there. What kind of impact does it have on the climate in the area even, you know. And those are the kind of things.....

I'm really glad to get an idea of what the timeline line, because that's pretty important. But when it comes time to have a presentation, to us in the future, I would sure like to see, you know, out of these studies, what have you come up with for impacts that you foresee on subsistence.

MR. DYOK: Mr. Chairman. If I could, the critical part of being able to do impacts is getting the baseline information and getting the science together, and that's our models. And we really aren't going to be in a position to have all the impacts identified and, you know, plan for mitigating and enhancing, you know, the environment until we have that done. So we do have a timeline, you know, for that, because that's really part of -- after we get our second year of field data, we will be able to put all this information together. And that's one of the reasons why we're moving forward with getting the models completed this year. So that puts us in a position to be able to, you know, get a preliminary assessment of what the effects are.

In the preliminary application document that we file, you have to put forward what you think

your effects are, and so we did that in that document. Much of that was based upon the work that was done in the 80s by the Alaska Power Authority. And I think a lot of that we're finding, you know, similar information that they obtained in the 1980s in terms of where the salmon go to spawn, the kinds of, you know, spawning conditions that they favor. Clearly there are much more -- many more pressures on the populations out there today than in the 80s, and you see that in the numbers, and obviously in the management decisions that have been made. So we recognize that, but I think our goal here is to really keep working on the models.

I think we'll have some really good baseline information that we can, you know summarize for you in the fall meeting. We have to, you know, guard some of the confidentiality of the subsistence work, but I think in terms of, you know, general findings, what we've seen, we can present that. And I think in terms of, you know, some of the effects on ice, I think we do have some good information on that already. We can speak to those issues. I could probably answer some questions on that. I'm not the expert on any of these things any more. But I think in terms of what we're finding, very similar to what we found in the 80s, but even this fall we're not going to be a position to really sit down and say, hey, these are the effects of the project.

We know generally what we want to do. We want to store water during the summer for release in the winter, because that's when you need the power, but we certainly need to make sure that the environment is, you know, going to be able to, you know, deal with those changes through whatever operational enhancements that we need to include in. If we need, you know, spiking flows to cause the out-migration of the juvenile salmon, you know, that's something we're looking at doing. Minimum flows. I know from some of the other hydros that I've been, you know, working at over the last 30 plus years, you know, stable flows at certain times are very important. So these we're factoring in.

We do know from say the salmon escapement study this year, as an example, we tagged at Curry, which is quite a ways, it's about 120 miles up the susitna river, we tagged in addition to, you know, tagging fish right in the vicinity of the Yentna and the Susitna River, we tagged over 600 Chinook salmon at

Curry, and then we tracked their progress up the river. Out of those, you know, 600 salmon, one made it upstream of the dam site. Last year we tagged and three made it upstream. This year we think, and the report that we produced, we tagged around six percent of the fish, of the Chinook salmon at Curry that went upstream of Curry. So we feel like we've got reasonably representative, you know, numbers.

Out of that, I would say that really the most important thing is to really look at the effect of the flows and the changes, inflows on the fishery downstream, because that's primarily where we need to really focus out effort, although we are going to continue, you know, looking at the fish that move upstream, and better understand that.

And so our plan is to do that. But I think there were some things that we have very specific information on, but in terms of, you know, what's the effect on downstream, which is really in my opinion, you know, the biggest area of concern that we need to focus on, we won't be there until we get the models done, and that's probably sometime in 2015.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Questions, Council members. Or audience.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Away from microphones) Will that data be available for independent review once you get the models done for outside people to look and then analyze.

MR. DYOK: You know, through the Chair. Yes. We're trying to make all that data available for independent review. We've actually taken an unusual step, and we are paying for the Federal agencies to use outside consultants to review our work and comment on it and work, you know, with us. So that's a significant budget that we've allocated for that purpose.

What we're trying to do is we have our data, you know, QA/QC'd. We are working with the GINA, which is the Geographic Information Network of Alaska, and we're putting all that stuff on their website so that it is available. When we filed out draft initial study report, we put all this data up on GINA already, so you actually can get access to much of the data that we collected last year.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Bill.

MR. SHUSTER: Yeah. That 2025, is that a turnkey date or a date you have powerlines after that or do you have everything done at 2025.

MR. DYOK: Through the Chair. Yes, sir, that's our goal is to have all of the, you know, construction, you know, completed, which would mean running power lines from the project to the intertie. And the Alaska Energy Authority is also, you know, looking at an independent project. Our transmission in the State is quite old and it's in need of upgrades. So, you know, the State is working with the railbelt utilities independent of the Susitna Watana project to get the transmission system up to today's, you know, standards, to make sure that it's reliable for all the railbelt users, and that's a companion product. And I believe the cost estimate to make all those upgrades is on the order of $900 million to a billion for those improvements. And those are needed irrespective of the project.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Question. Has there been any consideration of an intertie into the Interior, into the upper Copper Basin and places like that that aren't on the railbelt.

MR. DYOK: Mr. Chair. That's another very good question. And, yes, one of the commitments that the executive director of the Alaska Energy Authority made to folks in the Copper River Basin was to look at a transmission line that would link the Copper River area to the intertie. So there's an independent study ongoing for that as well.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Greg.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Well, I guess I'd just make a comment. I sure enjoyed, you know, working on the project, but I actually spent five hours in a chopper with this man, and a couple other big wigs. We flew that whole Susitna basin, and pretty impressive. And I got to, you know, learn a lot about the project and the fish escapement, what's going to be above, and I know they're real hard at how it will affect the wildlife stuff.

And I did see -- for the subsistence here, I did spot in my travels three caribou I believe.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You saw what?

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Three caribou.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You can't take them with a helicopter.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Any other questions. If not -- Gloria.

MS. STICKWAN: Can we get a copy of his timeline, just a simple, not anything complicated.

MR. DYOK: Mr. Chair. In the slide presentation that I was planning to give today, there is a nice little graphic of our upper timeline.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And she can pick up the slide presentation on Facebook, internet, or what?

MR. DYOK: Well, I will email that, you know, to Donald, and then he can distribute that to the committee, if that's okay with you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Thank you muchly for your presentation.

And at this point in time we have Christy. And this is our Tyonek tribal consultation district, right?

MS. CINCOTTA: Thank you. First of all, I'd like to thank Donald Mike for inviting me here to speak today a little bit about the Tyonek tribal conservation district, and the Council for giving me this opportunity.

I do have a PowerPoint presentation, but I can email that so that everybody can have access to that.

REPORTER: Excuse me. Could you identify yourself, please.

MS. CINCOTTA: Yes. I'm Christy Cincotta, and I'm the executive director of the Tyonek Tribal Conservation District.

So today I'm just going to give a little bit of background information about our organization and the programs that we do, and how we address subsistence issues in the Tyonek area.

So a tribal conservation district is an entity that works with landowners to provide voluntary, technical and financial assistance for conservation projects. Tribal conservation districts connect the tribe with USDA and other agencies. At this time there are 41 tribal conservation districts throughout the United States, and 11 of those are within Alaska. There are actually more TCDs forming in Alaska right now, so in future years there could be more.

The Tyonek Tribal Conservation District is located in Tyonek and the surrounding areas. It covers the same boundaries as Game Management Unit 16B. And it covers about six and a half million acres. That area was chosen because it's the traditional fishing and hunting grounds of the Tebughna people.

So a little bit of a distinction between tribal conservation districts in the Lower 48 and here. Those in the Lower 48 have been around for about 50 years, and are typically formed to assist Native American farmers and rangers by connecting -- or by providing assistance in connecting them with USDA in order to achieve their goals. And here in Alaska, the focus is more on subsistence rather than commercial farming and ranching.

For Tyonek Tribal Conservation District, our saying or our quote that is on the pamphlet that's around, is subsistence is our agriculture. And that's the vision that our board has for the organization. And I think it's a great way to look at it, because if you look at it that way, and subsistence is your agriculture, then conservation practices and taking good care of the land is your tractor. And, you know, Alaska Natives have managed their resources successfully for thousands of years. Having a TCD is one way to provide an entity to bring local priorities of the village and the Native corporation forward to other agencies.

Tyonek formed the first tribal conservation district in Alaska in 2005, and this is formed through a cooperative agreement between the village, the Native corporation, and USDA. Our board

is composed of five members. Two are representatives from the Native Village of Tyonek tribal council. Two are representatives from the Tyonek Native council -- or Tyonek Native corporation board, and then we have one at large member who is on neither of those organizations.

As I said, the organization formed in 2005, and first hired staff in 2011, which is when I was hired.

We are a non-profit, 501(c)(3) organization, and one important thing to mention about us is that we are non-regulatory. We do not own any land. We do not make any land decisions. We provide voluntary technical and financial assistance to the landowners to help them achieve their conservation and land management goals. And a lot of what we do is coordinating multi-partner projects between the corporation, the village, Federal agencies, state agencies, and other local entities.

Our mission is to conserve, enhance, and encourage the wise use of natural resources within our district. And our core values are to meet the needs of our stakeholders, form cooperative relationships, and use what the earth has to give.

We have four strategic directions that guide our organization, and those are to become more self-sufficient, to protect natural resources, to enhance energy resources, and to provide outreach and education.

At this time we have four programs that have evolved over the last couple years of having Staff, and those are our fish passage and habitat program, community agriculture, technical assistance, and outdoor science education.

So our fish habitat and fish passage program is probably our largest and fastest growing program. In the Tyonek area there are several culverts that present barriers to fish passage, about 15 at this point. And these barriers not only caused road washouts that can cost a lot of money in repairs, but those washouts also cause habitat issues for the fish and the barriers prevent fish from getting up to larger amounts of habitat for spawning and rearing. So Tyonek Tribal Conservation District partners with Federal,

State, commercial and local entities to work towards addressing these issues in a systematic way.

If I had a way to present this map to you, it would show that there are lots of culverts in the area, and almost all of them are fish passage barriers at this time.

So in 2012 Tyonek Tribal Conservation District began working with others to identify priority fish passage projects. And we began our first culvert replacement project through funding from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Tyonek Native Corporation. We were able to open up miles of habitat for fish. And the funding from those entities went towards funding local Native Village of Tyonek employees to install this fish friendly culvert.

At this time the culvert has been installed and all the stream bank restoration has been completed. And it has been built to withstand future washouts. So a two-foot diameter culture was replaced with an eight-foot diameter culvert. And it was one of the only ones on the west side to survive this last round of flooding. And we have observed fish on the other side of the culvert that have been able to make it past.

So we're going to keep working to do more work like this in the future. In 2014 we have a culvert replacement planned for June of this year, which will open up seven and a half miles of fish habitat. Over time we think that this can have a real impact on the fish population, but allowing for fish to get to where they need to go.

Also this year we are planning to complete design work for other culvert replacement so that we can continue to move forward in the future.

Another related goal is that we plan to develop and fund a crew to monitor culverts for possible issues and remove blockages before flood events occur to wash out these roads, and wash a lot of sediment into the streams until we can get all of these fixed.

A little bit about our community agriculture program. In 2012 TTCD was asked by the Community of Tyonek to assist with the development of a

community garden. This is a project that had started in 2007 when the Native Village of Tyonek obtained funding for fencing and a shed at a garden site. In 2010 the community got together and did a lot of hard word to clear the land, about one and a half acres, for a community garden. At that point the project stalled a little bit, because of lack of funding. Yeah, mainly because of lack of funding. So we were able to work together to bring in the necessary funds to make this project happen.

The role of Tyonek Tribal Conservation District, as our role is in many other projects, is just to gather input from the community, and to help coordinate the steps needed to achieve the community goals. The community goals for the garden are to share produce with elders, and with the food bank in the community, to use renewable energy, and to work with the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service to install two high tunnels in the community garden.

And the main goal of this project is to supplement subsistence resources to help increase the food sovereignty of the Village of Tyonek, you know, which is, although very close to Anchorage, off the road system, and there are still difficulties getting food there.

So we started in 2012 by planting vegetable starts in both the school and the tribal center. The students at the Tebughna School played a really big role by deciding what plants we planted in the garden, what vegetables, planting the starts from seed, growing them, taking care of them, and then planting them out in the garden when it was time.

Let's see. Also in 2012 we worked together with the community to install logs, or install raised beds from local materials, level the field for the planting of these vegetables, working with volunteers to fill the raised beds and plant them.

And in 2012 we were able to put together elders lunch salads that went out through the elders lunch program where everything in the salad except for the salad dressing came from Tyonek. So we had tomatoes, cauliflower, lettuce, and carrots.

In 2013 we wanted to take things a step further, to grow foods that are a little bit more

difficult to grow outside in Alaska. So we installed two high tunnels that were 22 feet by 48 feet, and we also installed an irrigation system that is fully powered by solar power. Again the students played a big role in planting all the starts for the garden. And the community came together to build the necessary infrastructure for this garden to go further.

So in 2013 we harvested about 500 pounds potatoes, and two to 300 pounds of other vegetables, including tomatoes, green beans, cabbage, lettuce, carrots, broccoli, and zucchini.

Our future plans for the garden are to try to start a school program where we could have year-round production that would go into the school lunches, to develop a plan for food distribution, including selling the food to provide funding for local jobs in Tyonek. And overall we're just going to continue to work with the community to develop the garden as they want the garden to be developed.

For our technical assistance program, this is kind of a catch-all for other natural resource issues that come up that landowners would like assistance with, one main project that we accomplished in this category was to develop an air quality project. Our organization worked together with the Native Village of Tyonek, ANTHC, and the Department of Environmental conservation to obtain funding to collect outdoor air quality samples in Tyonek and set a baseline data for future use.

The air quality monitoring equipment has been installed and is being monitored by the NBTIDAC (ph) department in Tyonek.

In addition, we've also been working closely with other TCDs in the State through a generous grant from the USDA Office of Advocacy and Outreach. In the last year and a half we have worked with Mountain Village, Kwethluk, and Nunivak Island TCDs, which are all new TCDs forming, and have been able to travel out there and help with the planning process.

Some other things that fall under our technical assistance program are vet clinics. We were able to do a spay and neutral clinic in Tyonek to get 21 dogs and one cat fixed, and provide shots and immunizations for 24 additional dogs through a

partnership with the USDA Animal, Plant Health Inspection Services I think, APHIS, and the Indian Nations Conservation Alliance.

Another program is a forest stewardship plan. We're working closely with the Tyonek Native Corporation, and have been able to obtain funding through the Alaska Department of Natural Resources to develop a forest stewardship plan for all Tyonek Native Corporation lands. We're hoping to complete this plan in 2014.

And our last program is our outreach and education program, which is relatively new. Last year we were able to coordinate one education event with Alaska Native chef Rob Kinnian (ph) who we were able to bring out to Tyonek to do a cooking demonstration with wild foods. He collected beach greens, and beach peas to cook food with the youth in Tyonek at a culture camp.

This next year we are planning to hold a day camp through support from the Alaska Conservation Foundation and the Tyonek Native Corporation that will incorporate both hands-on science demonstrations, and include a lot of local speakers to teach traditional knowledge to the youth. And we're hoping to continue to develop this into a program that works with the school throughout the school year.

For future projects, this year we are planning to do an invasive plant survey and control project in Tyonek, Beluga, Alexander Creek, and Skwentna through U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service funding. We're also hoping to develop internship programs for student shareholders interested in the natural resources and sciences. And we're always looking to work to address energy issues, and we're hoping to focus more on that in the future, because that's a major concern for people in Tyonek.

So to wrap up, forming a tribal conservation district has brought new resources into Tyonek and has helped to form cooperative relationships with many partners. We hope to continue working with our partners and help landowners and stakeholders in the Tyonek area to achieve their conservation goals.

If any of you have any suggestions for our organization, please let us know. We're still

relatively new, and, you know, looking for ways to improve, and, yeah, I think my contact information should be on that flyer that was handed out, and I will find a way to send out this PowerPoint. But if you have any questions.

MS. STICKWAN: Through that U.S. Fish and Wildlife funding, was that through the tribal.....

MS. CINCOTTA: Not through the tribal wildlife program, no, it's coastal through the coastal program.

MS. STICKWAN: Coastal program?

MS. CINCOTTA: Yes.

MS. STICKWAN: I was just thinking, you know, how we could combine funding through the fisheries along with the funding through the USDA. Can't you -- my understanding is you can't use Federal funding.....

MS. CINCOTTA: To match, right.

MS. STICKWAN: .....to match, but somehow I think that should be changes, because we're both trying to, you know, protect the fisheries and wildlife, and if somehow those fundings could be done. I don't know, maybe it's something we could include in our letter, I don't know, to the secretary, that this should be looked into, because we're -- to be able to match funding will be better for projects for the tribes, and for -- you know, it would just increase opportunities for the tribes and for OSM as well I would think.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And match funding from what source was this now?

REPORTER: Your microphone, Ralph.

MS. CINCOTTA: For our conservation district, our match funding mainly comes from the Tyonek Native Corporation, but, yeah, if we were able to leverage other Federal funds, that would make a big difference.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: For projects.

MS. CINCOTTA: Yes.

REPORTER: Ralph, your microphone.

MS. CINCOTTA: Oh, sorry, to complete projects, yes.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes. Thank you.

MS. STICKWAN: Could we include that in our letter -- annual report I mean.

MS. CINCOTTA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, that's what I was trying to find out, Gloria, what we would want to include in there. Currently, can you match funding, or can you not match funding.

MS. CINCOTTA: Most of the Federal grants do not allow you to match Federal dollars with Federal dollars.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, okay. You can't match Federal dollars with Federal dollars.

MS. CINCOTTA: Even if it's from a different agency, right.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mary Ann.

MS. MILLS: Yes. On your -- you said that you're developing an air quality program in Tyonek. Is that for a baseline prior to Chulitna mine?

MS. CINCOTTA: Yes. I mean, it's just standard good practice that we wanted to make sure there was a way to get baseline data, and at this point there wasn't any, so the monitor that is out there is of a quality that is legally defensible data.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Back to what Gloria was talking about right here, I'm just trying to figure out how we could put that in our.....

MS. STICKWAN: I'm not sure how to word it, but she might know more than me, or somebody else here.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The ability to match

-- I think that would have to go higher than the Secretary of Interior, but I'm not sure.

MS. STICKWAN: I think so.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think that that would be -- that would have to go almost to Congress, wouldn't it? Yeah. But maybe we can figure out a way to put something in to that effect that the ability to match funding.....

MS. STICKWAN: Or at least we could say that once the tribes get the money it's tribal money, a suggestion that it's tribal money and it's not Federal monies once the tribes receive it.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Greg.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: I've got a couple questions.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. I've got -- Bill.

MR. SHUSTER: Yeah, I've just got a quick question. On the community garden, who would be the contact for that?

MS. CINCOTTA: I'd be the maintain contact. Annabelle Gusemar, who's the community health representative for the village of Tyonek, is really the champion of the project in Tyonek, and I could get you her contact info as well.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mary Ann.

MS. MILLS: I was thinking about what Gloria said. Maybe somewhere in the letter we could write to secure -- or for food security, and that might satisfy the matching funds. I'm not sure, but, you know, with the tight budgets the way they are for everyone, and, you know, food security is very much a hot topic not only -- you know, it's now coming to Alaska, but it has been a hot topic worldwide, and maybe there might be a way to maybe use some of that language.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So basically what

we're looking at is the ability to use Federal grant money from one program to match Federal grant money from another program for food security.

MS. MILLS: Yes. Under the -- you know, every.....

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Under the tribal conservation district program.

MS. MILLS: Yes. Yes.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I don't see any problem with putting that in our report, do you, Greg, or do you.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Well, I think we're getting a little off subject here, but whether you can call that, but that's fine. We're ready to discuss it. I do have some questions for her on that.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah. Through the Chair.

Christy, thank you for your presentation. Very good. And you guys have done a model on making this. And to me it shows to this Board what can be done to preserve the subsistence, and how you're really preserving the fish streams and everything.

But I do have a couple of technical questions for you, because some problems arise out of these conservation districts. And I wear several hats back -- I wear too many hats. But, anyway, one of the problems is you talk a lot about culverts and maintaining them and that. In the Ninilchik area we also do the same under a Conservation Society Program grant. And one of the problems it's caused is, yeah, you put in culverts, and we've got good programs and we monitor them, we do all that stuff. But it allows a ton of agencies, Federal, State and others, to take leave of your land without -- pretty soon you don't know who's running the show so to speak. So I just caution you on that. And, you know, that does happen. So I know we've done that with our culverts, and now we've got them inspecting them, we've got them doing all kinds of stuff, checking for fish, blah-blah-blah-

blah-blah, compliance, and so, you know, you might want to warn your partners it might get costly.

MS. CINCOTTA: Okay.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: And the other thing, too, I have one other last question for you, on the six-point-some million acres. I see that's pretty much Tyonek area. And the reason I talk about this is there's other conservation districts being formed, and so a lot of them geographically cover a lot of Native land. They cover mixed patterns of Native land. And, you know, we have mixed ownerships and mixed uses, and you seem to have developed that real well with the Council, but how do you do it with other agencies and other landowners that have, you know, whole different development ideas or whatever. Anyway, I'm just throwing it out there. Thank you.

MS. CINCOTTA: Yeah. Well, so I guess technically as a conservation district, it is our goal to help any landowners within our district, but we wouldn't do anything that went against the mission of the organization.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: I guess just to follow up on that, I guess the question I would have is it appears that these people are forming conservation districts, and I'll just get to the point, and they're forming it in an area that an entity, and I will say Ninilchik Natives holds thousands of acres of land, and someone else is forming a district around us. I just don't know how to say the question.

MS. CINCOTTA: Well, the conservation district, like I said, doesn't have any regulatory or really any authority. It's just a non-profit. It's there to assist. A since a lot of us are so new, a lot of us don't at this point have the capacity to assist every landowner that's within our districts. We're trying to work to that point. But no land.....

MR. ENCELEWSKI: A very good job, and you can come assist us any time. Thank you.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think to go back to what Gloria's talking about, do we wish to.....

REPORTER: Your microphone.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Back to what Gloria was talking about, do we wish to include something in our draft annual report to the effect that to aid these tribal conservation districts, the ability to use Federal money from one program to match Federal money from another program would be an assistance in food security, or do we wish to leave that out at this point in time. I don't know. I'll leave it up to the rest of the Council.

Greg.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Well, I guess my comment would be, I mean, although it's admirable, and it's a great thing, I think we're kind of mixing up. I think the food security is going to be an issue of its own, and we're going to be talking about this tomorrow at the joint meeting. If we want to put it in a letter from you, I think it's going to -- you know, if we want to go to Congress and lobby to get it, I'm not so sure that it's something that should be addressed as our letter. Separate. I would keep them separate, but that's just me.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What's the thoughts of anybody else on the Council. Gloria.

MS. STICKWAN: What would you keep separate?

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Her conservation district and this presentation to us is about the conservation district, and I don't think that we at this point are prepared, at least I'm not, to know the pros and cons of lobbying to Congress or to whoever to match funds. So I guess I could support it, but, boy, I'll tell you, that's the way we got JP Anderson for, what do they call it.

MS. STICKWAN: Is that what we're doing? I didn't think we were lobbying; we're just asking for to -- I would see to get the Secretaries talking I guess, just to have matching funds so that once it's in the tribal hands it's tribal monies. I don't know if that's lobbying or what, and if we're allowed -- we're not allowed to do that or.....

MS. MILLS: I don't think we can lobby.

MS. STICKWAN: We're not allowed to lobby, but I don't see this as lobbying.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I don't think lobbying.....

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, that's probably the form.....

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's probably a poor -- we're advocating.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: We're advocating. That's correct.

MS. STICKWAN: I just see this s -- it could be for food security, but it would provide additional funding to do research studies along with the tribes. I mean, like she said, she's doing fisheries passage studies, and that to get those monies combined, that would help with the tribes and with other Federal organizations like U.S. Fish and Wildlife.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think one thing you said there, Gloria, probably is what would stymied that, and that was the idea that once a grant is received by the tribal organization, it's the tribal organization's money. But all grants come with strings attached to them. Lots of strings. And I don't think when you get a grant you're allowed to use the grant for anything other than what the grant was specifically made for. And I may be wrong on that, and maybe somebody could correct me if I am wrong.

Greg.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Well, I don't want to be the one doing all the talking, but I'll tell you where I'm talking from. I'm also president of the tribal council of Ninilchik, and I'm also president of the Ninilchik Native Association, so I've been trying to bring them together on these issues, because it is a consensus to work together on a lot of this.

But Ralph is exactly right. You cannot mix any of those funds at this present time. You get a grant, it's carried out for that thing.

I would love to see what you're talking about, a way to get more funds to mix and max. Glenn, when we get in trouble, we go to him for funds, so I don't know how to do it, I guess.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.

MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair. On just a thought, that, for example, this conservation district that is doing fish passage work, might be someone who would apply to be part of the Partners Program. That doesn't get us matching money, but it certainly would get us expertise and on the ground people who know how to do these things.

So maybe we could familiarize you with some of our programs.

MS. CINCOTTA: Yeah, that would be great.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria, let's hold off on this and see where it goes for a while, because I don't think at this point in time we have the expertise to suggest that Congress change -- it changes the grant laws. I would hate to get mixed up in something that is -- you know, like Greg says, it's pretty far off of our mandate for lack of a better way of putting it.

But I think it would be something that tribes could pursue, and especially through the government-to-government relationship. I think they'd have a much better chance to pursue it than we would.

MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.

MS. CAMINER: I think we've done a good job I think of putting on the record for this meeting that we've had this briefing, and we could see there is a potential for partnerships here. You know, we don't know the mechanism, but we would like to look into it further, and maybe that's something that could be discussed at future meetings if maybe we have Staff look into this a little bit more.

And also I wanted to comment, and we both thought of this, we had a discussion yesterday that these Regional Advisory Councils, and there's 10

of them who advise the Federal Subsistence Board, really could use some new and younger members, and so here you are from Tyonek, and representing Tyonek.

(Laughter)

MS. CAMINER: I don't think there's ever been anybody from Tyonek on this Council. I guess I would just ask, Donald can get you information, if you can help pass the word over there, that would sure be great.

MS. CINCOTTA: Sure.

MS. CAMINER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And if you want to apply, you're more than welcome.

MS. CINCOTTA: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With that I'm going to, because of our time crunch, I want to thank you, Christy, for your presentation.

MS. CINCOTTA: Thank you

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And I'm going to let you go, and we're going to go on to -- do we need a break before we go on.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, a real quick one.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, maybe we should just let individuals who need a break take a break. And we're going to go on to a presentation by Jack Lorrigan on tribal consultation.

Jack, you finally got your turn. Sorry.

And this is pretty important in what we're talking about right here. Tribal consultation implementation.

MR. LORRIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Council. Good afternoon. My name is Jack Lorrigan. I'm the Native liaison for the Office of Subsistence Management.

I'm presenting to you on the draft tribal consultation implementation guidelines. They'll be on Page 97 of your workbook.

The work group, which is comprised of the individuals on Page 96, including Ms. Stickwan on your Council, are seeking input from the RACs on the draft implementation guidelines. The Federal Subsistence Board's consultation work group is requesting Regional Advisory Council feedback on these two documents while simultaneously seeking feedback from Federally-recognized tribes and Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act corporations.

The draft implementation guidelines are intended to provide Federal Staff additional guidance on the Federal Subsistence Board's tribal consultation policy. It includes when consultations should be regularly offered; meeting protocols, including meeting flow, room set up suggestions, topics for consultation, preparation and follow-up for the meetings; communication and collaboration with tribes throughout the regulatory cycle; training guidance and topics for the Federal Staff and the Board; reporting on consultation; and how to make changes to the policy or guidance as needed or requested.

The draft ANCSA corporation consultation policy is adopted from the DOI policy on consultation with ANCSA corporations. It includes a preamble, guiding principles and policy. For your awareness, please read the policy section.

This draft policy has been improved upon by the work group, which now has representatives from the village and regional ANCSA corporations, thereby adding to the meaning the policy for the Board. It was originally in December of 2011.

Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Are you going to run us through this, Jack, or are we going to run through it. Or is this something for us to take home and run through.

MR. LORRIGAN: Well, the work group was seeking RAC input. We were hoping to have comments before the April meeting, but it just isn't going to happen with the agenda for the Board, so we're looking

more at a summer meeting to present this. So there is time for Council members if they wish to review it further.

We have not established a comment deadline yet, because we recently became aware of just how crowded the Board agenda would be in April, and so we've had to push this off to summer sometime, and the Board has not defined when that date is yet. But as soon as we do, we'd like to have thorough review by the Councils, the tribes, the corporations, and the Federal Staff is also reviewing it. So we're trying to get all these comments back together so there'd be a final document presented to the Board in summertime.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's what I was wondering about, because if we're going to make comments as a RAC, then we need to go through this step by step as a RAC, otherwise we can't make -- I mean, we could each individually take it home and make comments, but that's not RAC comments.

And if we're going to make RAC comments, when I look at this, is this anything that's on the joint schedule? I don't think so. This is straight for us as Southcentral, right?

MR. LORRIGAN: All the other RACs are reviewing this, too.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Well, we are -- the wish of the Council. Do we wish to take the time right now and go through this step by step and comment on it. I don't see any other opportunity we're going to have before summer myself, if that's what your wish is, to have -- even if we don't have something by April, if we're going to have something by summer, the only time this RAC is going to have to do it is right now. And we could go through this step by step and make comments on it, or we could go through it and we are going to meet again tomorrow. We could take it home, go through it, and then come up with any.....

Are you looking for recommendations for changes, additions and things like that, or are you looking for comment on what's been done. To me, from what I looked at it, I thought they've done an awful lot of work, and it's awful good work. I don't know how I would change it on a short notice. But I don't know what the rest of the RAC thinks on something like

this.

Greg.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Well, I haven't really thoroughly studied it, but I read through it, and, you know, I'm pretty comfortable with it. And we also put in our letter, our annual letter, a statement to it, what we thought about the consultation between tribes versus tribal entities, so that's added to it, and I'm good with that.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: This is a pretty detailed step by step, right down to the point with, you know, how -- everything from how the room should be, and how the protocol should be, and everything like that. Whatever committee did this, they put a lot of work into it, that's for sure.

Judy.

MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair. I guess I would ask Gloria, having represented us I guess on the committee, whether you have any thoughts on how it might be changed, improved, and maybe just a general comment on how the process has been working for tribes so far.

MS. STICKWAN: First of all, I think we did an excellent job.

(Laughter)

MS. STICKWAN: We went through these points by points, and I we thoroughly talked about it, and there's like a lot of people on the -- a lot of tribal members on there, and they all had their input, so, I don't know, I think I like the way it is written.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, we can have a motion to support this implementation guideline. Like I said, from what I've read on it, it's got an awful lot in here and it's pretty thorough. I think it's going to be pretty hard to abide by everything that's in there, simply because it is so thorough and so full. But I don't see anything that's not a good idea, that's my problem with it. It's not simple.

MR. LORRIGAN: These are guidelines. They are guidelines.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: They are guidelines, and that's the thing to remember, is they are guidelines. It's not something that they have to sit there and check off every time.

Mary Ann, you.....

MS. MILLS: Yes. Maybe we could support the concept then. If their guidelines and we agree to it, we can just support the concept and see how it goes.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Of the implementation guidelines that the committee worked up.

MS. MILLS: Yes.

MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I have no problem doing that myself.

Judy.

MS. CAMINER: I know at one of our meetings, Jack, you gave us sort of a count of how many consultations had taken place, and kind of the overall picture let's say of effectiveness. And so I guess if we could continue to do that, if it seems like they're effective, then they're really great. If we run into challenges, then maybe Staff or we will have some suggestions on how to improve the guidelines to make -- to really get the information from the consultation that we all need.

MR. LORRIGAN: Through the Chair. Ms. Caminer.

This is a living document. It's up to change from time to time, and I have had many challenges with this. Not with this, but with consultation and trying to hammer it out. It's come at me different ways and different forums, so we still have some tinkering to do.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Greg.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Well, I was about ready to make a motion to support it, and I'll do that in just a minute.

But I had one question, Jack. One of the things that for us, tribal consultation, government-to-government, you know, it's been good. It's been greatly improved. We get a call. But the one thing that we wanted to stress is when that community or that government or whoever it may be, a proposal affecting that area, that there's an extra effort made to consult with them. And I'm not sure if that's wrote in here, it may be, if I missed it or not.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, that's what I would consider would have to be the principle of this thing, is that when some -- when they're affected, you know, this is going to be put in place.

I'm like Judy. I would like to get some reports in the future as to how it's working. I'm like you. I look at this and I would be absolutely floored if I had to put all these steps in place, but the principle behind it, you could do. And the question would be, how does it work, and how do these guidelines help you do that.

MR. LORRIGAN: Mr. Chair. I anticipate some changes to the document through time as we exercise it and see how it fits with the program. And I most definitely can report to you how things are working.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: With that, a motion's probably in order then. And I think we should take action on this one.

Greg.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. I make a motion to support the implementation guidelines for the Federal Subsistence Board government-to-government tribal consultation policy as resented to us at this RAC meeting at this time, this date, this hour.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second. Mary Ann.

MS. MILLS: I second.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have any discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none, the question's in order.

MS. CAMINER: Question.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question's been called. All in favor signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by saying nay.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries.

And like I said before, I'll be more -- I'll be interested in seeing how it works, because like you said, it is a document in flux.

Thank you, Jack.

MR. LORRIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I was just curious if you had any thoughts on the consultation policy for ANCSA corporations. That was also part of the packet. It's Page 106 in the book.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That I haven't looked at. So if I understand right on that, Jack, the protocol will pretty much follow the same protocol that was used with the tribes; it's just recognized that there is a different level of authority there.

MR. LORRIGAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But as far as the protocol and the reasons and how it's done, it will pretty much follow all the other implication guidelines.

MR. LORRIGAN: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That seems reasonable to me. How about to you, Greg.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yes, it sounds

reasonable. I just read it.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mary Ann

MS. MILLS: Yeah. We have a chance to digest this a little more.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, Jack -- or Greg.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah. I was looking. I mean, it basically says that, you know, Congress required the director and Office of Management and Budget, Federal agencies are to consult to with Alaska tribes, and further with corporations, so there's the public law and all the other stuff it quotes from ANCSA, so they're required to do it.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. What I liked was the last sentence in the first paragraph under the preamble where it says, recognizing the distinction, the Board is committed to fulfilling its ANCSA corporation obligations by adhering to the framework described in this policy. But it recognizes the distinction. And I think like Greg said, it's part of the law, it has to be done.

Mary Ann.

MS. MILLS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You know, with the government-to-government relationship and with the laws that were put in place, it was done without consultation by the tribal governments, and, of course, that is a concern with me.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Do we need a separate motion for the ANCSA corporations? We've already had the motion on the -- no, we had a motion on implementation policy, and that applies to both the tribes and ANCSA. It's the policy, the implementation policy is used for both of them, right, Jack?

MR. LORRIGAN: Well, it will have some changes, because of the distinction between. The way that this happened last time is the tribes -- the RACs and the tribes were given the DOI policy, the Board's policy. And then the work group was put together to

develop the implementation guidelines. And the same is happening now. Now we have an ANCSA policy, and then we'll have a work group to develop the ANCSA policy guidelines. So right now it's just accepting the policy, and then the work group will transform its gears and go through putting together implementation guidelines to deal with ANCSA corporations.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So this last part's just basically an information part.

MR. LORRIGAN: Somewhat, yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Okay. With that, thank you, Jack.

I think we have -- have you got anything else for us.

MR. LORRIGAN: No, sir. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You don't. Okay. With that, I think what we have left, we have some agency reports, right?

And then what time is it right here. Do we want to take a break now, or do we want to just keep right on working.

MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair. We have agency reports. Native Village of Eyak and National Park Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service specific to the Southcentral region. So if you want to get those out of the way, we don't have to deal with them tomorrow.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right. That's what I was thinking. So I'll take the Native Village of Eyak report first, and then from there we're going to go on to -- is the BLM's report for everybody or just for us.

MR. PICHE: Hi. My name is Matt Piche, and I am the natural resources coordinator for the Native Village of Eyak.

I originally designed a PowerPoint for this presentation, but I will email that to the Chair,

and you can distribute it as you like. It's going to be a little difficult without the PowerPoint, but I'll have to make do.

And basically I'm here to present our 2013 Copper River Chinook escapement monitoring project results. And this project is funded through the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program, and the Partners for Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program through U.S. Fish and Wildlife, Office of Subsistence Management.

And I'll start by just kind of giving a brief overview of our project for those of you who aren't familiar with it. We conducted two sample mark/recapture studies on the Copper River, and with the goal of finding out the Chinook salmon escapement each year.

Now, this consists of running fishwheels for Chinook capture. This occurs at two sites, a lower river site called Baird Camp, which is in Baird Canyon, and an upper river site, about 91 kilometers upriver, and this is located just below Wood Canyon, and we call that Canyon Creek.

Now, a lot of consideration went into the location of these camps. And basically Baird Canyon is the first major channel constriction of the Copper River, so this resulted in increased water velocity in the canyon which tends to push the fish towards the outer edges of the canyon where our fishwheels are located. This increases the chance of Chinook capture.

Our second recapture camp located upriver is in Wood Canyon, which is the second constricted site on the Copper River.

And in between those two sites, it's very braided, and that helps with the complete mixing, which I'll get into in a minute.

Also, the camp locations are above and below any major fisheries. So below our camps we have the commercial fishery occurring out on the delta, and above the camps we have the major in-river fisheries, such as the fishwheels and the dipnets.

So the location being in between these two, gives us basically a great data set where we can

either add or subtract the catch data, and that provides overall run estimate, or a total upriver escapement estimate.

Now, at Baird Canyon we're fishing with the fishwheels, and every Chinook that we catch we're measuring and we're tagging. Now, at the upriver Kenny Creek site, that's our recovery site, we're simply catching fish that are tagged and untagged, and taking measurements and then releasing them.

Now, to give you an idea of kind of how a two-sample mark/recapture study works, like I said, at Baird Camp we're tagging all the Chinook we capture. And what you have to remember is the science and math behind this, it's all a ratio and a numbers game. So we're tagging all the Chinook that we're capturing, and then we're releasing them. As these released tagged fish are migrating upstream through the braided section which I just mentioned, they're mixing with all the fish that passed through Baird Canyon that we weren't able to tag. Every fish that eluded the fishwheels. So by the time they migrate 91 kilometers upriver, you have a completely mixed population of tagged fish and untagged fish. Now this provides a ratio of tagged and untagged fish. And essentially we can apply this ratio that we achieve at the upriver site, and extrapolate it down to the downriver site, and we have an idea of the total amount of fish migrating past Baird Canyon.

So that's kind of how, what, and why we do this project, and also where.

So I will now pass around a couple of these, to get into the nitty-gritty details of the project. Pass these around.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Should we turn them in for the dollar reward?

(Laughter)

MR. PICHE: So these are our external NVE tags. And these were actually designed specifically for MVCEM project. And basically we designed these in 2007, and that's when we implemented them. And it minimized previous issues that we had with tag retention -- tag detection, and it also increased our efficiency, because they actually have encapsulated a little pit tag inside that yellow

plastic material, and that can just easily be scanned, and we can put that into our data set. So that reduces the amount of time that we're actually handling the fish, which is good for the fish at the end of the day.

So that just gives you an idea of some of the research that has progressed through our project.

And we're also deploying -- we're also using these tags for a study that's being conducted on the Gulkana River. And RFID array is located along the riverbed, and as these fish pass over it, it will scan that tag, and we can link that in with our data set. And if anyone wants more details on that project, I can talk to you after the meeting.

So I had several charts and graphs which I'm not going to try to explain, but basically what we had in 2013, it was an extremely abnormal year for the Copper River. As many of you probably know, we had ice on the Copper River through the month of May. And there was a lot of property damage, there was a lot of fishwheel damage. A lot of people lost their fishwheels, because when the ice finally decided to go, it all went at once, and this created several ice dams along the river which created a large fluctuation in the water levels.

And basically what this resulted in, our lower river tagging site -- usually we're fishing around the 10th to the 14th of May. This year we had solid ice in front of our camp until the 25th of May. So you can't really deploy a fishwheel under those conditions, and it started to break up around the 25th, and then we had four days of just a constant ice barrage down from the camp, and it didn't become safe to put them in until the 29th. Se we were a little behind schedule this year because of Mother Nature. And sadly the Miles Lake counts also experienced some of the issues with ice. So there is a possibility that there might have been fish migrating up underneath the ice, and we don't have any data on the numbers of fish migrating through.

But if you look at our catch data, it would be easier with a graph, but we started catching fish around the 29th, and we didn't get up into any significant numbers until about June 5th. So what this suggests is a compressed run, and it also suggests that

the portion of the run that we might have missed before the 29th likely wasn't that large. But again there's no way of actually determining this.

So the migration time between Baird Canyon and Canyon Creek, when we're tagging all these fish, we're taking all their data down, so we get an idea of how long it takes them to move, to migrate through the river. And for 2013, most of the fish took between 10 and 14 days to migrate the 91 kilometers up river. Our slowest fish took 28 days to make it that far, and our fastest fish took four days to migrate the 91 kilometers. Now that's going against the Copper River current. And that's averaging about 23 kilometers a day, which is pretty impressive when you think about it.

I also have a graph comparing the overall Chinook length. Like I said earlier, we're taking the length and measurements on average Chinook that we're tagging. And when you guys review the PowerPoint, you'll be able to see a comparison from 2002 to 2013 of our average lengths. And the graph basically shows some annual variation; however, we do see a slight decline in overall Chinook size, which in 2002 to 2003 was about 920 millimeters, and 2013 were just below 870 millimeters.

So for basically the final numbers here that I'm going to go through, is our Peterson estimator for abundance. Now, Chinook abundance for 2013 between Baird Canyon and Canyon Creek, between June 5th and July 9th, was 32,581 fish. That has a standard error of 4,425 fish. Now, the five-year average -- our 2013 value was above the 5-year average of 30,529 fish, but it was below the 10-year average of 37,902 fish. The ADF&G total drainage sustainable escapement goal is 24,000 fish, and this is calculated by ADF&G using NVE's Chinook abundance data and the ADF&G catch data, because you've got to remember there's a fishery happening above our research sites. So they have to calculate basically the amount of subsistence use, personal use, and sport use fisheries, and subtract that from our value.

But those are the numbers basically for our project. And like I said, I will submit this PowerPoint. And if anyone has any further questions, feel free to contact me at NVE and I'll also be here tomorrow, so feel free to ask away then.

Does anyone have any questions one.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So basically we had a drop of about one inch in the length of fish over the is 10 years then, right?

MR. PICHE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What kind of variation do we get year by year?

MR. PICHE: We've seen a variation about -- anywhere from 30 to 50 millimeters year by year.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So one to two inches?

MR. PICHE: Yeah. Yeah. So, you know, the overall drop isn't anything that throws a huge amount of red flags. And next year for all we know it could -- or this season, it could go up another 20, 30 centimeter -- millimeters.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we keep track of, for lack of better way of putting it, the largest -- I mean, do we have -- I know what the average is from this, but do we see a lack of -- is it because -- in other words, we could drop and have an extra lot of small jacks once, and extra large one, or we can drop because the whole population has dropped. And I was just wondering what the -- is there much of a variation in the extremes swing.

MR. PICHE: In the extremes, no. One thing that our project does though is we exclude any Chinook that are less than 500 millimeters. Basically we have these live tanks that have escape panels, and this allows all the sockeye, including some of the smaller jack Chinook to escape out of the fish wheel, so they're not retained, so we don't have any issues with over-crowding. And so we really -- the jack component of it is kind of taken out.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

MR. EVANS: So has escapement been reached every year for the Copper River.

REPORTER: Excuse me, you're not on the record if you're way over there.

(Laughter)

MR. EVANS: Okay. I'll get on the record. This is Tom Evans, a wildlife biologist with OSM.

Has escapement been reached in the Copper River ever since you've been monitoring it?

MR. PICHE: The escapement that -- what we have to remember is there's a difference between the escapement and the abundance estimate that we get. As far as our abundance estimate goes, that's the amount of fish migrating through Baird Canyon, we have been above the 24,000 every year. However, ADF&G has to calculate in the upriver fisheries, and there is a lot of error associated with the more calculations that you make and the more things that you add it. And there have been -- following their calculations, I think there have been three or four years that we're below the 24,000. It wasn't a large amount below the 24,000, but I think there were three to four years that it was below.

MR. EVANS: Thank you.

MR. PICHE: You're welcome.

MR. SHUSTER: Question.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bill.

MR. SHUSTER: Yeah. I didn't write down the numbers so I don't have them to look at. Were there any differences between the Baird Canyon and the upper site for the size that you caught?

MR. PICHE: I don't have the actual values in front of me, but, yes, there were differences in the size which is expected, because as the Chinook are migrating upriver, they're undergoing, you know, morphological changes and physiological changes. And as you see a king in its spawning grounds, it's going to have a great big kite, whereas where we're catching them in Baird Canyon, they're pretty much all silver fish, bright, straight from the ocean. Baird Canyon's only about 66 river kilometers upriver from the mouth. So we think that that's primarily the reason that we're seeing length differences between the two sites.

MR. SHUSTER: I was just wondering at the Baird Canyon you may have your bigger kings going up the middle of the river, and you're not catching those, but you are catching them further on up the river, and that could be a difference in the length that you're seeing.

MR. PICHE: I think if -- you know, you may have some of that happening. And again with what we have available to use as far as technology, we can't really figure that one out, and it's pretty hard to fish the middle of the river. But I think if we saw something like that happening, there would be a larger variation in the size differences we're seeing. The variation is usually right around -- within 10 millimeters of your total length, which suggests that it's more of a morphological change than actually missing a large group of the larger fish.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Gloria.

MS. STICKWAN: Did you have to change where your fishwheel was downriver or upriver a little bit because of the ice had cut away from the bank or anything?

MR. PICHE: Yeah. You know, that's kind of a constant battle in any river with the fishwheels. And our Baird Canyon fishwheels stayed relatively in the same areas the whole season. The upriver fishwheels in Canyon Creek near Wood Canyon, we had to change the sites of those a few times. However, just to keep our data consistent and comparable from year to hear, we always keep a fish -- each fishwheel on its respective side of the river. We might move it up or downriver a little bit, but we never cross riversides, we never have two wheels fishing on the same side.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Andy.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chair. Is there a way to extrapolate from the data from the way upstream weir that's Fish and Game's weir compared to your numbers to see how many fish you may have missed when the ice was on the early part of the run?

MR. PICHE: Are you speaking of like

the Gulkana, the counting towers that they have there?

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yes.

MR. PICHE: I'm not exactly sure. I think there probably is a way to do that. I'm not sure of the amount of error that would be associated with that.

One of the things that I briefly mentioned, that the RFID array that we install, we installed that right next to the Gulkana River counting towers, ADF&G. So in addition to what they're seeing go by, and sometimes they'll look out and they'll see that big, yellow spaghetti tag sticking out of one of our salmon, and they make note of it. We also have the array that's tracking each fish that's migrating up through there. And we know that we were able to get a portion of that Gulkana return, because we had I think roughly 30 to 40 fish that we tagged at Baird Canyon cross that river array in the Gulkana.

But as far as timing, we haven't really looked into that yet, but that is a great suggestion.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: I was thinking that you could look at their numbers in comparison to previous years that you had numbers, too, and be able to determine how many you possibly have missed or (indiscernible - mic not on).

MR. PICHE: Yeah. And the other tough thing with that is, you know, if that Gulkana migration just falls outside of -- you know, if they're migrating up the river after, you know, let's say they start on June 5th or something, it could be another population going into a different river that we have missed, you know. So that will give us information on the Gulkana stock, which is good. So we will look into that.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy. Gloria.

MS. STICKWAN: Did you hear about that one Chinook that went up to Knotty (ph) Creek? Was that scanned or did you work within PS or Wrangell-St. Elias to look at that? I mean, did.....

MR. PICHE: I believe we got -- I think they recovered the tag on that, and we got it sent in. As far as the travel time and the dates, we haven't

gotten around to looking at the individual fish yet, but I'm aware of that, it is pretty interesting, because when you have something like that happen, you essentially can track its entire migration from Baird Canyon, which is river mile 66 all the way up to Tanada or like the Gulkana. I mean, you're talking about hundreds of kilometers of a journey, and that allows us to track the entire migration. So it's interesting info, but I don't have that info on me right now. But we are aware of it, yes.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Did anybody else have any other questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If you want to find out what fish are going up through the middle of the river, you could go take lessons at the Chitina River bridge. There's a lot of people that know how to catch them in the middle of the river. And it was kind of interesting to me this year, because I was up there at the start of the subsistence season, and the guys on the bank weren't catching much, but the guys drifting down the middle of the river were doing real good. And so I have a tendency to think that more fish go up the middle of the river than we think. But that's just personal observation and has no scientific bearing at all.

Any other comments.

(No comments)

MR. PICHE: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: With that, I'll turn my microphone on.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's always an interesting presentation to me, but then I have, you know -- I love that country.

So with that, we have some other agency reports. We have National Park Service.

MS. CELLARIUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the record, I'm Barbara Cellarius. I'm the

subsistence coordinator for Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve.

And Donald has distributed a packet of information to you, and I will try to go over this briefly, but if you have questions about things, feel free to ask if you want me to talk more about them.

And the first thing I'm going to talk about is actually is Alaska region wide. It affects national preserves in Alaska. It's something the Park Service is doing. And we're going to be holding public hearings in March on temporary restrictions for certain sporthunting practices in several national preserves. Public comments on these provisions will be taken from March 9th through March 22nd.

Basically we're renewing the temporary wildlife restrictions that we had put in place last year. These are in response to the decisions by the Alaska Board of Game to liberalize hunting seasons and methods for coyotes, wolves and bears. And the Board -- the Park Service requested that the Board of Game exclude national preserves from these regulations, that these concern hunting under State of Alaska regulations in national preserves. We asked the Board of Game to exclude preserves, and they declined to do that. The NPS restrictions don't affect subsistence harvest under Federal subsistence regulations.

In the press release there's bulleted points, you can see them on the front, that explain what the restrictions, the temporary restrictions would be. And then on the back page is a list of public hearings. And so those are going on this week, and then next week each national preserve that would be affected is holding a hearing, and there's also going to be one in Anchorage. But anyone can go to any of these, participate in any of these hearings and make comments, so you don't have to come to the Wrangell-St. Elias hearing to make comments on temporary wildlife restrictions in Wrangell-St. Elias.

There are also the opportunity for call-in to the public hearings, and that information is -- I think it's listed here. Yeah, there's the telephone numbers there, so if somebody wants to call in to a hearing, if they want to submit written comments, there's an explanation at the very bottom of the press release about how to do that.

So I'll stop there and see if there are any questions on that. Because it's the same thing as last year, I'm not going into a lot of detail, but I can answer questions if there are questions.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Barbara, and thank you for pointing out that it really doesn't affect subsistence. It's basically dealing with in response to State regulations.

Bill.

MR. SHUSTER: But these proposals that you're talking about, it doesn't only the national preserves. It impacts the entire unit or subunit that the preserve is in, like Charley. That would be 20E, but you're talking all about 20, not just the preserve that's within 20E?

MS. CELLARIUS: The Board of Game made hunting regulations for all of 20E, but the National Park Service only has the authority and the ability to affect activities that occur within the national preserve. So the temporary restrictions are only for the national preserves. We can't do anything outside of our boundaries.

MR. SHUSTER: So you're asking the Fish and Game to make restrictions only within the boundaries of the national preserves.

MS. CELLARIUS: We asked the Board of Game to exempt the national preserves from the changes in the wildlife regulations. They declined to do that, and so we're using our authority. And the Board of Game, essentially their response was that we should use our own process, and so we are using our own process in basically not allowing certain activities in the preserve.

MR. SHUSTER: What I'm probably confusing is the national parks versus some of your Friends of the Parks, what are they called, your -- well, this -- it's a group that pushes through national park agenda, and they have -- the guy who is the head of the State parks, John.....

MS. CAMINER: Jim Stratton.

MR. SHUSTER: Jim Stratton, yeah. His

group. He put forth just goes beyond the national preserve boundaries.

MS. CELLARIUS: What I am talking about is strictly something that the National Park Service and specifically certain national -- the national preserves in Alaska that are affected by these hunting regulations, and we are, as an example, from Wrangell-St. Elias, the Board of Game approved the taking of brown bears over black bear bait stations in Unit 12. We feel that that is not consistent with our management -- with how we need to manage our lands. And so what we're saying is that within the Wrangell-St. Elias National Preserve, that part which falls within Unit 12, we are not going to allow people to take brown bears over black bear bait stations.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But, Barbara, like you said, it has no effect on State land or Native land or anything like that. It only has effect on national park and preserve land.

MS. CELLARIUS: And really it's national preserve land, because the.....

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: National park's already closed.

MS. CELLARIUS: The national -- the state regulations don't apply on the national park lands.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Barbara.

MS. CELLARIUS: So I have several other things that I will go over much more quickly.

The Wrangell-St. Elias hearing will include an opportunity for public comment on a prohibition on domestic goats. And this is something that we had included in our 2014 superintendents compendium. And the purpose of this prohibition is to avoid disease transmission between domestic goats and Dall sheep. And the Board of Game has actually already taken action to prohibit the use of domestic goats as pack animals in Dall sheep territory. So if you have comments on that, we're also taking comments on that either at our public hearing or you can send them to us in writing.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'm just glad it wasn't 20 years ago.

MR. SHUSTER: Are llamas considered a domestic goat?

MS. CELLARIUS: I don't believe so.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. And?

MS. CELLARIUS: So then there is a two-page wildlife report that you have. At your last meeting Judy told you she would be giving you some wildlife information that she didn't have ready to present. And so there's a wildlife report. It covers the Chisana Caribou Herd, the Mentasta Caribou Herd, a recent moose survey that we did, and some sheep surveys from last summer. If you like me to talk about any of those things, I can, but we could just move on.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Barbara. I think that these are pretty simple for us to look at right here. And the interesting one was the Chisana one, because it isn't determined yet right at the end.

MS. CELLARIUS: What I would say about the Chisana, so in October they did the every three-year population census of the Chisana here. While we don't have a population estimate yet, they counted more animals this time than they did last time. And if you look at the bull/cow ratio, and the calf/cow ratio, they are consistent with continuing to have a small harvest of the herd. So they don't suggest that we would not have a hunt of that herd in 2014.

And then I gave you a table that summarizes the number of permits that we've issued for Unit 11 and 12 through the Federal subsistence program, how many people hunted, how many animals were harvested, so that's just -- I try to keep that table updated so that's in your report.

Then Molly has provided a copy of her fish -- it's a fish report, and it basically summarizes the Upper Copper River salmon fishery, the Glennallen subdistrict, the Chitina subdistrict, and the Batzulnetas area for the 2013 harvest season.

And then the one other -- well, actually I have a couple other things I want to

mention. I have a few copies of the handout, but I didn't put it in your packet. We currently have a proposed rule published in the Federal Register, so it's a proposed regulation package that implements our Nebesna off-road vehicle management plan. And the deadline on that I think is something like the 20th of March. And basically we're implementing the decisions that were taken in the ORV EIS, so that's something that certainly the SRC was very involved in developing that EIS, but I did want you to know that there is this public comment opportunity. If anybody is interested, I'm happy to give you a handout that kind of explains what's being done.

And there's actually a very nice map. One of the things we're doing is we're designating trails in designated wilderness. That was something that we were asked to do on art of this planning process. And so I've got a map of those trails.

So if anybody's interested, get ahold of me.

And the next SRC meeting, the next meeting of the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission -- I'm actually going to talk a little bit about what the SRC is during the joint meeting tomorrow. But they're going to be meeting October 7th and 8th, somewhere in the central Copper Basin. If not Copper Center, maybe Gulkana, Gakona, something like that.

And that completes my report, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Barbara. Any questions for Barbara.

I really like your hands out. So anybody should be able to read them. They're very clear, and they're very informative.

Judy.

MS. CAMINER: Well, not so much a question for you, Barbara. I appreciate what you have presented. Oftentimes I know you're given Denali information and preset that to us as well, or hand it out to us. So I guess maybe either between now and the next meeting, if there's any updates from Denali, I

And also I think you' probably heard the discussion yesterday about our lack of representation from that part of our region, so anything you might do to convey that to the park there, we'd appreciate it, or we can contact them directly too.

MS. CELLARIUS: You know, I think it's funny, because at Eastern Interior we spent a lot of time making sure we had a copy of the Denali report. I think I may have an electronic copy of Denali's report, and if I do, I will send it to Donald. I mean, I'll go back to my computer now and send it to Donald, then he may well have it before the meeting's over today. And if not, if I don't have it on my computer, we can get it from Amy. That's easy.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Barbara.

Any questions from anybody on the Council for Barbara before she gets away.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Barbara.

MS. CELLARIUS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Donald, next agency.

MR. MIKE: Fish and Wildlife Service.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fish and Wildlife Service.

MR. KRON: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the Council.

OSM's report is very short. It's just informational. Just to tell you a little bit about some of the things you heard a little bit about yesterday, we have a lot of vacant positions due to all kinds of reasons right now.

Carl mentioned yesterday that the person that normally puts together your Council books left us last fall. There's been a committee that's working on interviewing people. My understanding is

that position will be filled shortly.

Our deputy assistant regional director, the chief of staff position is vacant right now. There's recruiting going on right now. Karen Hyer, who is here at the meeting, is acting in that position right now as our chief of staff. Suffice it to say, we have a lot of vacant positions.

The State in the past and the Federal Government when budgets are short they restrict travel. And they make it challenging to fill positions. They make basically the supervisors scrutinize positions.

What we have to do is put together waiver requests. Last week I think I was -- I did four last week, I'd done three prior to that. But in any case we put together waiver requests which have to be approved by Washington, D.C. before we can start the hiring process. So there's a lot of scrutiny occurring on all of the selections.

But suffice it to say again there's a lot of people that are in acting positions. We're trying to do a lot of work. We basically -- we're currently about 40 percent down on staffing, so you've got a lot of people doing a lot of things. And you've had people here at this meeting who are in acting positions.

But again just wanted to let you know. It's not an excuse but we will do better.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. I's not an excuse, but it's a reason. And there is a difference between the two of them, you know.

And I only have one question. Are a lot of your vacancies because they got old enough to retire.

MR. KRON: Our deputy assistant regional director, the chief of staff, she took early retirement. And, again, she left right over the holidays, and they're recruiting for that position right now. So some of them are; others are because people have moved on to other jobs. So a variety of different reasons.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. I think about that, because I think of how many of them I've known and worked with for 20 years, and then I talk to a lot of the Council members, and I find out that they're also in the age that they're thinking of retiring, if you can retire from a voluntary position.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And I think that's -- I think we're going to get younger people involved in it one way or the other.

Thank you.

MR. KRON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Council members. My name is Jeff Anderson. I'm the field supervisor for the Kenai Fish and Wildlife field office in Soldotna, and I'm also the Federal in-season manager for Cook Inlet as well.

And I manage primarily a few different subsistence fisheries on the Kenai Peninsula, the sockeye fishery on the Kenai River and Kasilof River, are probably the two most heavily utilized ones. There are fisheries for other species as well, and those include Chinook salmon, and that's, you know, the primary reason I'm speaking to you today as a group.

Last year was another poor return for Chinook salmon on the Kenai River. The State of Alaska closed fisheries with emergency orders, and I actually followed with special actions to close the Chinook fisheries on the Kenai River as well on Federal waters.

And this year the forecast for Chinook on the Kenai is also very poor for the early run. They're expecting, you know, half of what the lower end of the escapement goal is. So the State has gone ahead and issued emergency orders to close basically all fishing for Chinook salmon in the Kenai River for the month of June, and all fishing for Chinook salmon on Federal waters, which, you know, occur higher in the drainage throughout the entire season, so through the end of July.

They manage the run in two -- well,

they manage the fishery in two distinct runs, the early run and the late run. Right now the early run fishery is closed through emergency order. The late run fishery may or may not start on July 1st, depending on how the early run comes in.

And last year I was able to, you know, have time prior to issuing special actions to consult with, you know, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Encelewski, and also a couple other local groups. And, you know, this year there is plenty of time prior to any special action that I would issue, but, you know, it is warranted. It is a conservation concern, and I will likely be issuing a special action to close the subsistence fishery on the Kenai River as well,

So I'm here to take any questions or, you know, respond to that.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Greg.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: No, I just appreciate, Jeff, you coming down and talking to us. Jeff came and me with me earlier, and also I'm from the tribe, and we have a real goat rope and a serious situation on the Kenai, so if we don't have kings, that early run kings is gone, and the late run kings are definitely in peril. So, you know, if we have to take the hit, we take the hit. We just, as we talked about, the subsistence users are the ones to be last, we want to have that opportunity.

So, Jeff, you indicated that you would wait, and I'm hoping you'll wait, because I'm going to use these tags to get some fish from Copper River.

(Laughter)

MR. ANDERSON: And I guess just, you know, for the benefit of the Council, and it's likely a reminder for many of you, but, you know, as an in-season manager, I can only issue a special action that's valid for 60 days. So if the late run does happen to fall, you know, on its face again and not come through as necessary, and if there are actions that are required past that 60 days, it would require, you know, action through the Federal Subsistence Board to deal with that as well. I'm not going there yet.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: A question, to show my

ignorance. A question on that, if you issue a special action for 60 days, and that went into effect on the 1st of July l on the late run, you basically wouldn't have many kings coming after that action ran out, would you?

MR. ANDERSON: Correct, there would not be any new fish coming into the river, but the fishery is open until the end of September actually, and it would be right on top of where the fish are spawning is where the fishery occurs on the Federal waters.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Mary Ann.

MS. MILLS: Last year there was quite a few sockeyes in the Kenai River, so how are you going to deal with that issue. If there's too many, are you going to open up for subsistence for the sockeye, or is it going to just be closed for all fishing.

MR. ANDERSON: Member Mills, through the Chair. The fishery I manage for sockeye is actually up on primarily the Russian River, a dipnet fishery. And there's a rod and reel fishery in the upper river as well. And I do not manage the commercial or sport fisheries on the river, that's the Department of Fish and Game. Any special action I would issue would be for Chinook salmon specifically, and would not impact the sockeye fishery at all.

MS. MILLS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Greg.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, Jeff, I have one other question, and I want to kind of bring it to the attention of the Board here, and so they could hear it. But my question being, you know, you may have to use a special action to close the Federal waters for the second run up in the spawning areas of the Federal ground. My concern is that, you know, that second run for all the years, even through all the hype and all the problems, they have met their escapement goal, and they have allowed fishing below us. So I would like you to kind of explain why we would close Federal when they're still catching fish below us so to speak.

MR. ANDERSON: Uh-huh. Member Encelewski through the Chair. I would consider closing that if and only if the State didn't really have a

fishery for the late run in July.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: That's exactly what I wanted to hear on the record. Thank you very much.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Bill.

MR. SHUSTER: Yeah. What are you going to do with the trout fishermen who are out there catching trout, but also catching kings accidently?

MR. ANDERSON: Member Shuster through the Chair. I think there probably is minimal incidental catch of Chinook salmon while people are trout fishing in sportfisheries. And again I think the Department considers that, you know, as a very minor, if any, mortality to Chinook salmon, but I don't want to speak for the Department on that. I have no authority as the Federal management to regulate really the trout fisheries for sportfishing.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bill, can I ask you a question?

MR. SHUSTER: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do you see it as a problem? Is there quite as -- I mean, as a person who lives there, so you see a lot of Chinook being hooked by trout fishermen?

MR. SHUSTER: Well, they are being caught. And when you shut down the king salmon, there's also the possibility people that want to catch kings, that's the way they can fish and get away with it. I know you don't -- can't regulate the trout fishing, but Fish and Game ought to be definitely looking into that, and as it becomes more and more constricted, the king salmon, that will be more and more a problem.

MR. ANDERSON: I concur.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The incentive will be there. Thank you, Bill.

Any other questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anything more to give us.

MR. ANDERSON: Yes, Mr. Chair, if it please the Council. I had a brief discussion with Ms. Hyer during one of the breaks, and I think it might be beneficial to the Council if I gave a presentation maybe at the fall meeting on projects that my office has completed that were funded through the Office of Subsistence Management's Partners -- or Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program. We have done quite a bit of work on coho salmon and steelhead when the fisheries were initially implemented on the Kenai Peninsula, and this might be good information for the fall meeting if you're interested.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We would be very interested.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Very good.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I mean, that would be -- it would be nice to get a report on, you know, the success or non-success of some of the programs that we've backed in the past.

MR. ANDERSON: And in addition to that, I could also speak to some the cooperative projects that my office is engaged with just with Chinook salmon monitoring on the Kenai as well. There is a lot of work being done that's not funded through OSM at this point.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And we definitely would be interested in that, too.

Greg.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I'd just like to make one last comment, Jeff. You know, we talked about consultation and all that other stuff, and I want to commend you, because I think you did an outstanding job, and I appreciate it. It's a change and it's welcome.

Thank you.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And I'll say the same thing. Thank you.

Okay. Donald.

MR. MIKE: BLM.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: BLM.

MS. BULLOCK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Council members. This is Sarah Bullock with the BLM in Glennallen.

And my handout is just kind of what it usually is. It's just our harvest status for moose and caribou. This year for moose, we saw a little less participation than our five-year average, with less bulls harvested and less hunter success, which I think kind of matches each other.

Yeah. Going on to the caribou harvest, if there's any questions over moose. You know, the caveat this year, we only had 23 percent hunt report feedback, because it is still open right now until March 31st. We still are offering the opportunity or you can still go out and shoot any caribou at this moment, and we expect that for the rest of the season. However, the harvest has been less this year than it is on the five-year average. And then, of course -- by around 129 animals less than the five-year average total.

So we think that's mostly due to, again, the herd corrections that happened this spring. And then also a lot of the animals kind of stayed out of the Federal area, so there wasn't a whole lot of opportunity for hunters to go out and participate in that hunt.

So last year you can see from the 2012 season it was quite a different story. We had over 500 animals harvested, and I think that reflects that 35,500 population estimate that they had.

Anyway what I'd like to mention on the last page is I know that it is out of cycle, because we're on the fish, but we would like you to recognize that there is a particular CFR within Unit 13 that affects caribou in Unit 13 for Federal subsistence hunters, and it basically says that you cannot hunt

within the pipeline corridor, you cannot shoot an animal on the corridor. This question was raised by a Federally-qualified hunter this year to one of our law enforcement rangers, because she -- they had seen State hunters out there, and they knew about this, and, like, why can't we do that? And they didn't have an answer for it, so they came back and asked me. And we agree that this might be a good proposal for the next session of wildlife regulations. But it is unique to all other GMUs for the Federal subsistence, and it does not exist in State regulations. So we just wanted to make you guys aware of that, and just kind of start thinking about it.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Now, if I'm understanding this correctly, you cannot take a caribou on the TAPS right-of-way in GMU Unit 13, but that is the only unit that you can't do that?

MS. BULLOCK: Yep. Yep, that is.....

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Under subsistence regulations.

MS. BULLOCK: Under subsistence and State. So it does not exist in any other subsistence GMUs along the TAPS, and it does not exist on the State regs at all.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And under State regs, you can take one on the TAPS right-of-way.

MS. BULLOCK: Yes. Yes. So during -- yeah.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So what we have here is we have a restriction on the TAPS right-of-way in GMU Unit 13 -- boy, my tongue isn't working right.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: GMU Unit 13 that restricts Federal subsistence hunters greater than any place else, and State hunters.

MS. BULLOCK: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, I think that's probably due for a proposal I would think.

MS. BULLOCK: Right. Yeah. I mean.....

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.

MS. STICKWAN: You said it's allowed under the State, but not allowed under Federal, is that right? I'm just trying to figure -- I'm confused here.

MS. BULLOCK: Okay. Yeah, from the State's perspective, there is no regulation that restricts State hunters from shooting caribou within the right-of-way of the pipeline. And according to this Federal regulation, it is CFR, Federal hunters cannot shoot within that pipeline corridor, which is defined as 25 feet on either side. It doesn't matter if it's above ground or below ground, you cannot shoot caribou on the pipeline.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, when I read this, does it indicate that the BLM is thinking of putting a proposal in or are you requesting a proposal from the public.

MS. BULLOCK: Yeah, it was the only kind of tweak I wanted to make to what I wrote down there. It says, you know, we seek to modify this, but, you know, we would like for a member of the public -- you know, it's more appropriate for one of the members -- a member of the public or a Council member to put a proposal in. WE just want to bring this to your attention, because it was brought to our attention, and we just want to simplify it, make it more fair and useful to subsistence users or, you know.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.

MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair. Thanks.

I really appreciate that you brought up this point, but I guess, and I think, I'm sure a proposal could be put together, but that's a long time out. That's two more years.

MS. BULLOCK: Yeah. Right.

MS. CAMINER: Is this not something that a special action might be good for.

MS. BULLOCK: Dan.

MR. SHARP: Through the Chair. Dan Sharp, Bureau of Land Management.

That regulation has been on the books for quite some time. It's not been on the bail schedule. No one's been cited under it. I don't see a sense of urgency, nor do I see that it would provide significant benefit. It's just one of those anomalous regulations. I'd view it primarily as a housekeeping to try to make it equal with at least the State regulations. Again, it hasn't been an issue. It's just one of these things that's lived on the books for a long time, and folks pointed it out, and we're trying to clean it up.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. I can think of some people who could have been in violation of that.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Greg.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: I was just going to comment, I don't think you'd be in violation, because it just says hunting. It doesn't say anything about shooting.

MS. BULLOCK: Right. At least perspective, yeah. Hunting is shooting an animal, and then it's -- but not necessarily.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think that you will have a proposal on this one before two years is up.

MS. BULLOCK: Okay. We just wanted to bring it to your attention.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: In fact, I can think of somebody who probably will write one.

MS. BULLOCK: Perfect.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I don't like being in violation.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Any other thing for us.

MS. BULLOCK: No, Mr. Chair. Unless anyone has any questions over any of the other harvest status or anything.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And your feeling is the same as mine, that the low caribou take was because caribou spent their winders over by Eureka and Lake Louise and Tolsona instead of up on the Denali and Paxson.

MS. BULLOCK: Yes, Mr. Chair. This year they seemed to kind of stick in the south area of 13B right around the Sourdough area, and then kind of as November moved on, they just kept continuing to go more south, and that became -- or they traveled basically out of our most southern, well, of the north areas, and we're not able -- or we didn't have an opportunity for Federal subsistence harvest, so -- and they're still there now.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's interesting, because back in the late 60s and 70s that's where they were all the time. I mean, it just -- that's where everybody went to go caribou hunting, down to Eureka, and out from there. So maybe it's a progression of the ecology, the food supply, or whatever. Or maybe they've gotten smart.

Thank you. Thank you muchly for the report. And thank you for the information.

MS. BULLOCK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bill.

MR. SHUSTER: Yeah. When we ran across those things with the State and the subsistence are different, do we take action on those, or just leave it for individuals to bring those.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We can take action, but like what wa pointed out, any action that we take now won't take effect for two years, so we have time to take action either as a Council -- and we can't take action. All we can do is put a proposal in. It still has to go through the whole. And so if an individual doesn't put a proposal in, we will put a proposal in.

MR. SHUSTER: Okay. Because it's kind of like on Kenai and moose.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Donald, what's our schedule right now. To make a decision as to where and when our next Council meeting is, or do we have another report.

MR. MIKE: That was the last of the agency reports, unless -- do we have anyone from the State, any reports from the State.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I asked (Indiscernible - away from microphones) our subsistence people (indiscernible).....

MR. MIKE: Right. Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: .....report (indiscernible) happen tomorrow.

MR. MIKE: Yeah, that's tomorrow. That's the joint, the State.

Mr. Chair, Mr. Encelewski has to leave, so he's already identified a preferred day for March.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I didn't catch the last part, Donald.

MR. MIKE: Our next meeting date for the winter meeting in March 2015. Mr. Encelewski has to leave, and he's got a proposal for a potential meeting date.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Greg.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah. Mr. Chairman. I would propose that we meet one week earlier this next year if possible, March 2nd through the 7th. I see it's open, and it doesn't conflict with other things I have at least at this time.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What does the rest of the Council think.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: That's the winter meeting.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: March 2nd through the

7th.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Or 3rd through 5th, it don't matter. That week.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Which one starts on Tuesday.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: 3rd.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The 3rd. Let's start it on Tuesday so we have Monday to travel. The 3rd through 5th.

Judy.

MS. CAMINER: (Mic not on)

MR. ENCELEWSKI: You do that to me every year. Every year. There seems to be a conflict. Is everyone good with the end of February, 17th through the 19th. Too early?

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's no problem for me.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: It's a good one.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What date.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: February 17th, 18th, and 19th. It's Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, of February.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: How does everybody feel about that one.

MS. MILLS: What date was that again?

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: 17th, 18th, and 19th of February.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do you have a problem with that one.

MS. CAMINER: I was just going to say it might be a Federal holiday on (indiscernible - mic not on).

(Microphones not on)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What day do we travel? Oh. I see what you mean. Be traveling on a holiday.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: We can make it the 18th, 19th, and 20th.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Let's make it 18th, 19th, and 20th, and that way they won't travel on a holiday.

MS. CAMINER: Maybe we won't need all three days and people won't have to travel the weekend.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Okay. 18th through the 20th. Does that sound okay to everybody. Anybody got a problem with it. Anything lined up.

(No comments)

MS. MILLS: Where are we going to meet.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We haven't decided that yet. But usually our spring meeting we are -- or winter meeting we usually end up having in Anchorage, because it's so much.....

MS. STICKWAN: Does anybody know when the Board of Game, Unit 13 meeting is.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What?

MS. STICKWAN: The Board of Game meeting for Unit 13, do anybody know when those dates are, 2015. I'm not sure what they are.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Does anybody know when the Board of Game meeting would be at that point in time.

MS. STICKWAN: It's going to cover Unit 13 next year, 2015.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I don't know. I don't think anybody's got the information. Nobody's got the information on that yet, do they. Or do you? There's somebody looking.

Okay. While we're at it, while we're discussing that, is it in agreement that our spring meeting should be held in Anchorage. Our February

meeting.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So we'll have it, the date that we decide will be in Anchorage. We've got the place.

Now Judy had liked to ask a little question on our fall meeting that we've already got scheduled.

MS. CAMINER: Greg, I was going to check with you and Mary Ann. We're going to be meeting somewhere in the Kenai/ Soldotna area I guess. And we're scheduled to start a Tuesday morning, October 14 and 15. I have a Monday night meeting here in Anchorage, and I wonder either if we could either move it by a day or even just start at mid morning or mid day or something like that. I didn't know how tight your schedules were for that week of the 14th. And again I think the 13th is a Federal holiday. So some people would have to travel on that Monday.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, it wouldn't matter to me I don't believe to move it over to the 16th. I've got a board on the 9th, but I think the 16th is clear.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Is there any problem with logistics you've already put in place, Donald.

MR. MIKE: No, I haven't made any logistical planning for that date, so it's still open.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think especially if Monday's a Federal holiday, I think it would be a good idea to move it back one day if it doesn't interfere with anybody else.

Did anybody come up with the Board of Game meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They don't have it posted up on their site yet.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. When the Board of Game meeting is in spring.

MS. KENNER: I have it in front of me,

and it's the Board of Fish.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Well, we don't need the Board of Fish. We need the Board of Game.

MS. KENNER: It's spring.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: In spring. Probably February 2014.

MS. CAMINER: '15.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: '15.

MS. KENNER: They do not have.....

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. They don't have it posted at this time. But that gives us a tentative schedule, and that can be adjusted at our fall meeting if we have to. So we will meet either in Soldotna or Kenai, was that what it was?

MR. ENCELEWSKI: I think that's what (indiscernible - microphone off) Soldotna/Kenai.

MS. CAMINER: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, because I've got Kenai.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Kasilof (indiscernible)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think we should meet on rafts going down the Kenai River.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And we'll have a nice short meeting.

MS. CAMINER: Southcentral region 13 to 17 March.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. So that's -- we should be fine, don't you think.

MS. CAMINER: I think so, for February, but we were talking about February.....

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, this is March right here, so if it's going to be in March, then we should be fine in February.

MS. CAMINER: This is Board of Game. Okay. Great. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Okay. Anything else.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Just what time do we meet in the morning.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, we're meeting at 8:00 o'clock tomorrow morning, joint session.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: 8:00 or 8:30?

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: 8:00. The other Council called for 8:00 o'clock and we didn't object.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We'll have both these rooms tomorrow.

MS. CAMINER: One. more.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Judy, one more question.

MS. CAMINER: Does anyone have wording from this morning's meeting of how Southeast might have changed or might have recommended on customary and traditional use on their policy? I mean, if there's anyway we can get a copy of that, it would be helpful for people to look at tonight.

MR. KRON: I have a copy of what they did, but I think they wanted to transmit that to you. They were still working on it, so I would be hesitant to give you the marked-up copy that I have.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: They were planning on meeting this evening yet if I remember right. So we need to kind of get out of here so they can meet, too. We're not going to adjourn, we're going to recess. So if there is nothing further we have to have on the

agenda for today, I'd like to recess this meeting until tomorrow morning 8:00 o'clock. And if something comes up that we as a Council need to deal with, we will deal with it after the joint session. And with that, if it's agreeable to everybody, the consensus is the meeting is recessed. I'm recessing the meeting right now.

(Off record)

(PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
)ss.
STATE OF ALASKA)

I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public, State of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 60 through 179 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of SOUTHCENTRAL FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME II taken electronically by Computer Matrix Court Reporters on the 12th day of March 2014 in Anchorage, Alaska;

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

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

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 10th day of April 2014.

_____
Salena A. Hile
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My Commission Expires: 9/16/14