

1 SOUTHCENTRAL FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

3
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5
6
7 Cordova, Alaska
8 October 19, 2010
9 8:30 o'clock a.m.

10
11
12 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

13
14 Ralph Lohse, Chairman
15 Doug Blossom
16 Judy Caminer
17 Tom Carpenter
18 Greg Encelewski
19 Ricky Gease
20 Robert Henrichs
21 Chuck Lamb
22 James Showalter
23 Gloria Stickwan
24 Tricia Waggoner

25
26
27
28 Regional Council Coordinator, Donald Mike
29 KJ Mushovic

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Recorded and transcribed by:
45
46 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
47 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2
48 Anchorage, AK 99501
49 907-243-0668
50 sahile@gci.net

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

2
3 (Cordova, Alaska - 10/19/2010)

4
5 (On record)

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'd like to call this October
8 meeting of Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional
9 Advisory Council in session.

10
11 At this point we'll have a roll call and
12 establish a quorum.

13
14 Donald Mike.

15
16 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Roll call for
17 the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council.

18
19 Mr. Robert Henrichs.

20
21 MR. HENRICHS: Here.

22
23 MR. MIKE: Mr. Ricky Gease.

24
25 MR. GEASE: Here.

26
27 MR. MIKE: Mr. Doug Blossom.

28
29 MR. BLOSSOM: Here.

30
31 MR. MIKE: Mr. Greg Encelewski.

32
33 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Here.

34
35 MR. MIKE: Ms. Tricia Waggoner.

36
37 MS. WAGGONER: Here.

38
39 MR. MIKE: Ms. Judy Caminer.

40
41 MS. CAMINER: Here.

42
43 MR. MIKE: Mr. John Lamb.

44
45 MR. LAMB: Here.

46
47 MR. MIKE: Ms. Gloria Stickwan.

48
49 MS. STICKWAN: Here.

50

1 MR. MIKE: Mr. Donald Kompkoff.
2
3 (No response)
4
5 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair. Mr. Kompkoff couldn't make
6 this meeting, he had a prior commitment dealing with his
7 Native Corporation's meetings.
8
9 Mr. James Showalter.
10
11 MR. SHOWALTER: Here.
12
13 MR. MIKE: Mr. Ralph Lohse.
14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Here.
16
17 MR. MIKE: Mr. Tom Carpenter.
18
19 MR. CARPENTER: Here.
20
21 MR. MIKE: Mr. Fred Elvsaas.
22
23 (No response)
24
25 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair. Mr. Elvsaas couldn't make
26 this meeting. He had some -- he couldn't travel due to
27 medical reasons.
28
29 Mr. Chairman. You have 11 members present. You
30 have a quorum.
31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. At this time I'd
33 like to -- Mr. Henrichs.
34
35 MR. HENRICHS: Mr. Chairman. Due to the AFN
36 convention going on and the flights being booked, I have
37 meetings in Fairbanks tomorrow and the only way I'm going
38 to be able to make them is to catch that 1:00 o'clock jet
39 out of here today.
40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'm sure we can excuse you then.
42
43 Okay. With that I would like to welcome
44 everybody. I think this is the first time I've seen more
45 people from the Council than from staff and everything
46 else. So but it's goods to see everybody that's here,
47 it's good to see all the Council members.
48
49 And with that we're going to go on with our
50 meeting. The first thing we have on the agenda is to

1 review and adopt the agenda that's sitting in front of
2 us. If anybody has any additions or changes or
3 corrections they'd like to put on the agenda, now's the
4 time to do it.

5
6 Mr. Henrichs.

7
8 MR. HENRICHS: Yeah, there's something I'd like
9 to add to it. And Tom may be able to help us out on
10 this. The Feds are raising hell on the traditional
11 handicrafts and they're -- tried to change the Natural
12 Blood Quantum that people can, you know, do things with
13 furs and stuff and what they're trying to do is a lot of
14 our younger kids they're not quarter blood so they're
15 trying to tell them they can't do it and sell them
16 anymore. So we'd like that to be on the agenda at some
17 point.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With the agreement of the
20 rest of the Council, we'll just stick that on the agenda.
21 Let's put that by other business then. Well, wait a
22 second, Mr. Henrichs might not be here at that point in
23 time so let's put it before agency reports if that's okay
24 with everybody.

25
26 Any comment on that.

27
28 (No comments)

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If we have no objection we'll
31 put it right before agency reports, between 10 -- between
32 11 and 12. At least we can get a report on what's
33 happening in that area.

34
35 Judy.

36
37 MS. CAMINER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Because we
38 now have at least a tentative agenda for the next Federal
39 Subsistence Board meeting and that includes information
40 from the review that the Department has been doing, I
41 wondered if we could put on our agenda some of those
42 agenda items that may be on the Board's meeting so that
43 when you're there, Mr. Chair, you'll have some of the
44 feedback from this Council as part of your comments. And
45 those topics might include rural determinations and
46 customary and traditional determination policy, the
47 program review itself and the MOU with the State of
48 Alaska. And we have a copy of that here that was at the
49 back table.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy, how about if we put that
2 right after the handicraft thing, before the agency
3 reports. That way Mr. Henrichs will be here and most
4 everybody else will be here at that point in time.

5
6 If that's agreement with the rest of -- we'll
7 visit the report for the re-visitation on the -- what do
8 we actually call it, Judy, it's.....

9
10 MS. CAMINER: The subsistence review.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Subsistence review. We'll visit
13 that after the handicrafts.

14
15 And thank you, it would be nice to have some
16 Council comments to take back when I go to the meeting.
17 And I am planning on going to the meeting.

18
19 Okay. Any other. Mr. Gease.

20
21 MR. GEASE: Yes. I'd just like to bring to the
22 attention of the Council, I'm not sure if we need to talk
23 about it, but it would be helpful to give some feedback
24 to the Council members from the Kenai Peninsula who might
25 go to the public meetings, the US Forest Service, the
26 Chugach Ranger District is holding public meetings this
27 winter on the Russian River area and there's a whole
28 suite of proposals for public review which includes --
29 the concern is bear/human interactions on the Russian
30 River and some of the -- in the planning document there's
31 a whole suite of proposals that include draconian
32 restrictions including the closure of the subsistence
33 fishery at the Russian River falls, including the closure
34 of the Russian River trail, including the closure of
35 sport fishing areas, including the closure of when people
36 can be on the Russian River itself.

37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have information -- does
39 the Forest Service have information on that?

40
41 MR. GEASE: The planning document, I thought I'd
42 forwarded it on to Donald, but.....

43
44 MR. MIKE: Yeah, that's.....

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Could you kind of lead us
47 in a review of that when the time comes.....

48
49 MR. GEASE: Sure.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: because I haven't heard --
2 I hadn't anything on that.
3
4 MR. GEASE: Okay.
5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Okay. So we'll put that
7 after the subsistence review, before agency reports.
8 Okay. Russian River. That sounds like -- anyhow.
9
10 Mike.
11
12 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The item that
13 Mr. Gease was talking about he emailed me that
14 information and I believe I forwarded it on to most of
15 the members here and I might have mailed some copies, I
16 don't know if I -- if -- I mailed some copies, so you did
17 or did not receive it, but I'm pretty certain I forwarded
18 the email from Ricky Gease. If not it's -- I apologize,
19 I meant to include it in the packet, but it slipped my
20 mind.
21
22 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Henrichs.
25
26 MR. HENRICHS: Yeah, I don't know whether we want
27 to comment on it or not, but after that big speel that
28 the Secretary of Interior gave us last year how they were
29 going to change the subsistence stuff and then I was kind
30 of shocked when they made the Co-Chair of AFN the Chair
31 of the Subsistence Board when I know there are a lot of
32 people that have been involved in this system that had
33 applied for that. That really shocked me. It's almost
34 like they think AFN represents the Tribes.
35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Well, that might be -- I
37 -- perhaps subsistence review on our agenda, that might
38 be something that you can bring up at that time, Mr.
39 Henrichs.
40
41 MR. HENRICHS: Sure.
42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Chuck.
44
45 MR. LAMB: Yeah, I'd like to -- I think it's
46 something you guys went over last spring when you met
47 with the Secretary, but -- about predator control. I'd
48 like to see the -- all the Advisory Councils maybe to get
49 together and petition the Secretaries and see if they can
50 get a comprehensive predator control program that will

1 align with the State and they'll work with them. There's
2 a lot of -- like Kenai Peninsula, that's almost all
3 Federal land down there, a lot of it, up around Wrangell-
4 St. Elias, McKinley Park, and there's -- you know, it --
5 they need to get something that'll -- really there's a
6 lot of ungual populations up here and there's some things
7 that got to be taken care of and I think predator's one,
8 is a major issue with it., I thought it was all Federal
9 land around it they need to get something though we're
10 losing a lot of ungulate population and predator is a
11 major issue with it. And I'd like to see something to
12 kind of work together with it, kind of get the politics
13 out and just get it done.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Shall we put that on our agenda
16 and just -- we can put that too then. We'll put that
17 right after the Russian River one.

18

19 (Council nods affirmatively)

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That gives us -- okay. Okay.
22 If that's agreeable to everybody.

23

24 Judy.

25

26 MS. CAMINER: One more possible item if we want
27 to in that the proposals to the Board of Fisheries are
28 now out for upper and lower Cook Inlet and some of those
29 may affect subsistence uses so I didn't know if we wanted
30 to go through some of those and perhaps decide whether
31 this Council wanted to make comments or not.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We can put that on there then.
34 We will look at that. So.....

35

36 MR. BLOSSOM: Which are they?

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Which -- are there any that --
39 are there any that any of the Council members that are
40 here have a concern about from the area that they apply
41 to?

42

43 Ricky.

44

45 MR. GEASE: There's over 200 proposals for both
46 lower Cook Inlet and upper Cook Inlet. I don't believe
47 there's any that would really influence the subsistence
48 fisheries on the Kenai Peninsula.....

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

1 MR. GEASE:or -- the only ones -- they
2 wouldn't affect -- they're a stock of concern for king
3 salmon in the Northern District which would potentially
4 affect the State subsistence fisheries in Tyonek, but
5 they don't affect Federal subsistence fisheries.
6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Judy.
8
9 MS. CAMINER: There are a couple that if
10 implemented would, for example, make State regs more
11 liberal than Federal, you know, or vice versa, and one or
12 two that change net size. And so -- and there's probably
13 only about 20 maybe that would have a potential affect
14 and not to necessarily go through each one, but maybe
15 just to highlight couple concerns.
16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Does everybody have the State
18 book, I don't -- didn't bring my State book along, but
19 it's possible what we could do is over lunch hour as a
20 Council take a look and see if there are any that you see
21 as -- especially you guys that live on the -- you know,
22 in the Cook Inlet area. I haven't followed what was
23 going on there at all, but if there are some that you
24 feel are of concern to the subsistence community that
25 would be a good time to bring it up after lunch.
26
27 Okay. We've got -- okay. Donald.
28
29 MS. MUSHOVIC: I also could give you guys a
30 heads-up on correspondence that will be coming from the
31 Eastern Interior Council, it's related to the Item G1A,
32 the Chisana Caribou Herd. And I could speak to that at
33 that point.
34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. And would you introduce
36 yourself to everybody so just in case somebody hasn't met
37 you.
38
39 MR. MIKE: My apologies, Mr. Chair. Kathleen
40 Mushovic is our newest employee at OSM and I'm the
41 coordinator, but she'll be taking over the Southcentral
42 Region as the coordinator and can introduce herself.
43
44 MS. MUSHOVIC: Yeah, I usually go by KJ and it's
45 real nice to meet you all.
46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Thank you. I'm sorry, I
48 should have done that on introductions and forgot.
49
50 Okay. So with that we've added some additions to

1 our agenda.

2

3 Mr. Henrichs.

4

5 MR HENRICHS: Yeah, I keep -- I hate to keep
6 dragging things out here, but one other thing that we
7 should be aware of is the fact that there are lawsuits
8 against National Marine Fisheries for failing to follow
9 the Magnuson-Stevens Act that has to do with sustainable
10 communities which Cordova is one. And according -- under
11 that Act they can't just wipe us out to give all the fish
12 to the subsistence or other people either, you know, so
13 I think that we need to be aware of that and I don't know
14 what's going to come of that, but there's guys in court
15 right now. So I don't know what's going to happen.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Have you got enough information
18 on it to give us a heads-up on what the different cases
19 are, Mr. Henrichs?

20

21 MR. HENRICHS: No, but one of the people who has
22 a lawsuit is in town and he'll be -- he'll probably show
23 up here. And it's getting real wild so.....

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Maybe if he shows up maybe we
26 can get a heads-up when the time.....

27

28 MR. HENRICHS: Well, I'll get him up here, don't
29 worry.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We can just -- we can --
32 if that time comes maybe we can give him a little bit of
33 on because that's one I haven't followed either.

34

35 MR. HENRICHS: All right.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So has anybody else -- have you,
38 Doug?

39

40 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are you aware of those?

41

42 MR. BLOSSOM: Like you said it's getting wild.

43

44 REPORTER: Doug. Doug.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It is getting wild?

47

48 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Doug said it's getting wild.

49

50 (Laughter)

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Well, in that case if we
2 get some information on it let's stick it in this section
3 right here.

4
5 Now we've got a lot of additions on our agenda,
6 are we going to -- are we going to make a motion to
7 approve the agenda as amended.

8
9 MR. ENCELEWSKI: I so move.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second.

12
13 MR. GEASE: Second.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and seconded
16 that we approve the agenda as amended. We've added the
17 handicrafts, the subsistence review, the Russian River,
18 predator control, the Board of Fish and possible on the
19 Magnuson Act.

20
21 Okay. All in favor signify by saying aye.

22
23 IN UNISON: Aye.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by saying
26 nay.

27
28 (No opposing votes)

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries.

31
32 Okay. Now we need to review and approve the
33 minutes. You find them on Page 4 if you've got the same
34 book that I've got.

35
36 A motion to accept the minutes is in order and
37 then we can go through them. Do I hear a movement of
38 motion.

39
40 Chuck.

41
42 MR. LAMB: I'll move.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We have a motion to approve the
45 minutes. Do I catch a second.

46
47 MR. BLOSSOM: Second.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. It's been moved and
50 seconded to approve the minutes. Discussion.

1 (No comments)
2
3 MR. CARPENTER: Question.
4
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Question's been called.
6
7 All in favor signify by saying aye.
8
9 IN UNISON: Aye.
10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by saying
12 nay.
13
14 (No opposing votes)
15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries.
17
18 Okay. What we have now is the Chair's report.
19 First I'll make it fairly short and fairly simple. One
20 of the things I'm going to tell you right off the bat is
21 that all of the proposals that we dealt with, the Board
22 pretty well followed our -- you know, deferred to us and
23 followed what we did even in a couple case where another
24 Council had an opposite viewpoint.
25
26 So if you take a look on Page 11 you'll see the
27 response that the Board made to the proposals that we
28 acted on and you'll see that they pretty well went along
29 with us, I was really happy -- I was real happy with how
30 the meeting went. And I was real happy with how the
31 Board responded to this Council's suggestions, I guess is
32 the word that we have to use for it since they're not
33 binding.
34
35 The Federal Subsistence Board's annual report
36 response, if you take a look at that on Page 25, that's
37 to the annual report that we had and again we -- the
38 Board was very -- I'll say very accepting to what we
39 suggested. They wouldn't guarantee us that they wouldn't
40 hold a season during -- they wouldn't hold a meeting
41 during moose hunting season which was logical, but that
42 was one of the things we asked for.
43
44 The agreed that we need to do -- we need to
45 maintain our Fisheries Monitoring Program, but like they
46 pointed out they have no control over the financing on
47 that. And there has been some cuts in the Federal
48 department.
49
50 The Russian River fishery has been successful,

1 that's why it's kind of interesting that the Russian
2 River is on the firing line right now because it turned
3 out to be a very good thing that worked out for the
4 subsistence users and I think for the fish too.

5
6 And the review of the Secretarial's -- the review
7 of the program we're going to go over later so I'll just
8 say that it's interesting that some of the suggestions
9 that we put in as a Council, and a lot of Councils didn't
10 put suggestions in, ended up being part of their
11 recommendations. And I think that just shows that, you
12 know, we need to be -- we need to stay involved with
13 stuff like that because of suggestions that came strictly
14 from this Council ended up being in this recommendation.

15
16 So with that, any questions.

17
18 (No comments)

19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You can find all of the
21 information between Page 11 and Page 28. And.....

22
23 Judy.

24
25 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair. One item at the May
26 meeting was a briefing on community hunts and I know
27 that's kind of ever changing, but I thought that was a
28 useful presentation and thought perhaps at our next
29 meeting that could be an agenda item if that would
30 working out timing wise.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Let's put that down as a
33 suggestion for the next meeting then.

34
35 I know that the State dropped their -- you know,
36 by emergency order due to a lawsuit, dropped their
37 community base caribou and moose hunt at least up in Unit
38 13. And I know that that's on the agenda for this fall
39 to find something to replace it. From what I had
40 understood from talking to community members up there it
41 was fairly successful and fairly well accepted. So it's
42 interesting -- it'll be interesting to see what the State
43 comes up with to replace it.

44
45 Mr. Henrichs.

46
47 MR. HENRICHS: Yeah, you know, Gloria could
48 probably give us a report because she was at that Board
49 of Game meeting and it was a very interesting meeting.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's funny, because I was just
2 going to ask her to because I thought -- because she also
3 dealt with the community hunt up there too.

4
5 Gloria, can you give a little.....
6

7 MS. STICKWAN: Well, they approved of a community
8 hunt for Unit 13. It's inaccurate, we had to comply with
9 the court regulations so anybody -- any community could
10 apply for a community hunt if they want to. And they
11 gave us our permit back, the State's going to be
12 administering the hunt this year, not AHTNA.

13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh.
15

16 MS. STICKWAN: And that's illegal to do that they
17 said in Court. So Fish and Game will administer it and
18 they'll have a community (ph) hunt as well and try and
19 hunt for other people. So we got a community hunt back
20 which was good.

21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, it seemed to be pretty
23 successful to me.

24
25 MS. STICKWAN: Yeah, we got a lot of moose last,
26 first time in a long time that I've seen so much for
27 people. We had a sharing at -- in the community and
28 there was like tables of meat that people could get. I
29 never seen that before in my life where people could get
30 meat, they just chose what they wanted and that was
31 because of the community hunt, sharing -- people hunting
32 and sharing their meat provided a lot of meat for the
33 community, first time in a long time I've seen -- never
34 seen that before, you know, like that.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Did the approved one that the
37 State, does it pretty much following the same guidelines?

38
39 MS. STICKWAN: We still have to work on the hunt
40 conditions, that wasn't worked on at the Board of Game
41 meeting. So we have to meet with Fish and Game staff and
42 work on the hunt conditions. So we're.....

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But still a step in the right
45 direction.

46
47 MS. STICKWAN: Yeah, it's -- bring that hunt back
48 and we think it'll pretty much be the same as last year.

49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Good.

1 MS. STICKWAN: I think it will be anyways, but
2 we'll see.

3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Good. Any questions. Mr.
5 Henrichs.

6
7 MR. HENRICHS: Yeah, was -- I just stopped in
8 there and the reaction of those Game Board members
9 actually shocked me because the Governor or the Attorney
10 General told them that they ought to lay off that, they
11 said who's the Attorney General, you know. And they
12 said, you know, if they don't like what we do they can
13 have this seat. And the guy that said that was Spraker
14 which shocked me because when (indiscernible) the
15 subsistence moose hunt down in the Kenai he went
16 ballistic and now he's drawn back of it. So it was a
17 pretty interesting meeting, pretty shocking actually.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Good. Any questions for Gloria.

20
21 (No comments)

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With that we will go on
24 to Council -- other Council members' reports. We've had
25 some other reports by Council members so far already, but
26 does any other Council member have something they'd like
27 to bring to attention or report on that they've got.

28
29 Tom.

30
31 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.
32 I'll just be brief because we are going to have a report
33 from the Forest Service a little later, we can get into
34 greater detail if necessary.

35
36 We have a -- the moose drawing, subsistence
37 drawing hunt here in Cordova and this year we had some
38 concerns by people in the community. A lot of people
39 were having a hard time finding moose this year and so
40 the Advisory Committee in town, we held a in-season
41 meeting, there were some in-season aerial surveys flown
42 that are completely unusual, that usually doesn't take
43 place. And the public showed up and we had the
44 Department of Fish and Game, US Forest Service, Native
45 Village of Eyak. And basically what we came down with,
46 we came to the conclusion that we were going to go
47 forward, proceed as the regulations stated this year and
48 basically the concern is the bull to cow ratio is fairly
49 low and most of the tags that are given out are bull
50 tags. So I think it's become a little bit easier now

1 that the leaves are fallen off the trees, people are
2 having a little bit easier time finding moose, but there
3 is still some concern about the bull to cow ratio. And
4 I think the concerns that people had in town were given
5 to both the Forest Service and the Department of Fish and
6 Game. So they understand people's concerns that they
7 want to have a pretty sustainable moose population here,
8 not only for hunting, but, you know, there's a lot of
9 people that enjoy viewing them and other things like
10 that.

11
12 So but anyway we can get into greater details
13 later, but I just thought since it was a subsistence hunt
14 that I'd bring it to the attention of the Council.

15
16 Thank you.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tom. Were there any
19 recommendations that came out of the meeting?

20
21 MR. CARPENTER: Well, there were several, you
22 know, one we encouraged the -- it's kind of a cooperative
23 management agreement between the State and the Forest
24 Service and, you know, when you have two different
25 managing bodies sometimes -- not necessarily in this
26 case, but sometimes the prescription for management is a
27 little different based on the type of biologist you are,
28 I guess, and some biologists are aggressive, some aren't.
29 And I think we have a little bit of a combination of both
30 of those, which is good, it's good to have a diverse
31 group of ideas when managing things.
32 But one is we wanted to see our bull to cow ratio come
33 back up to be a little bit more sustainable for the
34 future.

35
36 But the one topic that was discussed and it was
37 discussed at length was that this hunt actually goes
38 until the end of December for bulls, it closes on October
39 31st for the antlerless. One of the concerns was that
40 does the -- does the bull hunt need to go so late into
41 the year, especially when you're talking about if you
42 have a smaller population of animals and there are fewer
43 bulls to breed the amount of cows necessary for good
44 population recruitment, if you have a bad winter and the
45 bulls are breeding a lot more cows, is there undue stress
46 put on those bulls after the rut when the snow gets a
47 little deeper in regards to people hunting them, also
48 predation and things like that.

49
50 So one consideration was to possibly start or

1 have a proposal that would be submitted and I believe you
2 -- this council probably will see a proposal in the next
3 Board cycle that requests somewhat of a shorter season
4 due to some of the biological concerns in regards to
5 post-rut activity, in regards to some of the instances
6 of, you know, bad winters, predation and things like
7 that.

8

9 So that's about all I -- that was the main topic
10 after we discussed the -- you know, the general ideas.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Tom on that.

13

14 (No comments)

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tom. Okay. Any
17 other Council members.

18

19 Mr. Henrichs.

20

21 MR. HENRICHS: Yeah, that -- it's interesting to
22 note our moose herd here started with 24 orphan calves
23 that we've fed through the summer and turned them loose.
24 And since the -- we started that, we've taken over 4,600
25 moose from that herd. And back when we started it fuel
26 wasn't sky high so a moose is a huge thing for a family
27 here now. But we did have a fund raiser to put in a
28 fenced area for orphan calves and we raised \$12,000 with
29 a raffle. And both Jim Gitelson and myself spent \$1,000
30 on tickets and never won anything. But the guy that was
31 the most popular is the guy that won the sewing machine,
32 he got all kind of proposals. It -- but we've got the
33 corral down here and we're going to start putting it up
34 so it'll be ready for next year and we're going to start
35 getting some orphan moose calves down here to change the
36 genetics of the herd. And that's a good thing.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Have you got -- has -- have you
39 got it lined up with the State to get the calves?

40

41 MR. HENRICHS: Yeah, kind of, but a lot of it
42 depends on the Governor's election, but I can't see
43 anybody going against it.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

46

47 MR. HENRICHS: It's -- you know, the problem with
48 it, the whole deal is people in Anchorage think there's
49 moose all over the place. There's more moose in the
50 Anchorage area than there is in a lot of the rural areas,

1 you know. And we need to rebuild those herds in rural
2 areas and we can do it.

3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, I think your example of
5 the fact that, you know, it started with 24 calves here
6 and 4,600 moose have been taken and we're maintaining the
7 herd, our -- I think our goal is a little bit over 300 on
8 this side of the river plus you got to realize that all
9 of the moose that are in Bering River and Martin River
10 and even down the Teller way, that those are all moose
11 that came out of those 24 calves. And I don't know if
12 you're including those in the 4,600 that were taken, you
13 know, I think that's 4,600.....

14
15 MR. HENRICHS: I think, I mean -- yeah.

16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You think so. But, I mean, it's
18 interesting just how that little start and that was in
19 the '50s, right?

20
21 MR. HENRICHS: '49 through '59, I think.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: '49 through '59.

24
25 MR. HENRICHS: And I helped do it myself.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, I know.

28
29 (Laughter)

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I didn't call you by -- I didn't
32 call you by your nickname, did I.

33
34 (Laughter)

35
36 MR. HENRICHS: Well, one other thing to add is
37 that the Chamber of Commerce hired some Southeast seiners
38 when they were going to False Pass in the '30s, to bring
39 deer up and kick them overboard and that's how the deer
40 herd got started here and we have probably taken 100,000
41 deer off that herd. And then in the '70s we started our
42 own hatcheries and we've probably had a million fish come
43 back because of those hatcheries that we started. So we
44 didn't sit around waiting for god to take care of us, we
45 decided to shape our own destiny.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, I still think he had a lot
48 to do with it myself, but that's prejudice on my part.

49
50 Okay. With that any other Council member have a

1 report.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. And thank you, Mr.
6 Henrichs. With that Administrative business.

7

8 Donald Mike.

9

10 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. One other item,
11 Mr. Chair, you neglected to discuss was discussing the
12 2010 annual report topics. But it's up to the Council,
13 you can add it as you go as far as 2010 annual report
14 topics.

15

16 I handed out a pink folder for all the Council
17 members and there's some information in it that did not
18 make the book publication. But this morning the
19 Department of Fish and Game handed out a Summary Data for
20 State of Alaska Upper Copper and Susitna Area
21 Subsistence, Personal Use and Sport Fisheries. So it's
22 a handout that I gave this morning. And within the pink
23 folder there's a blue copy, it's -- the top page is the
24 Summary of the Decision of the Ninth Circuit Court of
25 Appeals for the Chistochina case. And these were --
26 Council members requested that the Council have this
27 information for their reference for this meeting. And
28 the smoke colored copy's a MOU and that's the latest MOU
29 that OSM has. And a member of the Council requested that
30 this Council have a copy for their reference. And a pink
31 copy is the latest from the Secretary, Pat Pourchot's
32 office, and it just summarizes the subsistence review.
33 And then finally there's a green copy, one of our
34 members, Judy Caminer, was able to attend a May Board
35 meeting and, Mr. Chair, you weren't able to -- unable to
36 make it so we sent in Judy, but it's a summary of her
37 report at the last May, 2010 meeting. So and that's just
38 for your information.

39

40 And, Mr. Chair, for the -- the nomination cycle's
41 been opened and we're taking applications right now for
42 Southcentral Regional Advisory Council. And members from
43 this Council, Ms. Tricia Waggoner, Mr. John Lamb, Ms.
44 Gloria Stickwan and Mr. Donald Kompkoff, your term
45 expires in 2011. So I have some applications in the back
46 so if you wish to reapply you can just send those in.

47

48 And that's all I have. And, Mr. Chair, this will
49 be my last coordinator with Southcentral Region and
50 Kathleen, KJ, Ms. Mushovic, will be taking over the duty.

1 So and I'll be assisting her today.

2

3 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Donald. I'd say --
6 and I don't mean that insulting to the person that's
7 following you, but I think we're going to -- we're going
8 to miss you, we've really enjoyed working with you, I
9 really enjoyed working with you. Wish you lots of
10 success with the Councils that you're going to be working
11 with and it's going to be different. So but we can still
12 call you up and bug you at your office, can't we?

13

14 MR. MIKE: Anytime, Mr. Chair. You have my
15 number, but.....

16

17 (Laughter)

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

20

21 MR. MIKE:I got assigned to the Western
22 Interior Region and the intensity hasn't changed so -- I
23 thought it would, but the intensity between Southcentral
24 and Western Interior, they're about even.

25

26 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. And I thank you for
29 bringing something else up. If we may at this time I'd
30 like to ask Judy if she could give us a little bit more
31 of a report on the May meeting, there's anything other
32 than what you wrote down that you think we should know.

33

34 MS. CAMINER: I think the main points -- well,
35 first as you mentioned that the Board was very much in
36 agreement, sometimes after a lot of discussion, with some
37 of our or most of our recommendations. And also
38 particularly the Chisana Caribou proposal and I guess
39 we'll hear more about that later in our meeting. That
40 was an example of a cross over or a proposal that
41 affected two regions. And one thing I thought came out
42 from the Board meeting, at least some of the discussions
43 was that, for example, if RACs are discussing proposals
44 that do affect a couple of regions that it would be fine
45 for a RAC member from that other region to attend or to
46 teleconference in to that meeting to be part of the
47 discussion and perhaps a lot of their discussion and some
48 of our discussions and some of the Board's discussion
49 could have been shortened if perhaps there had been some
50 of that early coordination. But I know sometimes it's

1 hard to know which ones might be those more controversial
2 ones. But that was real encouraging that there can be
3 this cross communication among the RACs.

4
5 And I think the other thing was that -- one thing
6 that was also clarified is that we could -- if an issue
7 came up quickly we could meet anytime sort of with proper
8 notice and one reason might be as we talking before if
9 there were actions perhaps that the Board of Fisheries or
10 Board of Game, we wanted to respond to quickly or perhaps
11 there'd be other circumstances ahead. I don't know,
12 really if it's the review or could be any sort of
13 circumstances, but just something to keep in mind that
14 that is a possibility.

15
16 And I mentioned the community hunts and that that
17 might be something we'd want to hear about as well.

18
19 I think that was it.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Judy.

22
23 (No comments)

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Judy, and I'm sure
26 glad you were available to go. It was -- let's just say
27 it's the wrong time when there's a salmon run on the
28 Copper River.

29
30 Donald.

31
32 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I forgot to
33 include that today we have a request to -- from Ninilchik
34 or -- Tribe wishing to call in and listen in on the
35 Ninilchik RFR and I believe they're on-line, but I'll
36 double check.

37
38 Mr. Sir. Thank you.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Gloria.

41
42 MS. STICKWAN: I just want to state what Judy
43 said that proposals that affect our areas we should be
44 able to at least teleconference someone especially for
45 the Chisana Herd and the Nabesna ORV issue. I think
46 someone from this Council should be able to
47 teleconference because those issues are important to us.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Gloria. Donald.

50

1 MR. MIKE: Good morning. Do we have anybody on-
2 line for the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council
3 meeting? I guess not, but the line's open for anybody to
4 call in.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So we'll -- if somebody
7 comes on-line we'll just stop what we're doing and listen
8 to them.

9
10 At this point in time we have public testimony.
11 Do we have anybody in the public who wishes to testify.

12
13 MS. GARDNER: Hello.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: There we've got somebody.

16
17 MR. MIKE: Who do we have on-line? Hello. Can
18 you hear us?

19
20 MS. GARDNER: Lesia Blizzard and Amber Garner are
21 on the line.

22
23 MR. MIKE: Okay. We're going through our agenda
24 and we'll be discussing the Fisheries Resource Monitoring
25 Program. And that's.....

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. If they'd wish to -- this
28 is public testimony time, if they wish to say something
29 at this time we'll -- and not wait around until we're on
30 the RFR, they're more than welcome to.....

31
32 MR. MIKE: Can you hear that, ma'am.

33
34 MS. GARDNER: Yeah, we can -- can you hear us?

35
36 MR. MIKE: Yeah, we can hear you.

37
38 MS. GARDNER: Okay. Lesia Blizzard and Amber
39 Gardner are on-line, but we're not going to testify,
40 we're just on-line to gather information.

41
42 MR. MIKE: Okay. Thank you.

43
44 MS. GARDNER: Thank you.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Okay. At this point
47 in time if there's no other further public testimony
48 we'll go on to our Fisheries Monitoring Program. And
49 you'll find the information on Page 29.

50

1 MR. FRIED: Good morning, Mr. Chairman. Members
2 of the Council. My name is Steve Fried, I'm a fishery
3 biologist with the Office of Subsistence Management. And
4 what I'd like to do this morning is to provide a brief
5 overview of the upcoming Fisheries Resource Monitoring
6 Program 2012 call for proposals and emphasize the
7 priority information needs.

8
9 Just a brief process overview, next month,
10 November, OSM is going to advertise the request for
11 proposals for 2012. And taking commitments for the
12 ongoing projects and assuming that we have stable funding
13 there should be about \$2.7 million available to fund new
14 projects.

15
16 The Monitoring Program is designed to provide
17 information needed for management of Federal subsistence
18 fisheries and a important part of the request for
19 proposals when we issue it is a list of priority
20 information needs that helps focus proposals on issues
21 and needs of the greatest concern in managing Federal
22 subsistence fisheries.

23
24 A draft of the priority information is being
25 provided to all the Regional Advisory Councils and in
26 your books it's on Pages 29 to 34. And this is just a
27 draft document at this point, it was developed by OSM,
28 Fish and Wildlife and Forest Service staff, it's been
29 reviewed by the Technical Review Committee and that
30 included Department of Fish and Game representatives on
31 the Federal Review Committee. And in developing the
32 draft we've all drawn upon any existing strategic plans,
33 previous identified priorities, any sorts of issues and
34 information needs identified by the in-season managers.
35 And we've all -- this has been done in the context of
36 projects that have already been completed or are still
37 being conducted and there are a few projects that are
38 still ongoing. I believe there's three -- there's four
39 in Southcentral including the Copper River Chinook
40 assessment, the mark/recapture program there, there's
41 some sockeye assessments on the upper Copper on Tanada
42 Creek and Long Lake and there's also a harvest monitoring
43 project also on the Copper River being done to take a
44 look at I think the accuracy of harvest reporting in the
45 fishwheels, subsistence fisheries.

46
47 Right now we're looking for Council input into
48 the process to ensure that items identified in the draft
49 in your book are truly priorities and that other
50 important information needs have not been left off the

1 list. And as I mentioned before, probably about in the
2 middle of next month, the request for proposals for 2012
3 will go out and will include a list of these priority
4 needs. And the resulting proposals will be reviewed by
5 the Technical Review Committee, they'll make a decision
6 on which ones should be submitted as full investigation
7 plans and at that point a draft of the monitoring plan
8 will be compiled for review by all the Councils and that
9 will occur this fall, the fall of 2011. The Federal
10 Subsistence Board will review the draft plan probably in
11 January, 2012 and the funded projects will begin by
12 April, 2012.

13

14 So for Southcentral Region as I mentioned there
15 are four projects that are already going on so those are
16 already funded through 2013 or 2012 so they're not
17 included in the priority information list that you have
18 in your book. And as I mentioned there's the three stock
19 status and trends projects in the Copper River and the
20 harvest monitoring project in the Copper River.

21

22 For Southcentral the 2012 request for proposals
23 at this point is focused on only one priority information
24 need if you look at Page 34 and it concerns harvest
25 monitoring. And it's the historical and current
26 subsistence use areas for harvest of salmon and non-
27 salmon species by residents of Ninilchik, Hope and Cooper
28 Landing. And research should include intensity of use
29 and use on Federal public lands and waters. And so far
30 that's the only information need that's on it right now.

31

32

33 There's also a Multi-Regional set of information
34 needs and for 2012 it's focused on three priority
35 information needs that concern climate change, customary
36 trade, harvest monitoring and traditional knowledge. You
37 can also see these on Page 34. And as I mentioned before
38 the purpose of these needs is to focus the request for
39 proposals and right now there was general consensus among
40 at least the agency staff that there's kind of a shortage
41 of harvest monitoring and traditional knowledge proposals
42 that are being submitted and so that's why we tried to
43 focus the 2012 call on a lot of the areas on trying to
44 get more of the proposals in. We haven't had trouble
45 getting stock assessment proposals, but they've been --
46 the stock assessment's sort of been -- has overshadowed
47 the harvest monitoring and traditional knowledge one. So
48 we're hoping that by focusing the call on that we'd be
49 able to get some more proposals, but I want to remind you
50 that any proposal received will actually be reviewed and

1 given full consideration for funding even if it's not on
2 the list. And each cycle, probably about 20 percent of
3 the proposals that are actually funded have addressed
4 needs that are outside the priority listing.

5
6 So just in closing I'd like to remind the Council
7 that approval of the draft priority information list
8 including any recommended modifications, should be looked
9 at as an action item for the meeting. And so I encourage
10 the Council to discuss the list, determine whether it
11 reflects your priorities and if you'd like to add some
12 items this is the time to do so.

13
14 So thank you for your time.

15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

17
18 MS. WAGGONER: In reading through some of these
19 other proposals that were in front of the Federal Board,
20 there's another community, Sunrise, that the residents
21 asked to be added for C&T and caribou and moose, does
22 that -- should that be included in your proposal for
23 fish?

24
25 MR. FRIED: No, we don't fund wildlife proposals
26 through this, there's a separate.....

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, I think she wasn't
29 asking.....

30
31 MR. FRIED: Oh, okay.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:for wildlife, she's saying
34 that we have another community that's like Ninilchik,
35 Hope and Cooper Landing that's seeking C&T for moose and
36 caribou so as a rural community they're also be qualified
37 for fish. So should they be added to this historical and
38 current subsistence use and just put Sunrise in there
39 along with Hope, Cooper Landing and Ninilchik.

40
41 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. You're more than
42 welcome to although I would add that in those analyses
43 that we do we sort of include -- we include that
44 community in the Hope designation, but if you want to
45 specifically include it, that -- that's your call.

46
47 MR. GEASE: Mr. Chairman. There's been some
48 ongoing discussion whether Moose Pass should remain
49 linked to Seward and it would be helpful to have
50 information on Moose Pass historical patterns both on

1 wildlife and fisheries.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Steve.

4

5 MR. ZEMKE: There was a funded community profile
6 data study for Seward and Moose Pas was included in that
7 and that was done I think in 2003. So there is data on
8 community uses of wildlife and fish for Moose Pass and
9 Seward from that period of time.

10

11 MR. GEASE: Thank you.

12

13 MS. STICKWAN: I have a question.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.

16

17 MS. STICKWAN: I was wondering if could projects
18 be put in for like capacity builders for village members
19 to learn about procedures for Board of Game and Board of
20 Fish, is that still a part of this educational part of it
21 that -- it's not a part of this anymore, it used to be
22 that you could put in educational projects?

23

24 MR. FRIED: Yeah, if I recall I think there were
25 things like the salmon camps and those sort of education
26 outreach activities that the Board decided they'd fund
27 from another source and not the Monitoring Program, but
28 capacity building is a very important part of all the
29 projects. So if there's something that would mesh with
30 some of the work to do that, then that would certainly be
31 fine to fund with the Monitoring Program.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, if I understood right the
34 Monitoring Program is setup strictly for informational
35 needs for subsistence resources and fish resources
36 basically. So to educate for taking part in governmental
37 things would be part of an informational need, but if
38 they had a monitoring program that they then had to
39 present, that would give capacity building and skill
40 building in dealing with those kind of institutions. But
41 I think it still has to be a informational gathering
42 process of some sort, either harvest or stock assessment
43 or something like that that they would have to start
44 from, wouldn't they?

45

46 MR. FRIED: Yeah, that's correct. I mean, the
47 other thing that might be of importance in this is that
48 there is a Partners for Fisheries Monitoring Program and
49 there is a partner in Eyak so that might be another way
50 to do some outreach through the Native Village of Eyak

1 and their partners program.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.

4

5 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair. And maybe Gloria has
6 some ideas on this, but if you're looking for more
7 community harvest data with all the AHTNA villages
8 there's probably some where that data is not as up-to-
9 date as we would like it, but I don't have a sense of the
10 priority for that or maybe Molly has some ideas too.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, Steve, I see that where our
13 priority basically is looking at the Kenai because of --
14 I would imagine because of the RFR and the other
15 conflicts we've had down there and the lack of
16 information that we've needed. Do we feel like we have
17 the information that we need for the Copper Basin, the
18 Susitna, the other areas where we have communities that
19 make use of subsistence resources, I mean, where the
20 priority -- we have only one priority here and it's
21 basically with the Kenai and we've kind of I'll say
22 neglected the Kenai in the past in favor of the immediate
23 in the Copper Basin. But our -- when we're looking for
24 use like this have we got the information from -- we've
25 got stock assessment and now we've got the harvest thing
26 that AHTNA's doing on the Copper, but do we have
27 community -- sufficient community use information that it
28 wouldn't hurt to put that on the priority too?

29

30 MR. FRIED: Well, maybe there's somebody from the
31 Anthropology Division in the audience that can answer.
32 I think we have fairly good information. One thing I'd
33 like to point out too is that we're actually doing a data
34 base, we've just finished it for Wi-Fi, it's for permits
35 but also to enter all the harvest information in it and
36 now we're turning to fisheries. Hopefully within the
37 next year we'll actually have access to data on the web,
38 both for us and for the public which will be very helpful
39 also.

40

41 DR. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. If you
42 remember in the very early days of the Fisheries
43 Monitoring Program in 2000 we funded a project on certain
44 Copper River communities and the use of Copper River
45 salmon and then subsequently we funded a project or a
46 project was funded to look at non-salmon species. That
47 was over -- that was about 10 years ago. So I think that
48 it's certainly -- if this Council wants to look ahead and
49 anticipate what -- kind of where some of the flashpoints
50 are with regard to fisheries resource use, be they salmon

1 or non-salmon species, and, you know, you can kind of
2 look ahead and say okay, where do we need updated data
3 because if you have a project like Mr. Zemke just
4 mentioned that we have a project from 2003, well, that's
5 one data point, but as we all know sometimes when you
6 only have one data point that's called into question when
7 the Federal Board is dealing with something, well, those
8 data are 10 years old or, you know, we need more recent
9 data. So I think it's -- this Council is pretty familiar
10 with where some of the potential flashpoints might be
11 with regard to subsistence resource use in your region
12 and if you feel like you might want some updated data for
13 a certain area, certain community, then I think it's
14 certainly within your call to request that that be added
15 to the call for proposals.

16

17 The other point I would make is that this is a
18 priority information need and as Dr. Fried said, it's
19 always within -- you know, proposals always come in that
20 don't necessarily address an information need, but are an
21 important information need for subsistence use. But
22 clearly with limited funding which unfortunately that's
23 the state we're in, we are trying to direct the call. So
24 if you only have one call you're going to -- or one issue
25 you're going to get proposals that address that one issue
26 probably, if you have a couple of issues then you're kind
27 of getting -- putting some more things out there. So I
28 guess I would encourage you to talk about areas where you
29 think more information might be needed and recognizing
30 the limitations of one year or even two years of harvest
31 data because things do change.

32

33 Mr. Chair.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

36

37 MS. WAGGONER: I would like to ask for one more
38 priority and that being getting reliable estimates of
39 Chinook on the Kenai because that's going to impact
40 subsistence use and allocation. And this year was
41 notoriously biased high, if you look on the State web
42 site for their Chinook counts. So if there's some way
43 for the Fisheries Program to work with the State and get
44 accurate escapement counts so that we have time enough to
45 protect subsistence resources.

46

47 MR. GEASE: Mr. Chair.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Gease.

50

1 MR. GEASE: On the -- just to give an update on
2 the sonar counters. On the Kenai River there's two types
3 of sonar counters that are used at mouths where the
4 Chinook are counted. There's a split beam sonar which is
5 an older technology and there's a DIDSON sonar. There's
6 been three generations of DIDSON sonars and they finally
7 have their final kind of configuration of two long range
8 DIDSON sonars, one on either bank. And on their testing
9 they do 20 minutes on one side, 20 minutes and then they
10 have a null time frame and then they make their counts
11 off that. The DIDSON seemed fairly accurate, what
12 they're doing now is doing split beam comparisons
13 between split beam and DIDSON and they're having some
14 issues with figuring out the reliability and the
15 precision between those two and what the differences are.
16 But the DIDSON counts if you call up Fish and Game are
17 much more reliable than the split beam counts even though
18 they still have the --use the split beam as the official
19 count, if you ask them for what the DIDSON counts are,
20 those are a better reflection of what's going on.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Ricky. I think we
23 found that out out here on the Copper too that it's a
24 much more accurate tool.

25

26 Gloria.

27

28 MS. STICKWAN: I think the Tanada project is
29 going to be up next year, I'm not sure. Somebody from
30 Wrangell probably could answer that question. But I'd
31 like to see that project continue, it's just -- I know
32 it's not up yet, but, you know, for thinking about the
33 future to get it going because it's an important -- it
34 tells us how many wild stock are going up -- all the way
35 up to Tanada Creek. And if -- I would like to see that
36 continue even though the project's not up yet, but just
37 keep that in mind that it needs to be funded.

38

39 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Who's going to fund it.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Steve. Oh.

42

43 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, Steve can answer it
44 then.

45

46 MR. FRIED: Yeah, the Tanada Creek weir is
47 already funded.

48

49 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's funded for three years?

50

1 MR. FRIED: Through 2012, I believe or.....
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Until 2012?
4
5 MR. FRIED: Yeah.
6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So.....
8
9 MS. STICKWAN: 2012 so.....
10
11 MR. FRIED: 2012 or 2013.
12
13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 2013.
14
15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: '13.
16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: 2013. So it would.....
18
19 MR. FRIED: '13. Yeah, so it.....
20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:it would come up in
22 our.....
23
24 MR. FRIED:it would 20 -- the next one, the
25 2014 call would be Tanada.
26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So it would come.....
28
29 MR. FRIED: That's why it's not there.
30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:it would come up in the
32 next series then.
33
34 MR. FRIED: That's correct.
35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So it's funded until the next
37 series. Okay.
38
39 MR. GEASE: Mr. Chair.
40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that's one of our stock
42 assessment programs that's been very successful and been
43 very helpful too.
44
45 Ricky.
46
47 MR. GEASE: Sure. One thing I would like to see
48 under the multi-regional priority information needs,
49 there's probably about 10 to 11 different Chinook salmon
50 regional long-term data bases. One of the issues we seem

1 to be having around the State is low Chinook salmon
2 returns which are most likely linked to ocean
3 productivity over long-term cycles. We really don't have
4 a statewide modeling program to incorporate ocean
5 productivity. For example, back in the '80s and '90s
6 there were a couple million Chinook returning statewide.
7 Currently now we have probably less than a million
8 statewide returning. When you have high ocean
9 productivity you tend to have larger numbers of fish
10 returning per river system, they're older fish, they're
11 larger fish. And then when we kind of wax and wane
12 between these ocean cycles like where we are now, we get
13 an earlier age class return because there's not a lot of
14 food in the ocean, they tend to be smaller fish. And it
15 would be nice even if it isn't funded here, if it's
16 listed here as a priority information need so then there
17 could be some coordination between the Federal agencies
18 and the State agencies to get a statewide Chinook model
19 going that would incorporate the long-term data sets that
20 we do have around the State. We tend to look at Chinook
21 returns as individualized to the system and then we look
22 at mesh structures or in-river fishing or in-river
23 habitat issues and we don't have a lot of information on
24 ocean productivity, how it relates to individual systems.

25
26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Ricky, do you think that would
28 go along with climate change information that -- and I
29 know we've been looking at -- here at Cordova been
30 looking at the ocean and things like that. And would
31 that be part of that ocean productivity that you're
32 talking about?

33

34 MR. GEASE: Well, there's climate change in --
35 just in terms of the ocean being a climate area, then
36 that's changing through time. That seems to be cycling
37 on a 20 year period of time of productivity, of maximum
38 productivity for Chinook salmon and minimum productivity.
39 Back in the '60s and '70s we had very low returns it
40 seems statewide and then also in Cook Inlet we had lots
41 of rivers that were closed to king salmon fishing. If
42 you go back to the 1940s there were lots of harvests in
43 the fishtraps and so there does seem to be these pulsing
44 of productivity in the ocean and we need to -- I think we
45 need to have a better understanding and grip on that.
46 And I think the long-term data sets can present some --
47 I think they go back to the early '70s and Southeast
48 Alaska I think is the longest data set that we have, but
49 match them up with these other river systems.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All right.

2

3 MS. STICKWAN: I just want to make sure that it
4 stays on as a priority is what I was trying to say, the
5 Tanada thing, you know, even though it's not up I just
6 want to make sure that it stays on as a priority even
7 after 2014 or '13, whatever it is, that it stays on our
8 list.

9

10 The other thing is, you know, has there been --
11 has there been studies on glaciers melting, I mean,
12 there's -- in our area there's glacier melting and it
13 affects our fishing, high water and I would like to see
14 more studies done on that too, and help fix our river, I
15 mean, under climate change.

16

17 DR. WHEELER: To get to your first point, Gloria,
18 we -- the Tanada Creek project is funded through 2013, in
19 2014 we'll be doing the same routine again, coming before
20 you with priority information needs. So you -- that
21 project -- this Council will have an opportunity to add
22 that project to the list so that continued funding will
23 be ensured, budgets willing, of course. So there won't
24 be a lag between this call for proposals and the next
25 call for proposals in terms of your ability to add that
26 to your high priority list.

27

28 And then with regard to glacial melt, I guess
29 that would probably -- that's such a general -- glacial
30 melt and how it affects river systems and in turn
31 resources, it's a fairly general information need, but
32 that would probably fall within the -- any other projects
33 that come in, but we could certainly think about how it
34 could be refined a little bit. I mean, we -- what we
35 found through the history of the monitoring program is
36 that it's not real helpful to have real general issues or
37 information needs because you're sort of casting a really
38 broad net and it implies that we've got unlimited funding
39 to fund these sort of -- these needs. So we found that
40 it really helps to be as specific as possible. So if
41 there was a particular system that people were concerned
42 about or a particular resource in a particular system or
43 particular area, that would be more helpful.

44

45 Mr. Chair.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So basically what we're looking
48 at here is a priority, not saying that that indeed was
49 our priorities in the past or changes the priorities that
50 we already have, but this would be the priority for this

1 call for proposals and that's all.

2

3 MR. FRIED: That's correct.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It doesn't have any affect on
6 our other previous priorities or future priorities.

7

8 DR. WHEELER: That's correct, Mr. Chair. And
9 just to add, I mean, last time we did a call for
10 proposals in 2010 we had on the order of close to \$6
11 million, this time we're less than half of that, again
12 budgets willing, because this is all predicated on what
13 Congress gives us for a budget for 2012. So we -- we're
14 having -- by necessity we're having to be as specific as
15 possible because we just don't have the funding that we
16 used to. And it's helpful -- it's not really fair to
17 project investigators to put this broad call out there
18 because that kind of implies that we've got all this
19 money and we can fund stuff. So we found that it's
20 better to be specific because we are really limited in
21 terms of funding that we have.

22

23 Mr. Chair.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Steve, I think you
26 said that this was an action item on our part, that as a
27 Council we need to have a motion to either accept the
28 priority or add some priorities to it or change the
29 priority or anything on that order. So the first thing
30 that we need is a motion to put this on the table and
31 then from there we can have discussion, we can amend it,
32 add to it, subtract from it or whatever.

33

34 So I'll call for a motion at this point in time.
35 Motion to accept the priority that has been presented to
36 us by -- I guess you'd call it the Fisheries Resource
37 Monitoring staff, right, or what would this -- what would
38 it -- what would the proposal be for the Fisheries
39 Resource Monitoring Program for 2012 to accept what's on
40 -- what's on front of us right now.

41

42 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chair. I move we adopt the
43 priority information needs for the draft 2012 priority
44 information needs.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second.

47

48 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Second.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Now we can put it on the

1 table. So is there any discussion, does anybody see
2 things that need added to this or just any -- does this
3 look like a priority need for our Council.

4

5 Ricky.

6

7 MR. GEASE: I would like to -- the notion to do
8 a statewide Chinook salmon modeling program with ocean
9 productivity as it relates with climate change to stocks
10 across the State and linking and looking to see if
11 there's any relationships between long-term data bases
12 per river systems, watersheds, throughout the State.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Ricky.

15

16 Personally I sense Chinook salmon affects
17 subsistence users all over the State, I think that's a
18 very valid suggestion.

19

20 Do I hear a second to add that.

21

22 MR. HENRICHS: I'll second.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and seconded
25 that we add a priority to have a long-term data base on
26 Chinook salmon and ocean productivity statewide.

27

28 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Discussion. Judy.

31

32 MS. CAMINER: Oh, I wasn't sure if you wanted
33 more items added or you want to do one item at a time.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Let's do one item at a time.

36

37 Any discussion on that.

38

39 (No comments)

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question for that -- the
42 question's available for that amendment then.

43

44 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Call the question.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Ques -- we have the -- that's --
47 was that a motion?

48

49 MR. GEASE: Yes.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And we had a second on it. Okay.
2 So the question's been called.
3
4 All in favor signify by saying aye.
5
6 IN UNISON: Aye.
7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by saying
9 nay.
10
11 (No opposing votes)
12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. So we'll add
14 that to our -- to a priority need that we see.
15
16 Any other.
17
18 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair.
19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.
21
22 MS. CAMINER: I'd like to see a harvest
23 monitoring study for Moose Pass and selected Copper River
24 basin communities perhaps to be specifically decided upon
25 in consultation with Gloria and Park staff or Service
26 staff, et cetera.
27
28 MR. CARPENTER: Second.
29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So what we're really
31 looking at is we're looking at rural communities on the
32 Kenai and is Moose Pass a rural community, right?
33
34 MS. CAMINER: It is not a rural community.
35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's not a rural community. So
37 then would it even fit in the subsistence -- would it fit
38 within our scope if it's not a rural community.
39
40 Ricky.
41
42 MR. GEASE: Mr. Chair. The 2010 census is coming
43 up and I think it would be useful to have information on
44 Moose Pass specifically. There's been some changes in
45 Moose Pass in terms of the US Forest Service has moved
46 their headquarters out of Seward and into Moose Pass,
47 there's -- there could be changes in the linkage between
48 Moose Pass and Seward. And so I think it would be
49 worthwhile to have more.....
50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: At Moose Pass.
2
3 MR. GEASE:current information specifically
4 on Moose Pass.
5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Mr. Blossom.
7
8 MR. BLOSSOM: Yeah, Mr. Chair. I guess, Ricky,
9 I would question though why do we want to know until the
10 Federal Board decides it's a rural community, if it's not
11 a rural community why are we getting involved?
12
13 MR. GEASE: I think being proactive in terms of
14 something that's coming down the pike, it might be useful
15 information for the Federal Board to have and to have an
16 updated data set on that specific community. It's a
17 small community, I mean, it's 20 miles -- it's closer to
18 Cooper Landing than it is to Seward. And I think with
19 the Forest Service moving out of Seward, I think that was
20 a lot of the vehicle traffic that linked those two
21 communities together. That's no longer there and I think
22 there may be some changes on the configuration of Moose
23 Pass.
24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Is that a motion?
26
27 MS. CAMINER: That was a motion.
28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's a motion by Judy.
30
31 MR. CARPENTER: Second.
32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and seconded to
34 add Moose Pass and selected Copper basin communities to
35 our informational historical usage informational need.
36
37 And the Copper River communities will be in
38 consultation with Gloria as to which communities she
39 feels at this point in time have a lack of information.
40
41 MR. CARPENTER: Question.
42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Question's been called.
44
45 All in favor signify by saying aye.
46
47 IN UNISON: Aye.
48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Opposed signify by saying nay.
50

1 MR. BLOSSOM: Nay.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With that we have the
4 historical and current subsistence use areas for harvest
5 of salmon and non-salmon species by residents of
6 Ninilchik, Hope, Copper Landing, Moose Pass and selected
7 Copper basin communities, intensity of use and use on
8 Federal public lands and water.

9

10 And then we the long-term data base on Chinook
11 salmon and ocean productivity statewide.

12

13 Any other additions or changes somebody would
14 like to see.

15

16 MR. BLOSSOM: Yeah, Mr. Chair. I guess, you
17 know, we start taking these little rural communities,
18 you've got at least three Russian villages that don't
19 qualify for being rural right now. Are we going to look
20 at all those too, I mean, that's where I see this headed
21 is I can -- I can name half a dozen places on the
22 Peninsula that if we're going to start studying all
23 these, I mean, they're all as small as Moose Pass.

24

25 So that was my objection so I guess I'll leave it
26 at that.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Looking at it as a Pandora's
29 box. Okay. Hearing no further discussion, the question
30 on our amended 2012 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program
31 priority's in order.

32

33 MR. CARPENTER: Question.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question's been called.

36

37 All in favor signify by saying aye.

38

39 IN UNISON: Aye.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by saying
42 nay.

43

44 (No opposing votes)

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. Thank you,
47 Steve.

48

49 And with that we're going to go on to the
50 Ninilchik request for reconsideration, Ninilchik

1 customary and traditional use of all fish in the Kenai
2 River area. We'd like an update on that. And we'll
3 decide whether or not.....

4
5 Would you like a break?

6
7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Break time. We'll take
10 a 10 minute break, fill your coffee cups, unfill
11 your.....

12
13 (Off record)

14
15 (On record)

16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'd like to call this fall
18 meeting of the Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional
19 Advisory Council back into session from our recess. I
20 hope everybody had a chance to get a coffee and get rid
21 of a cup of coffee or whatever you needed to do. There's
22 good food back on the table back there courtesy of Native
23 Village of Eyak I'm pretty sure. And so they deserve our
24 thanks. They deserve our thanks for last night's dinner
25 too. So I'd like to express that thank you again to
26 them.

27
28 So with this we're going to go on to the
29 Ninilchik request for reconsideration and we're going to
30 have an informational presentation on it by Helen, right?
31

32 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It will
33 be what you want desire. I'm going to start out talking
34 about where we are and why we are where we are and if you
35 turn to Page 35 in your books there's an executive
36 summary of the request for reconsideration.

37
38 This reconsideration was submitted by the
39 Ninilchik Traditional Council and it requested that the
40 Federal Subsistence Board reconsider its decision that
41 they made January 14, 2009 on Proposal FP09-07. And that
42 proposal I'm sure all of you who were here then will
43 remember was a proposal requesting that Ninilchik be
44 added to the communities with a positive customary and
45 traditional use determination for all species of fish in
46 the Kenai River area. In the Ninilchik Traditional
47 Council's view the Board's interpretation of information,
48 applicable law or regulation was in error or contrary to
49 existing law.

50

1 The Board has in the past recognized Ninilchik's
2 -- Ninilchik residents' customary and traditional use of
3 all fish in the Kasilof drainage, but only salmon in the
4 Kenai River area. Proposal FP09-07 requests an expansion
5 of this -- that C&T to all fish in the Kenai River area.
6

7 The Board met in a public work session November
8 12th, 2009, almost a year ago and after much discussion
9 they voted to hear the issue again. They'll be meeting
10 November 9th and I did get confirmation from Polly
11 Wheeler this morning that it will be on the agenda
12 November 9th. Greg asked me this morning what day it
13 would be because the meeting is going November 9th and
14 10th in Anchorage in a public work session to take up
15 this RFR.
16

17 We don't have any new information on the
18 proposal, FP09-07, since it was last addressed by the
19 Board in January of 2009. And the information remains
20 unchanged. I did include in this executive summary, and
21 this is new -- not new information, but compiled in a
22 different way, a table with the history of the issue,
23 that's found on Page 37. And then if you turn to Page 38
24 in your books you can see the summary of the South
25 Central Council's recommendation to the Board on FP09-07.
26 And then on Page 40 -- you can also see the same summary
27 on Page 40, but there is the justification for the
28 Council's recommendation. And if I could just -- I'll
29 just comment on it that originally the staff
30 recommendation -- well, the staff recommendation stays at
31 -- is -- stands, continues to stand, but the staff
32 recommendation was to support the proposal and it was for
33 all fish. But this Council modified it to change that to
34 Dolly Varden, Arctic char, lake trout, rainbow and
35 steelhead trout. Their justification for that was that
36 there's documented use of fish in the Kenai River by
37 residents of Ninilchik. It is the nature of subsistence
38 to use what is harvested, harvest of resources is
39 opportunistic, often associated with other subsistence
40 activity. The Council recommended the customary and
41 traditional use determination by limited to freshwater
42 species that were historically harvested prior to 1952
43 when subsistence fishing was allowed.
44

45 What this is -- excludes by listing those species
46 is burbot, Arctic grayling and pike, but if that
47 recommendation does get supported by the Board in this
48 next review, it's not anticipated to have any real affect
49 on the -- Ninilchik's use of resident species in the
50 Kenai River area because there's no Federal open season

1 for burbot and Arctic grayling and no Federal regulations
2 for pike. There are no limits harvesting pike under
3 State regulations. So essentially if the Southcentral
4 Council recommendation stands and goes forward to the
5 Board and the Board adopts this, what we would end up
6 with is as it's displayed on Page 40, you'd have all fish
7 for Hope and Copper Landing residents and then you'd have
8 them by species for Ninilchik. But as I said essentially
9 there's no real difference because there are no Federal
10 seasons for burbot and Arctic grayling, the net affect is
11 the same.

12
13 So, Mr. Chair, at this point I think it's up to
14 the Council to decide, if you want me to I can go through
15 a summary of FPO9-07, this is the same information you
16 heard in the fall of 2008. I'm happy to do that, I can
17 give you a short summary. You can re-vote if you'd like
18 to support your recommendation, you can take it up and
19 have -- you know, maybe have a new recommendation, it's
20 up to you to decide how you want to proceed. So I'd like
21 to ask for guidance as to what you want me to present to
22 you, if anything at all.

23
24 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

25
26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Thank you, Helen.
27 And I'd just like to ask the Council because I'll be
28 going to the meeting what they would like me to take to
29 the meeting and if they think that we need to go through
30 the whole thing, that would be fine. If they just want
31 to make a motion to reaffirm our original decision and
32 they want me to take that to the meeting, that would be
33 fine. I'm like you, I'll leave it up to the Council what
34 they would like to hear or not hear or what they would
35 like to do on this proposal right here. We've -- as
36 you've mentioned before, we have heard it a number of
37 times, we've made a decision on it a number of times and
38 there is no new information. So I'll leave it up to the
39 Council.

40
41 Do we have any motions on the table or anything
42 to that order.

43
44 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to
45 make a motion to reaffirm our original stance on this,
46 we've taken it up many times, there's no new information
47 and I would make a motion to stand on that.

48
49 MR. CARPENTER: Second.
50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and seconded
2 that we reaffirm our original decision and that that's
3 what I take to the meeting.

4

5

6 Discussion. Judy.

7

8 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair. I guess -- I mean, one
9 new piece of information is how the Board discussed and
10 acted at this November meeting a year ago which probably
11 was after a meeting where you discussed the RFR. And
12 that does go to the question of the three species that
13 are not mentioned in this RAC's recommendations. And I
14 guess there was some discussion about it and looking at
15 the transcripts it appears that at least one of the
16 members mentioned how as Helen said this would be
17 different from the C&T for Cooper Landing and Hope and
18 that if the RAC which has said fishing is opportunistic
19 in the past, would that still not be true if a person
20 were fishing and came across burbot or some of the other
21 species that are not listed here. So that just might be
22 something we would want to discuss.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think, Judy, that if we go
25 back and look at the records we'll see that we did
26 discuss that in the past and we were looking at exactly
27 what Helen said is that this has no -- this has no impact
28 on opportunistic fishing on the Kenai River because we're
29 dealing with species that aren't there or that have
30 unlimited limits for lack of a better way of putting it.
31 But it -- I agree with you, it does look inconsistent
32 except we were dealing strictly with Ninilchik, the other
33 two were standing at that point in time. And that's one
34 of the reasons that we wanted to stress the fact that
35 we're dealing with what happened prior to 1952. And I
36 can remember we went over it quite a bit in discussions
37 that way.

38

39 So that's up to the -- the motion that's on the
40 table is to do it as it stands. If somebody would like
41 to amend that motion and thinks that it's more consistent
42 that can be done.

43

44 James.

45

46 MR. SHOWALTER: Yes, I got a question on this
47 proposed regulation. In here it says the community of
48 Ninilchik, does that include the rural area or just of
49 Ninilchik?

50

1 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: For this analysis we included
2 -- there are - I mean, there are boundaries that Fish and
3 Wildlife uses for Ninilchik and I'd have to go back and
4 look at that, but it does include Happy Valley as being
5 a part of Ninilchik. And those boundaries actually are
6 created by the census, they -- and every 10 years they
7 will modify the boundaries depending on where people
8 live. So it can change, it's sort of an interesting
9 process. But there is -- I want to say the tower. I
10 better not say without checking my notes first, but there
11 are some specific boundaries so that you know where
12 Ninilchik ends and it does include Happy Valley.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, James, I think this was a
15 proposal put in by the Traditional Council in Ninilchik
16 if I remember right, wasn't it, Greg?

17

18 MR. ENCELEWSKI: No, Mr. Chairman. Originally it
19 was put in by Steve Vannick and Fred Barr. Fred Barr has
20 passed on, it was originally put in by two residents from
21 Ninilchik and it wasn't by the Council.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. And it was for Ninilchik?

24

25 MR. ENCELEWSKI: That's correct. It's for the
26 whole Ninilchik rural area.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Does that answer your
29 question, James?

30

31 MR. SHOWALTER: Yes.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug.

34

35 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chair. Ralph, you might -- one
36 additional thing when you go to that meeting is this area
37 was given C&T and the right to fish for salmon. It
38 almost seems ridiculous that they wouldn't have caught
39 trout and other species that are always present when
40 salmon are present.

41

42 So that would be, you know, my thoughts on it.

43

44 MR. GEASE: Mr. Chair.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Gease.

47

48 MR. GEASE: Having been at the Federal
49 Subsistence meetings, there was issues in terms of the
50 C&T for salmon if I'm not mistaken was predicated on the

1 concept of fish stocks being harvested in Ninilchik were
2 traveling up into the Federal waters and the C&T finding
3 was not necessarily based on fishing in the Federal water
4 themselves, but fish trends are migrating. So if you
5 harvested stocks in Ninilchik those stocks were passing
6 through the area on their way up in and some of those
7 fish then were spawning in Federal water and that was
8 considered to be qualification for a C&T determination.
9 So even though it wasn't spatially harvested on Federal
10 lands, because those fish were migrating into Federal
11 waters I think the Federal Board considered that to be
12 enough of a harvest on Federal lands. When that came --
13 when the issue came to resident species, resident
14 species, the trout, Dolly Varden, were not migrating past
15 Ninilchik and there was a question of then would that
16 qualify. And I think that's where the rub of the issue
17 was for other species for the community of Ninilchik.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I remember that too, Ricky, and
20 I think that they -- that was one of the arguments that
21 was used against it, but at the same time what the
22 Council considered was the different -- the different,
23 I'll say verbal testimony we had of relatives, people in
24 the past, that went up into Tustumena Lake, upper Kenai
25 River trapping and on hunting, fishing trips and stuff
26 like that from Ninilchik. And that was what we were
27 basing ours on and I know that they were using the stock
28 thing as saying that that was their argument for salmon,
29 but that didn't apply to the trout. But I think ours was
30 more on -- you know, I don't know if you call it
31 anecdotal or verbal or what, but people from the area
32 that said that they'd actually knew people that went up
33 there and, you know, historically used them.

34
35 Doug.

36
37 MR. BLOSSOM: Yeah, Mr. Chair. Yeah, Ricky, we
38 had that brought before us the two times that it came up
39 and we rejected it both times as that wasn't pertinent
40 information. And all of our information that we gathered
41 in making our decision was on actual fishing in the
42 system.

43
44 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair. I mean, also recalling
45 there certainly was a lot of valid scientific
46 information, maps that were done, interviews that had
47 been done, people who did come forward both in writing
48 and with public testimony about that traditional use of
49 the Kenai River and all the -- of all the areas in the
50 Kenai River drainage.

1 MR. CARPENTER: Question.
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Question's been called on
4 supporting our original finding and for me to take that
5 in front of the Board. The question's been called.
6
7 All in favor signify by saying aye.
8
9 IN UNISON: Aye.
10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Opposed signify by saying nay.
12
13 (No opposing vote)
14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries.
16
17 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair. I guess one more
18 thought for the meeting itself, there's been this
19 question on whether deference is given to the RAC on C&T
20 issues and the official answer at this point in time is
21 that it is not. But I think you certainly would be on
22 firm ground to challenge why the recommendation of this
23 Council should not be accepted or respected or whatever
24 the -- I'm sure you'll find the right words, but does it
25 have to.....
26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Especially in light of the
28 information we got from the review, I think that -- I
29 think that that's one of the points that I will be
30 bringing up.
31
32 Mr. Henrichs.
33
34 MR. HENRICHS: Yeah, generally it seemed to me
35 like if there's no biological reason not to accept the
36 RAC's recommendation then they almost have to accept it.
37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, their original thoughts on
39 that is that applies only to taking, it doesn't -- the
40 regulations that apply to taking. It doesn't apply to
41 taking, it doesn't apply to C&T. But if we read the --
42 if we read the new review there's some indication that
43 that's been broadened. It doesn't say exactly how, it
44 doesn't say exactly what, but the -- from the review I
45 get the feeling that they feel that that deference needs
46 to be broadened to more than taking regulations. And
47 that's kind of -- that's kind of where we'll approach it
48 when the time comes.
49
50 Ricky.

1 MR. GEASE: One of the recommendations was that
2 direct the Federal Subsistence Board with RAC input to
3 review customary and traditional use determination
4 process to provide clear, fair and effective
5 determinations in accordance with Title VIII, goals and
6 provisions. It's unclear to me -- I think one of the
7 issues with Ninilchik that came up before the Board and
8 there was interesting conversations between Federal and
9 State, the use of surveys, life history surveys versus
10 annual surveys over a period of time. That issue came up
11 today whether we -- you know, if it's a one point survey
12 or whether there's kind of annual surveys which are
13 tracking through time. And the difference between --
14 when you have a life history survey does -- one of the
15 questions in my mind would be do you -- not every person
16 in that community during that period of time, people are
17 transient, they may at part of their lifetime be in a
18 different community, they may hunt and fish in an area,
19 does that -- although they're living in that community,
20 that time frame, does a life history qualify you if that
21 person moves into your community versus is it a
22 community's use, not the individual's use whether they're
23 in that community or not.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Uh-huh.

26
27 MR. GEASE: So those are issues that I think that
28 we can give some -- I think there needs to be more
29 clarification so that everybody understands exactly what
30 qualifies and what doesn't qualify.

31
32 MS. MUSHOVIC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Would you
33 want to consider checking in with our teleconference
34 participants to see if they still wanted to remain silent
35 or participate.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I sure would like to. We should
38 have done that before we voted.

39
40 Are you there?

41
42 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, they said they didn't
43 want to testify.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: They said they didn't want to
46 testify, they just wanted to listen.

47
48 MR. MIKE: Didn't you want anything to the -- for
49 the Council? Hello. Maggie.

50

1 MS. GARDNER: Hello.
2
3 MR. MIKE: Hello. Did you want to add something
4 for the Council?
5
6 MS. GARDNER: No, we're not going to testify,
7 we're here to gather information.
8
9 MR. MIKE: Okay.
10
11 MS. GARDNER: So we're having a really hard time
12 hearing what has been -- has there been a decision made?
13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, we made a decision to
15 reaffirm our original findings because we had no new
16 information. And our original findings were to include
17 Ninilchik -- let me see if I can -- would you like me to
18 read the whole thing to you or is it just enough to tell
19 you that we reaffirmed our original decisions?
20
21 MS. GARDNER: Yeah, that's probably all right.
22 I mean, you're going to tell us what was the result of
23 this meeting on-line or something?
24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes.
26
27 MS. GARDNER: Okay. Do you know when that will
28 occur?
29
30 DR. WHEELER: This is Polly Wheeler with the
31 Office of Subsistence Management. The Federal
32 Subsistence Board is meeting November 9th and 10th in
33 Anchorage. Ralph Lohse who's the Chair of the
34 Southcentral Regional Advisory Council will carry that --
35 the Council's recommendation to the Federal Subsistence
36 Board. In addition we do transcripts of all of these
37 Regional Advisory Council meetings and they will be
38 available on the web in roughly two weeks, give or take.
39 So the tran.....
40
41 MS. GARDNER: Okay.
42
43 DR. WHEELER: Yeah, the full transcript will be
44 available and then -- and then after the November Federal
45 Subsistence Board meeting the full transcript of that
46 meeting will be available, even though it's a public work
47 session, we're still going to do a transcript because the
48 Board will be making a decision and that'll be available
49 too in roughly two weeks.
50

1 MS. GARDNER: Okay. Thank you.
2
3 DR. WHEELER: You're welcome.
4
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you for standing by
6 and.....
7
8 MS. GARDNER: Oh, you're welcome. I wish the --
9 the reception is not very good, we're having kind of a
10 hard time hearing you.
11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, maybe I wasn't talking
13 good enough into the mic, but we'll try to do better in
14 the future.
15
16 MS. GARDNER: Okay. Thanks.
17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Okay. With that
19 we're going to go on to some of the agenda items that we
20 added to our agenda. The first one is the handicrafts
21 and I see we have a handout here from the Alaska
22 Federation of Natives that deals with this.
23
24 Mr. Henrichs, you're -- you brought this up.
25 Have you -- would you like to lead the discussion or give
26 us some background on this discussion at this point in
27 time?
28
29 MR. HENRICHS: Yeah, no problem. I -- and this
30 is -- we actually -- our Tribe took the AFN resolution
31 and we actually changed it to where it says -- oh, it's
32 the second to the last whereas, we changed it because it
33 originally came from the Sea Otter Commission to continue
34 their subsistence traditions pertaining to marine mammal
35 harvest. And it was sea otter harvest. So and this is
36 just kind of informational so people know what's going on
37 there.
38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. If I understand right the
40 problem has been basically with about the fifth -- sixth
41 line down where it says in the CFRs Native means a
42 citizen of the United States who is a person of one-
43 fourth degree or more Alaskan Indian. And that's where
44 our problem is coming at this point in time is that a lot
45 of the younger generation aren't one-fourth any more. Am
46 I correct, Robert?
47
48 MR. HENRICHS: Yeah. And actually last night at
49 dinner Diane Rydel brought her five year old daughter to
50 the dinner and her five year old daughter is our youngest

1 skin sewer and she actually made a sea otter purse for
2 her mother. And under the new regulations she would be
3 barred from doing that and selling them, you know, like
4 -- which I didn't think was too good.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That would be under Federal
7 regulations?

8
9 MR. HENRICHS: Yeah.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now would she be barred from
12 making it or just -- I mean, could she make it as a gift
13 for her mother, could she -- could she make it or is it
14 illegal for her to possess and to make?

15
16 MR. HENRICHS: I believe she'd be barred from
17 selling them.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I saw a different shake of the
20 head right here. So.....

21
22 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. Keep in mind the Marine
23 Mammal Protection Act is different from ANILCA, but I did
24 used to be the executive director of the sea otter --
25 Alaska Sea Otter Commission before they took on stellar
26 sea lions and my understanding of the Marine Mammal
27 Protection Act and the implementing regulations are that
28 it's harvesting and it's making handicrafts, that the
29 blood quantum figures into the harvesting, but also the
30 making of handicraft even if it's for -- not for sale and
31 certainly if it is for sale. But one thought that I had
32 is that you might want to put this town as a topic for
33 your 2010 annual report just in terms of commenting on
34 the implementing regulations and that you would challenge
35 the Fish and Wildlife Service on the blood quantum and if
36 this -- you know, to protect and continue subsistence
37 uses they might want to consider.....

38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: For future generations, yeah.

40
41 DR. WHEELER:for future generations because
42 ultimately I suppose you could argue that -- I mean, if
43 you have the same regulation in the Lower 48 there's many
44 Tribal members that wouldn't qualify either. So just a
45 thought.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And as time goes on less will.

48
49 Mr. Henrichs.

50

1 MR. HENRICHS: Yeah, it was kind of strange
2 because a good friend of mine who has worked with sea
3 otters and seals and other marine mammals for years, he
4 sold many, many sea otters blankets and he'd done it for
5 years and then the Fish and Wildlife Service came to him
6 and said, you know, those sea otter blankets aren't
7 altered enough, you can't do that anymore.....

8
9 (Laughter)

10
11 MR. HENRICHS:which that really slowed him
12 down, right, yeah. So just it's weird how all of a
13 sudden these regulations are interpreted differently. So
14 but we're urging AFN to pass this and we'll be going at
15 it with the Feds.

16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, that's what I was
18 wondering, Mr. Henrichs, is because they still left that
19 same quarter in there and that's where the -- that's
20 where the issue comes. If this is AFN's, are they going
21 to address that issue that your -- that you brought up
22 which is line six down here, the fact it still says one-
23 quarter Native.

24
25 MR. HENRICHS: I believe they will address it.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You think so.

28
29 MR. HENRICHS: Yeah.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Gease, I saw you had
32 your.....

33
34 MR. GEASE: Yeah, this is just as a -- the State
35 of Alaska took this issue up with the Silver Hands
36 Program and they made the changes that are reflected
37 here. And so now with the Silver Hands Program it is any
38 lineal descendent of an enrolled member of the Alaska
39 Native Tribe.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any lineal descendent, there's
42 no blood quantum?

43
44 MR. GEASE: There's no blood quantum in the
45 Silver Hands Program. And so this change request for the
46 Federal regulations would actually come into compliance
47 with what the State does now.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Thank you. Greg.

50

1 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Mr. Chair. If I may, I think we
2 got Ninilchik on the phone or we had them on the phone
3 and I guess we could just tell them we're done with it,
4 but they kind of called after we got started here.
5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Ninilchik.
7
8 MR. MIKE: Can you hear us?
9
10 MR. I. ENCELEWSKI: This is Ivan with the -- from
11 the Ninilchik Tribe and apparently -- I guess we just
12 missed the discussion so.....
13
14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Good morning, Ivan.
15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, Ivan, what -- could we --
17 do you have some information for us or would you like us
18 to tell you what we did or what?
19
20 MR. I. ENCELEWSKI: Let me -- if you could just
21 brief us real quickly on what we did and we apologize,
22 we're -- we didn't know it would be pretty short.
23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Basically we reaffirmed
25 our original decision on it and we'll be supporting that
26 in front of the Board -- I'll be supporting that in front
27 of the Board on the 9th.
28
29 MR. I. ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Well, I guess that's
30 it then. Like I said we just called in and, of course,
31 we continue to support it and we thank the RAC again.
32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. We'll see you there.
34
35 MR. I. ENCELEWSKI: Okay.
36
37 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Thanks.
38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Okay. This
40 handicraft one was mostly information, I don't think
41 there's any action that we need to take on this unless a
42 Board member would like to make a proposal for an action
43 by our Council.
44
45 Ricky.
46
47 MR. GEASE: I'd make a proposal that we put this
48 on our 2010 report supporting this request.
49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. And that would be

1 supporting that any lineal descendant?

2

3 MR. GEASE: That's correct. If you look in -- it
4 -- now it be resolved that the delegates -- you know, we
5 can just say this RAC petition the Secretaries of
6 Interior and Commerce to change the definition of Alaska
7 Native under 50 CFR 18.3 and 50 CFR 216.3 to include
8 lineal Alaska Native descendants of those originally
9 enrolled in the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act and
10 Alaska Natives enrolled in Federally recognized Tribal
11 government.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

14

15 MR. HENRICHS: Second.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and seconded
18 that we include that statement in our annual report.

19

20 Any discussion.

21

22 (No comments)

23

24 MR. HENRICHS: Question.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Question's in order.

27

28 All in favor signify by saying aye.

29

30 IN UNISON: Aye.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by saying
33 nay.

34

35 (No opposing votes)

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries.

38

39 Okay. Then the next thing that we added to it
40 was our subsistence review. If you'd take a look, I
41 think you got the blue paper if I remember right.

42

43 MR. GEASE: Pink.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You're right, pink paper. Pink
46 paper. I saw Fleagle's name on that one so.....

47

48 (Laughter)

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And if we take a look on the --

1 oh, I guess it's the third -- fourth page -- let's see,
2 one, two, three, fifth page, the top of the fifth page we
3 see one that -- we see one that was our -- one of our
4 recommendations and one that we just discussed right now
5 which is to direct the fishery -- direct the Federal
6 Subsistence Board to expand deference to RAC
7 recommendations other than just taking decisions. And
8 this came out of the review.

9
10 Judy, have you got some things in this you would
11 like us to look at specifically? I went through it and
12 I didn't see anything that I would take difference to,
13 but I -- maybe there's somebody else on this Council has
14 some things that they would like to add to it or have us
15 put in our annual report for it. That would be a good
16 place to put it or for me to take to the Board meeting.

17
18 MS. WAGGONER: Back in -- just after 2000 we had
19 a focus group meeting that discussed definition
20 rural/non-rural and various members around the -- folks
21 around the State participated in this. Is there any --
22 is OSM going to redo that focus group with the new
23 census, does anybody know?

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I don't know. Okay.

26
27 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair or through the Chair.
28 Where you're at with the rural process right now is that
29 as you all know the 2010 census, the data has been
30 collected, now it's being analyzed, we expect to get the
31 data 2012. What our plan -- we take our direction for
32 how we deal with the rural issue from the Board, the
33 Board is meeting in November, we will be presenting a
34 history of kind of the rural issue from the inception of
35 the program in 1990 through the 2000 census, the method
36 -- methodological issues that we dealt with in the 2000
37 census and then where we -- where we ended up. Keep in
38 mind we ended up roughly 2007 so three years ago it
39 seemed sort of unbelievable that we're dealing with the
40 -- we'll be dealing with the issue again before too
41 awfully long. It's -- I don't know what the Board --
42 what direction the Board is going to propose to take at
43 this point in time.

44
45 Keep in mind it is a brand new Board, none of the
46 Board members have dealt with the rural issues. We have
47 a new Chair, we have the Park Service and Fish and
48 Wildlife Service are the two long-standing Board members
49 and I think they have two and three years respectively
50 under their belts. We have brand new BLM, brand new --

1 we don't have a BIA person yet, they're still searching
2 for a regional director and then Forest Service is brand
3 new as well. So and the Chair's new. So on -- I don't
4 expect we'll get a lot of direction. Not to -- and I'm
5 not being disrespectful here, I just think that it's sort
6 of complicated issue to wrap your arms around. I think
7 at the November meeting and probably meetings subsequent
8 to that, it's going to be a question of getting the Board
9 up to speed and letting them -- kind of getting them to
10 have an understanding of what the issues are. So in
11 terms of them providing direction if we're going to have
12 focus groups, what -- I can't speak to that right now.

13

14 MS. WAGGONER: Thank you.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I see that it was one of the
17 recommendations that came out of the review is that with
18 RAC input we would review rural determination. And but
19 it doesn't have a timeline on it.

20

21 DR. WHEELER: And it doesn't have details beyond
22 that. So as -- with all of these things the devil's in
23 the details so if we.....

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

26

27 DR. WHEELER:look at the presumptive
28 thresholds, if we look at methods, if we look at what
29 communities -- I mean, obviously RACs will be involved at
30 every step of the way, but the direction for how we're
31 going to tackle this issue again based on the 2010 census
32 data has not come and I don't expect that it'll be out
33 for another year. But again, we have a little bit of
34 time, but we have to be proactive as well. But we do
35 wait for the direction from the Board.

36

37 Mr. Chair.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But this also would be a time
40 for us as a RAC or as individual RAC members to do some
41 thinking as to what we see as problems with rural
42 determination and as how we as individuals would like to
43 bring to this RAC ideas that we can support as a RAC for
44 rural determination. And I think that that's something
45 -- like you said it's not going to happen this November,
46 but it's something for us to get ahead of the curve and
47 maybe put on our agenda for a little bit of input at our
48 next meeting and a little bit more input at the next
49 meeting after that as to what way we as a RAC would like
50 to see this go. And it -- that -- we wouldn't be out of

1 line to do that, would we, to put that on our agenda?

2

3 DR. WHEELER: Not at all, Mr. Chair. In fact, I
4 would go a step further and recommend that you put it,
5 again your -- consider putting it on your 2010 annual
6 report list of topics. That will give a heads-up, it'll
7 be sort of a reminder to everybody to be thinking about
8 it and a reminder to all of us that are involved in the
9 program that this RAC I'm sure among others, wants to be
10 involved in the process and the earlier the better. But
11 absolutely.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. So we could put a
14 reminder in our annual report that we will be taking this
15 up at our future RAC meetings whether we get direction
16 from them or not?

17

18 DR. WHEELER: And that you encourage the Board to
19 actively solicit ideas for a rural process from the
20 Regional Advisory Council members and to keep the Council
21 members informed throughout the process. Not to put
22 words in your mouth, but something like that.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, but that's what I was
25 thinking is basically something on that order.

26

27 Does that answer -- does that suit the rest -- I
28 mean, just to get a consensus on that, does that suit the
29 rest of the Council.

30

31 (Council nods affirmatively)

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We will put it on the agenda for
34 our next meeting and then we'll probably put it on the
35 agenda for the meeting after that, but everybody do some
36 thinking as to where you see problems with the rural
37 determination or which direction you'd like to see the
38 rural determination go. And then we can have a broad
39 discussion on it in our next meeting and then set
40 something up for the meeting after that to actually take
41 up some issues.

42

43 Judy.

44

45 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair. On the rural
46 determination since I have had a chance to think about it
47 a little bit, if I can just bring up three quick points
48 that I think could be perhaps considered. One might be
49 the linking of where -- what school district kids go to.
50 Another one would be there is normal population growth,

1 I mean, that just happens and since ANILCA passed every
2 community has had a natural population growth or perhaps
3 some have had declines. I think somehow that ought to be
4 factored into those seemingly threshold numbers, just
5 needs -- seems to me there needs to be some allowance for
6 that. And lastly I think I recall in one of the Senate
7 Committee reports when it was giving an example of
8 Ketchikan being a non-rural community, but and thinking
9 that the population level was a certain level and perhaps
10 that where we got the 7,000, 7,500, but I think the
11 population of Ketchikan, it had been brought up in some
12 of the meetings, was actually higher than that at that
13 time. So perhaps some more research into really what was
14 the population then, what is the population now might be
15 something to look into for that next cycle.
16 linking of what school district kids go to
17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, just the threshold -- the
19 whole idea of thresholds.

20
21 Helen.

22
23 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yeah, I just wanted to clarify
24 what Judy said since I did work on the Ketchikan for the
25 last rural is that in -- when that number -- Ketchikan
26 was described as being a non-rural place and they used
27 the number 7,000, that in actuality Greater Ketchikan was
28 around 11,000, but they were only looking at the
29 population of Ketchikan. And when we did the rural
30 determinations we looked at great -- the greater
31 communities as they were linked. So I think that's what
32 Judy's referring to. So that it wasn't that the
33 Ketchikan population was larger, but the Greater
34 Ketchikan population was.

35
36 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Helen.

39
40 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.

43
44 MS. CAMINER: Well, first thanks, Helen, for
45 refreshing my memory there, it was kind of -- was a
46 little hazy on that. But if we could maybe go down this
47 list just real quickly.....

48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's what I was think -- the
50 list of his recommendations.....

1 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:just the recommendations.
4 And also -- to me I think we should also go down the list
5 of things that they aren't able to address because it
6 takes Congressional action, just so that we have an
7 understanding of that.

8

9 Ricky.

10

11 MR. GEASE: Mr. Chair. Just one more comment on
12 the rural/non-rural determination. I'd like to just see
13 a matrix so that each community in Alaska is judged by
14 the same standard so that when -- if there -- if we're
15 looking at airports or school districts or, you know,
16 population growth or decline, that we start at just a
17 zero point, a base point, and like a zero base budget we
18 go through each community and judge them by the same
19 standard.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And I think that's something
22 that we can bring up when -- you know, when we work on it
23 and that's what I'm for is I'm looking for these kind of
24 ideas that we can then sit down and discuss as a RAC and
25 then -- so we'll have something to take to them when the
26 times comes.

27

28 Okay. Judy suggested that we go through these
29 recommended actions that came out of this meeting or out
30 of this process, I guess, is a better way of putting it.
31 And if anybody wishes to make any comments on them or we
32 can see what's actually happening. It's -- the first one
33 says add two public members representing subsistence
34 users to the Federal Subsistence Board. And that's not
35 happening at this point in time yes, is it?

36

37 DR. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Actually we,
38 we being OSM, are drafting a proposed rule to add two new
39 members. Now adding two members to the Federal
40 Subsistence Board means that we've got to change Subpart
41 B regulations which is program structure. That's a
42 Secretarial directive, but it needs to go through the
43 rulemaking process. So we've drafted or we're drafting
44 a proposed rule, that'll go into the Federal Register,
45 we'll solicit public comment and then respond to the
46 public comment and then publish a final rule. So we're
47 looking at -- yesterday somebody had asked me if we
48 thought we'd be able to do this by January, by the
49 Federal Board meeting in January and I said oh, I wish
50 government could move that fast. But we're probably

1 looking at.....
2
3 MR. CARPENTER: Next January.
4
5 DR. WHEELER: Huh?
6
7 MR. CARPENTER: Next January.
8
9 DR. WHEELER: January, 2013 maybe, I don't know.
10
11 (Laughter)
12
13 DR. WHEELER: But we're looking at least a year.
14 Pat Pourchot had asked us, we said at least a year,
15 possibly more. Keep in mind that our special action
16 regulations that we just got published in the Federal
17 Register last week took two year -- over two years to
18 wind their way through the process. So government
19 rulemaking is anything but efficient and timely so it'll
20 be at least a year and possibly two. We'll do what we
21 can, but we have no control -- I mean, we draft the
22 proposed rule, then there's a whole bunch of other
23 signatures and loops that have to be jumped -- or hoops
24 that have to be jumped through. So at least a year,
25 possibly more.
26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But basically there's being work
28 done on adding two public -- I mean.....
29
30 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Pourchot directed us to do
31 that, we work for the Secretary so yes, we are drafting
32 a proposed rule to add two new members. And initially we
33 had talked about -- the terminology we used was rural
34 Alaska citizens, but that's not correct, it's people that
35 will represent the interests of rural Alaska. I was
36 corrected on that.
37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.
39
40 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair.
41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Council, anybody got any
43 comments on that one.
44
45 Ricky.
46
47 MR. GEASE: I think Mr. Henrichs brought up a
48 point earlier of Chairs and if we have two more public
49 people on the process. I'd make a recommendation for our
50 RAC to consider that the Chair position could get very

1 political with each new administration that comes in and
2 I think for the long-term health of the program I don't
3 think that that is a good policy. I think a different
4 approach might be if we are going to add two public
5 members that some of the leadership then on the Federal
6 Subsistence Board reflect the leadership of the RACs and
7 that we give deference to the current Chairs who go to
8 the RAC meetings maybe on an alternating format or, you
9 know, a three year term or whatever term it is, that
10 those members be chosen from the RACs which in and of
11 themselves already provide an informal voting process
12 which recognizes expertise in subsistence matters.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And this would be for the Chair
15 of the Federal Subsistence Board?

16

17 MR. GEASE: No, I'm saying for expanding from --
18 it's basically there's one public position on the Federal
19 Subsistence Board currently and if you expand it to three
20 the danger I think is in a process is to try and de-
21 politicize it so that it's not a public -- it's not a
22 political appointment, but it actually reflects those one
23 to three members who are the Federal Subsistence Board
24 actually reflect knowledge of subsistence issues in
25 Alaska. And I can think of no better way to try and do
26 that than to actually use the Chairs that are elected by
27 the RACs to have representation on the Federal
28 Subsistence Board. It would strengthen the ties between
29 the Federal Subsistence Board and the RACs because
30 somebody who then would be on the Federal Subsistence
31 Board has gone through the RAC process. And it is much
32 less a political process than a knowledge based
33 recognition of who amongst the peers of the RAC Chairs
34 has the most knowledge or can function both on the RAC
35 and the Federal Subsistence Board.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So that would apply not
38 only to the two new -- the two new public positions that
39 we're putting in, but to the Chair of the Subsistence
40 Board too. Is that what you're suggest -- I'm trying
41 to.....

42

43 MR. GEASE: I mean, I would say at least for the
44 two public positions and whether it's the Chair or not,
45 that would be -- I think that may still be a political
46 appointment, but I think for the long-term health of the
47 process you don't want to get into a position where
48 changes in administration in Washington dictate changes
49 on the Federal Subsistence Board because I think there
50 are long-term issues that are dealt with where continuity

1 is important. And I think that continuity is reflected
2 in the Chairs of the RAC process and, you know, I think
3 that you get a concentration of expertise and knowledge
4 base that may better serve when we're talking about many
5 of these recommendations have to do with the relationship
6 between the RACs and the Federal Subsistence Board to
7 begin with.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now would that be something that
10 we should forward in our annual report or should we
11 forward that as an actin item or should we just leave it
12 as a suggestion in our minutes and go from there?

13
14 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. As this proposed rule
15 winds its way through the process we will keep the
16 Regional Advisory Councils informed and I guess my
17 recommendation would be to include this as an action item
18 in your annual report you'd like the Board to consider,
19 but then you'd also want to submit public comments when
20 the proposed rule is out for public comment so that that
21 would have to be -- if it's submitted as a public comment
22 on a proposed rule that has to get a response from the
23 drafters of the proposed rule. So you could come at it
24 from different angles and the point would be clearly
25 made.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.

28
29 MS. CAMINER: Well, a few other angles might be,
30 Mr. Chair, you will be at the Federal Subsistence Board
31 meeting to represent this Council for the RFR and I hope
32 you can stay for the rest of the discussion where this
33 topic will come up. So I think you should have the
34 opportunity in just a few weeks to relay these
35 suggestions. And secondly I hope as much as possible
36 that the RACs can be consulted while you're drafting the
37 regulations too, I mean, the kind of discussion we're
38 having here I'm sure could be replicated many other times
39 with the Councils and probably a lot of good ideas may
40 come up even before the draft becomes official.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Would this be a -- would
43 this be a consensus item of this Council to take forward,
44 I mean, would this -- this has been presented, would the
45 Council feel that this would be an item that would be
46 worthwhile for me to take forward to the Board if I have
47 an opportunity to? And I think all we need is a
48 consensus on that, I don't think we need an action item.
49 And does this meet -- does this meet kind of the feeling
50 of this Council?

1 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Mr. Chair.
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Greg.
4
5 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, it meets my feeling of it.
6
7 (Laughter)
8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, does anybody on this
10 Council object to me taking this idea forward, I guess
11 that's a good way to put it.
12
13 (No objection)
14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Chuck.
16
17 MR. LAMB: I'm for anything that gets politics
18 out of it.
19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug.
21
22 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chair, I just want to make sure
23 you understood it. It means that these two public
24 positions will be taken from the RACs, someone in one of
25 the RACs is going to be this person, right, that's what
26 I agree with.
27
28 MR. GEASE: (Nods affirmatively)
29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That was my understanding.
31
32 MR. BLOSSOM: Okay. I just wanted to make sure.
33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. And possibly all three,
35 but basically that we think that the expertise for the
36 public should come from the RACs.
37
38 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. Just a quick
39 clarification. As the program is currently structured,
40 and this is again in Subparts A and B, that the Federal
41 Board Chair is selected by the Sec -- it's in regulation
42 that that person is selected by the Secretary of the
43 Interior and with the concurrent on the Secretary of
44 Agriculture. So.....
45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Uh-huh.
47
48 DR. WHEELER:it would take another
49 regulatory change to have the Chair not be a political
50 appointee, but the two positions, the two added public

1 members that's separate.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But that's -- but everybody
4 that's on this Council is appointed by the Secretary of
5 the Interior, I mean, it -- for our suggestion that they
6 came from the RACs, the Secretary of the Interior still
7 has to do the appointing.

8

9 DR. WHEELER: Duly noted, Mr. Chair. You're
10 correct.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, I mean, it's not -- the RACs
13 aren't going to do the appointment I hope. Well, maybe
14 we will.

15

16 Ricky.

17

18 MR. GEASE: In some way to go outside a RAC is a
19 political process.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right.

22

23 MR. GEASE: When you stick with people who are in
24 the RAC process it's not a political, then it becomes
25 based on other factors.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So you were -- the
28 original was at least these two would come out of the
29 RACs, not be appointed outside of the RACs?

30

31 MR. GEASE: Correct.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. I just need to have that
34 clarified if I'm going to take it, you know. And then if
35 the Chair comes out of the RAC that's an appointment by
36 the Secretary of the Interior, but our suggestion would
37 be that he would appoint somebody out of one of the RACs.
38 Was I correct on that or was I wrong?

39

40 MR. GEASE: Yes, that's correct. Because at the
41 end of the day you still -- if a lot of these
42 recommendations are tying a closer relationship between
43 the RACs and the Federal Subsistence Board and if you
44 have people who are familiar with the RAC process when
45 they get to the Federal Subsistence Board then a lot of
46 those issues go away.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Okay. Is that the
49 understanding of the rest of the Council then.

50

1 (Council nods affirmatively)
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We took care of one.
4
5 (Laughter)
6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Henrichs.
8
9 MR. HENRICHS: Yeah. Well, to a point, but they
10 said that these two new public positions will be, you
11 know, appointed and represent people from rural Alaska
12 or, you know, I think they should be from rural Alaska.
13 I don't think they should -- you know, you can appoint
14 somebody from Anchorage to represent the people in rural
15 Alaska and that's a problem with that Federal Subsistence
16 Board, all those people live in Anchorage or Juneau. And
17 it shouldn't be that way.
18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, I think that was Ricky's
20 idea with the fact that they -- if they come from the
21 RACs and the RACs have input in it they probably will be
22 rural Alaskans.
23
24 MR. HENRICHS: Well, not only will be, they
25 should be.
26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.
28
29 MS. WAGGONER: We have to keep in mind too, but
30 isn't there because of FACA we have a portion of people
31 on the RAC that are not qualified -- Federally-qualified
32 subsistence folks and they can represent commercial or
33 sport interest too. So somehow needing to get across --
34 I like the idea that they come from the RAC, but it needs
35 to be someone that has designated subsistence on their
36 application, you know, because that's the one -- that's
37 the block that personally you mark so if you're
38 subsistence then it can be that.
39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think Ricky's idea was that if
41 it comes from the RAC the RAC will make sure that that
42 person does meet that qualification, you know, I mean
43 because the RAC wouldn't appoint somebody that didn't --
44 that they didn't feel.....
45
46 MR. GEASE: Uh-huh.
47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:would meet their -- you
49 know, their best interests I would think.
50

1 Okay. We already talked about the next one,
2 direct Fishery -- Federal Subsistence Board to expand the
3 deference to RAC recommendations other than just taking
4 decisions. And one of the ones that I'm going to pursue
5 with them is I think there should be deference towards
6 RAC decisions on customary and traditional because if
7 there's anything the RAC should have a better handle on
8 than somebody that -- like Bob Henrichs was saying,
9 somebody that lives in town and deals with nothing but
10 data would be what the communities are really like.

11
12 Judy.

13
14 MS. CAMINER: And another one would be rural
15 determination.

16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And rural determination. That's
18 -- okay.

19
20 Tom.

21
22 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah, just one comment on the
23 C&Ts. I think it's an important point that -- and I was
24 always dumbfounded that the RACs weren't shown deference
25 on C&T because most of the information presented to the
26 RACs for them to come up with their recommendation for
27 C&T is in regards to taking. So I think that hopefully
28 that this will be resolved in the future and that we will
29 be shown deference.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Any other comments on
32 that one.

33
34 Let's go on to the next one. Direct Federal
35 Subsistence Board to review with RAC input Federal
36 subsistence procedural and structural regulations adopted
37 from the State in order to ensure Federal authorities are
38 fully reflected and comply with Title VIII. Changes
39 would require new regulations. In other words basically
40 what we'd be doing is reviewing all regulations that were
41 adopted straight from State regulations. And I think
42 that'll probably come before us one by one, directed
43 straight from OSM, won't it, I mean, different
44 regulations will be brought to our attention and so for
45 us to review and decide whether or not they're
46 applicable.

47
48 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. These are -- these --
49 all of these recommended actions are coming from the
50 Secretaries, they're going to the Federal Board, they're

1 going to be presented to the Federal Board and then the
2 Federal Board will provide direction to OSM. At this
3 point it's premature for OSM with the exception of the
4 adding two members part, it's premature for OSM to be
5 taking action on any of these items because they haven't
6 been -- the Board has to give that direction, keep in
7 mind the Board works with -- under the delegated
8 authority of the Secretaries and we are the
9 administrative arm of the Board. So until the Board
10 gives us further direction.....

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So these are
13 recommendations to the Board, the Board can take action
14 on them at whatever time they want to, they don't have to
15 take action on all of them at once?

16
17 DR. WHEELER: That's correct.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. And then it's premature
20 for us to take action on them until the Board directs us
21 in which direction they're going to go, but we can make
22 comment on them?

23
24 DR. WHEELER: Oh, absolutely. And I think you
25 can give -- I mean, again if -- the RACs are the
26 foundation of this program so the Boards are going to --
27 I think the Board should be looking to the Regional
28 Advisory Councils for their advice and input on these
29 things. So we will do whatever we are told to do, but
30 the Regional Advisory Councils have an opportunity to
31 weigh in at this level and I think that's completely
32 appropriate.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

35
36 DR. WHEELER: And you may want to prioritize some
37 of these things, look at some of these things and say
38 these are the most -- these are the most important items
39 to us and the Board should consider directing OSM to do
40 this yesterday.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, the three that we're
43 looking at right here was -- you know, are the State
44 regulations, customary and traditional use and rural/non-
45 rural. And all of them call for the Fish -- the Federal
46 Subsistence Board to have a review of them with RAC input
47 on that. If we're going to prioritize those how would we
48 as a Council prioritize those three, which would be the
49 most important out of those three right there.

50

1 MR. GEASE: Mr. Chair.
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Ricky.
4
5 MR. GEASE: I think all three of them in
6 relationship to all of them are the ones that are
7 important to the RAC.
8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So what you would be
10 looking at is what we should ask is that the Federal
11 Subsistence Board expedite taking action on these
12 basically, in other words we consider these important
13 enough that we would -- we'd appreciate them, you know,
14 taking action at their soonest -- at their earliest
15 convenience to do something about them. Would that kind
16 of be -- I'm just trying to figure -- feel out how I
17 should present it to them, you know, as representing the
18 Council. So we figure that like these three here are
19 important enough that we would like to see action taken
20 in the immediate future or fairly immediate future
21 anyhow.
22
23 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair.
24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.
26
27 MS. CAMINER: I mean, I guess with the rural
28 determination there will be some limitations as to how
29 much work can take place until the numbers come in.....
30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Uh-huh.
32
33 MS. CAMINER:so in that sense it may not be
34 timewise the same priority as the others. I would think
35 the deference aspect might be real important to all the
36 RACs actually.
37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.
39
40 MS. STICKWAN: Mr. Chair. It.....
41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Wait, we've got one over here
43 first.
44
45 MS. WAGGONER: On the rural/non-rural, is --
46 looking at the process and I think that is important
47 especially to look at before the numbers come out so that
48 we look at a fair process before, you know, they even
49 know what the numbers are. And that was one of the
50 things of the focus group that I participated in was what

1 is the process, how do we make the determinations.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I kind of agree with you there
4 because if you wait until the numbers come out then you
5 can be biased by which community has or which community
6 doesn't have numbers, you know, and where if you come up
7 with your process first and before you know the answer,
8 it's a little easier to come up with an unbiased process.
9 And so to me that would -- out of these three right there
10 that would be my priority. But I just don't know if the
11 rest of the Council would look at it that way.

12

13 Tom.

14

15 MR. CARPENTER: I think deference would be the
16 highest priority for me and then I think probably the
17 addition of the two public members taking into account
18 some of the ideas that Ricky presented would probably be
19 my second highest priority because I do think that taking
20 as much of the political aspect out of this very
21 political system out as you can and putting people as
22 Polly said from the RACs who kind of is the mainstay of
23 this whole program, I think it adds a lot to the Federal
24 system and it shows -- it shows the public in general
25 that the -- that the bottom up process still can work.
26 So I think those would be my two highest priorities.

27

28 MS. STICKWAN: I want to go back to the input of
29 the Federal Subsistence Board. I won't mention any RACs,
30 but there is one RAC that concerns me. I don't know if
31 they really look out after subsistence fully as well as
32 they could. And I would be concerned about a Chair being
33 selected that doesn't really represent true rural
34 subsistence areas. I won't to be able to ensure that the
35 RACs select somebody who's going to protect subsistence
36 as much as they can because the -- you know, there may be
37 a Chair that gets selected from Anchorage and then if
38 they pick somebody from Anchorage that doesn't represent
39 our subsistence rights, you know, it's -- we're just
40 going to be voting for somebody that's not -- they're not
41 going to protect us. So I want to see something more
42 than just the RAC Chairs, I want to see that they are on
43 the subsistence like she said that, you know, they should
44 be from the subsistence -- it should be a subsistence
45 seat from a rural area.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, when I take a look at
48 these I look at the first five of them and I think these
49 have direct applications to the RAC. The last five of
50 them, they're good, but they're not things that we

1 immediately -- I mean, like executive sessions, MOU,
2 these are more I'd say administrative type things, budget
3 and things like that. But the first five of them
4 actually deal with stuff that we deal with as a RAC. And
5 those would be my priority if I was going to pick a
6 priority out to take to them.

7

8 Judy.

9

10 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair. I think the MOU is an
11 item that the RAC ought to be involved in and maybe
12 become more familiar with and hopefully you'll be able to
13 be there for the discussion that the Board has with the
14 State. And it would be good to know what dialogue has
15 occurred since this MOU was signed. I think there's a
16 number of items in the MOU that perhaps the RAC could
17 look at more -- in more detail at some point in terms of
18 following State management plans and kind of the
19 different standards that this program has for health of
20 populations than perhaps the State standards and some of
21 the proposals that come to us are as a result of those
22 differences. So I think that's a key topic also.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think it's a big topic, but I
25 don't think it's got the same priority the -- I mean, I
26 -- for myself these first five to me really hit things
27 that we have dealt with based on -- you know, basically
28 like you said the MOU we have dealt with and we're going
29 to get to review that one way or the other, but the first
30 five of them if that's agreement to the rest of the
31 Council, would be the ones that I would discuss with them
32 as a priority. And the rest of them we're going to --
33 they're directed to review the MOU, that's going to come
34 back to us, we're going to have a chance on that. You
35 know, we're going to review the budget and things like
36 that, but that's not going to be a priority because we're
37 not going to have that much on an affect on it, but we
38 deal with customary and traditional, we deal with
39 rural/non-rural, we deal with -- what was the other one,
40 oh, the State regulations and things like that. And I
41 think that unless the Council or unless there's enough
42 reason to put one of the other ones above that, those
43 five would be my priority. And I'll take the concern of
44 the rest of them to the -- I'll take any concern that
45 anybody has to the Board, but I think that those are the
46 ones that I would concentrate on more than anything else.

47

48 Gloria.

49

50 MS. STICKWAN: I disagree. I think the MOU

1 should be on there, I think there's things in there that
2 needs to be reviewed with RAC input. And I think it's
3 something we should be looking at as -- we will, but I
4 think it should be part of the priorities.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, see that's what I'm
7 wondering is now would we say that we should deal with
8 that before we deal with rural/non-rural, should we deal
9 with that before we deal with customary trade. You know,
10 I'm trying to prioritize these as to what, you know,
11 I.....

12
13 MS. STICKWAN: Well, they're going to bring this
14 up in the November meeting so that should be
15 addressed.....

16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

18
19 MS. STICKWAN:immediately.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Okay. We'll include that
22 one then too.

23
24 MR. GEASE: Mr. Chair.

25
26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Ricky.

27 MR. GEASE: I would like -- since the request for
28 reconsideration oftentimes does stem around customary and
29 traditional use, I think it is important that one also --
30 we just had an example for the Ninilchik where there were
31 -- seems to be different -- what's acceptable and what's
32 not acceptable and if there's a clear transparent process
33 about how do we deal with oral history testimony, both on
34 the RAC level and the Federal Subsistence Board level,
35 how do you deal with life history surveys, how do you
36 deal with repeating surveys for communities for
37 subsistence, is it just a one point, is it two point or
38 three point. One of the ways of getting more money for
39 -- in the subsistence budgets, both in the State budget
40 and the Federal budget is to say if there's a requirement
41 that you need two or three surveys based within a 10 year
42 period of time then money can get put into budgets
43 because its a requirement for a decision making process.
44 And then that raises up in priority for that. But if we
45 don't have a clear process then some communities can get
46 left by the wayside. It also stems to the issue of doing
47 surveys on rural areas that didn't get -- that didn't
48 come forward with customary and traditional use and they
49 can kind of get lost by the wayside in the process
50 itself. And so standards of what needs to get done in

1 communities that do come forward and participate in the
2 process, standards for communities that didn't.

3

4 And there's also this ongoing process of land
5 transfers. There's some land transfer that in certain
6 areas may go to the State and just become rural and that
7 again falls into that process of you're in a rural area,
8 it just became State land, people can first start living
9 in that area, how does this process deal with that.

10

11 So I think more comprehensive policies and
12 procedures for C&T would be helpful, gets us out of the
13 trap of everybody understands what their by. And I think
14 the other reason why that's important for the Federal
15 Subsistence Board is just the situation that we find
16 ourselves in now, there could be a whole new slate of
17 people there who have no idea what's been going on in the
18 past.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So basically what we're saying
21 is that what came out of this review, these directions,
22 we concur with to the Fish -- to the Federal Subsistence
23 Board. We concur with the idea that there should be a
24 review of C&T, there should be a review of the rural
25 determination, there should be a review of the MOU, there
26 should be a review of the State regulations that have
27 been adopted, we agree with that. We also think that
28 there should be some other guidelines added to the two
29 public participants and we definitely concur with the
30 idea that there should be more deference to the Council.
31 So those first two that are up there are our highest
32 priorities really and then we concur with the findings of
33 this review on these other ones and we ask that they
34 expediently start the process to comply with them. And
35 how about the ones we get down a little bit farther, we
36 concur with those too, but we don't consider them as high
37 a priority as these other ones that directly affect us,
38 would that be a way of putting it?

39

40 I mean, I don't find any of these that I don't
41 concur with, it's just whether or not -- you know,
42 whether or not we -- how fast are we going to get started
43 on them, you know. And to me the first two are extremely
44 important, the rest of them I want to see them get going
45 on as fast as they can, you know.

46

47 And if that's what you would like me to take to
48 the meeting then that's what I'll take to the meeting.
49 If you disagree with that, tell me now.

50

1 Gloria.

2

3 MS. STICKWAN: I'd like to know what they going
4 to do at the Federal Subsistence Board meeting in
5 November about the MOU, is that just going to be a
6 discussion or what's going to happen there?

7

8 DR. WHEELER: As it stands right now the MOU
9 signatories are going to meet on the afternoon of the
10 10th so that would be Board of Game Chair, Board of Fish
11 Chair, the -- all of the Federal Subsistence Board
12 members as it -- the new Federal Subsistence Board with
13 the new Chair. So they're going to meet and discuss.
14 That's all I know. And that -- you know, whatever they
15 discuss is at the direction of the people that are there.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Is it an action item or just a
18 discussion item?

19

20 DR. WHEELER: It's just a discussion item, Mr.
21 Chair, as far as I know.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So basically it's to up
24 -- it's to give them the information so they know where
25 they stand at this current point in time, but not to
26 change it?

27

28 DR. WHEELER: Actually, Mr. Chair, the MOU calls
29 for an annual meeting of the signatories so this is just
30 consistent with the annual meeting. I think the last
31 annual meeting was November 12th of 2009. So this is the
32 -- they haven't met in the subsequent months since then
33 so this is just the annual meeting of the signatories.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So what this is calling
36 for is a review of that from the Fish -- the Federal
37 Subsistence Board?

38

39 DR. WHEELER: That is correct. They're sort of
40 two different items, the meeting on the 10th is an annual
41 meeting of the signatories, what the recommendation is
42 from the Secretaries to the Board is review it with the
43 RACs. So those are sort of two different events in a
44 sense.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Does that answer your
47 question, Gloria?

48

49 MS. STICKWAN: Uh-huh.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Shall we go on and --
2 Judy.
3
4 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair. Just a couple more
5 items that the next section says in addition the
6 following items are called upon by the Secretary and I
7 thought I'd mention two very quickly. The last bullet on
8 the page mentions reinstatement of the one year cycle for
9 Fish and Wildlife rulemaking.
10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's where I was just getting
12 to next.
13
14 MS. CAMINER: Okay. Sorry.
15
16 (Laughter)
17
18 MS. CAMINER: Okay. Go ahead.
19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I was just going to go on to
21 these additional ones because I thought that -- I thought
22 that the first one, establish an interior line item for
23 the core subsistence budget program. That's interior
24 line item, in other words it will be part of the
25 Department of the Interior's budget, approved by the
26 President, am I correct, or Congress or whatever you want
27 to call it, signed by the President.
28
29 DR. WHEELER: I guess to a certain -- this is all
30 well above my pay grade, Mr. Chair. But I guess my
31 understanding of this is that -- I mean, as it stands
32 right now each of the DOI agencies have their own
33 subsistence budget. Fish and Wildlife Service which is
34 where OSM's budget comes through, we don't actually have
35 a line item, we have -- our budget comes through Refuges
36 and it comes through Fisheries. So this would be
37 removing that out of it, I guess, and I think it would be
38 as I read it the core subsistence program budget. I
39 honestly don't know if that would be just OSM per se or
40 that would be BIA, Park Service, BLM and oh, Fish and
41 Wildlife Service, you know, if all of those would be in
42 the DOI Secretary's budget. I don't know. But yeah,
43 ultimately the budget gets approved by Congress and
44 signed by the President.
45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So that it can't be dropped or
47 it can't be lost in the -- I mean, it can be dropped, but
48 it can't be lost in the Department if it's a line item
49 budget, the Department can't divert the money to
50 something else.

1 DR. WHEELER: That would be correct, yeah. And
2 -- I mean, the beauty of that is that it's clear, it's
3 out there, but you have a -- you know, you have a
4 friendly administration, the budget can go up, you don't
5 have a friendly administration the budget can go away.
6 There's lots of unfunded mandates out there. So.....

7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Uh-huh.

9
10 DR. WHEELER:I guess the -- you know, right
11 now there's some thought that well, maybe the budget's
12 protected by being within the agency, I don't know. But
13 apparently Mr. Kessler wants to speak about this.

14
15 MR. KESSLER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm Steve
16 Kessler with the Forest Service. This is how the
17 majority of the money for the Forest Service comes
18 forward, there is a line item in the President's budget
19 and the Congress then allocates. That has been good,
20 that has been maybe not so good. There have been
21 increases that Congress has provided through that process
22 and there -- over the last year we've seen 50 percent of
23 the funds that we saw before. But there's no question
24 that those dollars are available for this program at that
25 point. And, you know, from the Interior side, you know,
26 it's really up to the agencies at this point to figure
27 out what to do versus up to Congress to figure out what
28 to do.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Any questions.

31
32 (No comments)

33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And the next one was to consider
35 the building of an annual budget, periodic meetings of
36 the Federal Subsistence Board in rural areas, in other
37 words not always in Anchorage, and reinstatement of the
38 one year cycle for fish and wildlife. And that's one of
39 the ones that we brought to their attention was the fact
40 that we just didn't figure that a two year cycle was good
41 enough. I'm glad that there's been times like this one
42 that maybe it was, but in general what we were look --
43 asking for was a one year cycle. And that was a
44 recommendation along with increased support and training
45 for the RAC members and increased capacity within the OSM
46 for research and analysis. So it basically would be
47 they're recommending some gains in areas that are
48 important to us.

49
50 Direct the Interior or InterAgency Taskforce in

1 the evaluation of the OSM and related agency subsistence
2 budget, organizational ideas and diversity issues. And
3 I think that's pretty much an administrative thing there,
4 isn't it, Judy?

5
6 MS. CAMINER: Well, it appears to be by this, but
7 I guess I would recommend that the review include RAC
8 members.

9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. You would like to say
11 direct the Interior or InterAgency Taskforce with the
12 consultation of RAC members to look at the budget, the
13 organizational issues and diversity. So include RAC
14 members or to include the RACs?

15
16 MS. CAMINER: Yes, exactly.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. And the next one,
19 encourage the Fish -- Federal Subsistence Board, the OSM
20 and DOI, Department of Interior agencies, to utilize
21 contracting and use of Section 809 cooperative agreements
22 with local Tribes and other entities to fulfill program
23 imperatives which is a good recommendation. And direct
24 Fish -- Federal Subsistence Board and Department of
25 Interior Directors to prioritize their responsibilities
26 for subsistence management, attend Federal Subsistence
27 Board meetings whenever possible while also allowing
28 designation of high ranking, knowledgeable alternatives.
29 In other words they're ask -- they're saying that for the
30 Directors subsistence should be a priority and that if at
31 all possible they as a Director should attend the
32 meeting, but at the same time they still are capable of
33 doing what they've done in the past which is to appoint
34 an alternative.

35
36 Recommended actions not being pursued at this
37 time, it says some commentators propose changes requiring
38 significant statutory changes in Title VIII of ANILCA or
39 other Federal laws including. And I think basically what
40 they're saying is these are outside the authority of the
41 Secretary of the Interior and they have to come from
42 Congress. And that was to redefine ANILCA, the
43 eligibility for a subsistence priority to either Native
44 only or rural residents plus urban Natives, to expand the
45 definition of public lands in ANILCA to allow Federal
46 subsistence management on Native owned lands, to exempt
47 the RACs from the requirement of Federal Advisory
48 Committee Act and others FACA and only permit
49 participation by subsistence users, in other words nobody
50 representing alternatives or non-rural, and to clarify in

1 statute that Title VIII of ANILCA is Indian legislation.
2 And like what came out of there is that that's outside of
3 the Secretary of Interior's -- Secretary of Agriculture's
4 authority, but that anybody can petition their
5 Congressman or Congress -- or interested Congressman to
6 pursue something like that in Congress.

7
8 Any questions on that.

9
10 (No comments)

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I have an understanding then
13 about -- I mean, I think I have an understanding about
14 what this RAC would like me to take forward to the Board.
15 I'm not sure how much of an opportunity I'll get to do
16 it, but I'll do my best.

17
18 Any other comments on this that somebody would
19 like me to take up there.

20
21 (No comments)

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none, we will -- oh, we
24 got time, we'll go on to another.....

25
26 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, do you want to see
27 Herb's or do you want to have him get rid of it before
28 lunch.....

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

31
32 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE:so that.....

33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. That's just what I was
35 looking down there.

36
37 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, Bob brought it up.

38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob, the issue with the Magnuson
40 Act, I see that you go Herb here. Would this be a good
41 time to present that?

42
43 MR. HENRICHS: I will introduce Herb and let him
44 explain his dilemma. Herb Jensen, one of our Tribal
45 Council members.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

48
49 MR. JENSEN: Mr. Chairman. Board. We aren't
50 prepared to make a statement. I just talked to Greg and

1 he said that we were -- we'll write a statement up and
2 give it to you for your publication or deliver it to the
3 -- to you to distribute within 30 days.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Can you -- some of us
6 aren't cognizant about what this is all about. Have you
7 got a -- can you give us any kind of information on it at
8 all, Herb?

9

10 MR. JENSEN: The lawsuit in itself sues the
11 Federal government and the State of Alaska on a yes or no
12 question, whether Magnuson applies in Alaskan waters for
13 salmon.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

16

17 MR. JENSEN: And if it does there's a whole set
18 of rules under Magnuson, there's 10 priorities and if
19 you've read them you know what they are. Rural is
20 preference and a litany of other issues that go along
21 with protecting rural along with, you know, some others.
22 But basically yes or no and Department of Justice has
23 reviewed it and told the National Marine Fisheries or
24 NOAA that they're probably going to lose at the circuit
25 court level. But we can fill out a detailed report and
26 deliver it to you so you have the nuts and bolts of it.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Could we have that for our next
29 meeting then?

30

31 MR. JENSEN: Sure. I'll talk to Greg, we'll get
32 it as soon as possible.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

35

36 MR. JENSEN: Thank you.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Herb. Mr.
39 Henrichs.

40

41 MR. HENRICHS: Thirty years I've been trying to
42 get a gag order on you and now they got one.

43

44 (Laughter)

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Mr. Jensen.

47

48 Okay. We have the Russian River thing was the
49 next thing that was on our agenda.

50

1 Mr. Zemke, can you kind of fill us in with what's
2 going on there a little bit from the Forest Service
3 standpoint.

4
5 MR. ZEMKE: Okay. Steve Zemke with the Chugach
6 National Forest and subsistence coordinator. I know
7 that, I think, Ricky Gease forwarded this on to Donald
8 Mike who I think forwarded it on to the rest of the
9 Council members. It's a 66 page report. What initially
10 was is a -- kind of a third-party review of and a
11 discussion of bear and human interactions on the -- kind
12 of the Russian River area, the Kenai/Russian River
13 confluence primarily. And it's very conceptual, it's
14 again a third-party review. It's not an actionable, if
15 that's actually a word, kind of process, if we're
16 actually at alternatives or options. It's kind of an
17 evaluation of what we're doing out there, maybe a
18 critique of some of those items. And then it kind of
19 maybe provides us with some other items that we might
20 consider in the future. Again those are just broad scale
21 ideas, they aren't -- weren't looked at specifically on
22 the ground. And then again it was not a particularly --
23 it's not a document designed to go forth any specific
24 action.

25
26 And so what it will provide, and it should have
27 had a cover letter out from our District Ranger kind of
28 saying here's what it is and here's what it isn't so we
29 could kind of get beyond the idea about well, here's, I
30 think Ricky said draconian, options that -- such as
31 closing the Russian River subsistence fisheries, Falls
32 side, you know, it's in the document, but it's not any
33 particular action that the Forest Service or Fish and
34 Wildlife Service is planning to undertake.

35
36 What is going to happen is currently there's a
37 collaborative InterAgency group of the Forest Service,
38 Fish and Wildlife, Kenai Refuge, Alaska Department of
39 Fish and Game, their Wildlife Division, Fisheries
40 Division, Alaska Department of DNR and the Kenaitze
41 Tribal Association are starting a process to take a look
42 at what -- maybe looking at a strategic plan for the
43 Russian River confluence area. And they're starting that
44 process, they're just beginning and they're looking to
45 have that action plan done by about December 2011. So
46 little over a year from now. And again those wouldn't be
47 action items, the strategic plan would be looking at
48 broad -- items that need to be done and if there are
49 specific items like regulations that would be needed to
50 deal with something like food storage or fish waste

1 there'd be a -- at that time there would be kind of an
2 assignment of -- in that action plan there would be a
3 group would go forth and decide how to implement a
4 strategy to maybe reduce fish waste on -- in the Russian
5 River area or be able to control food storage in that
6 area.

7
8 So that's kind of the process or the point that
9 we're at right now. Again it's not a Forest Service led
10 action, it's this collaborative process in this group of
11 these agencies, Forest Service is just maybe coordinating
12 the process, but they're not -- there's not a lead agency
13 and it's not designed to come forth with kind of a
14 National Environmental Policy Act decision as such.

15
16 One of the things that the group would like is
17 input from stakeholders, certainly the RAC, Southcentral
18 RAC is a major stakeholder and would be looking for maybe
19 a representative from the RAC to be able to directly
20 interface with their process. I know right now there's
21 nobody sitting on -- from the -- kind of the Eastern
22 Kenai area where Bill Stockwell was before, I'm not sure
23 what the -- where we're at with kind of the current --
24 not Council nominations, what the -- you know, the new
25 membership would be as we come forward, but certainly
26 amongst your member would be -- if there's somebody or a
27 group of members that want to be directly involved we
28 certainly could deal with that.

29
30 One of the other things that we have on-line is
31 there's a brown bear population estimate study that's
32 occurring on the Chugach Forest and the Refuge this
33 summer. Information was collected, it was kind of a
34 mark/recapture study using bear hair to DNA. That
35 information is being analyzed right now. We're probably
36 looking at population estimates sometime early this
37 winter and then kind of confidence intervals on that
38 estimate by early spring. So hopefully we can have the
39 information available from that to -- maybe for the RAC
40 in the March meeting and could set up and make sure the
41 biologist in charge of that study could come and give a
42 presentation of what that information provides. There'll
43 also be a meeting opportunity to have the collaborative
44 group, they probably have more of a actual action plan
45 out, they're going forward, be able to present their
46 information at that time at -- during the Anchorage
47 Wildlife Cycle meeting this March.

48
49 With that I guess that's all I've got for now
50 unless there's some other questions.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I got just a couple questions.
2 In other words basically that wasn't a -- that wasn't
3 proposals, those were ideas. But now if you've got this
4 working group and the working group decides on action,
5 does that action proposal then come to the general
6 public, does it come to like the Fish Board meeting, does
7 it come for public comment, is there -- or is that action
8 group going to be able to propose actions and take
9 actions?

10
11 MR. ZEMKE: Mr. Chair. The strategic plan that
12 would be developed would be a public process so there
13 would be a series of meetings that would be held, be open
14 to the public for comment and they're also probably
15 soliciting potentially members, one may be the Kenaitze
16 group is one public that is involved. Again if we could
17 get a member from the Southcentral Council that would be
18 involved directly with the process that would be another
19 way of providing public information. As far as how
20 they're actually developing that and the schedule, that's
21 being presented right now and once we have that
22 information it could go to the Council so you'd have a
23 better idea of how that's happening. The action plan
24 certainly isn't -- you know, it's kind -- again it would
25 be broad scale direction of where -- you know, how to go
26 forward and developing specific methods such as Forest
27 regulations or Forest orders or Board of maybe Fish
28 proposals could come out of that to change the way things
29 happen. But those would happen going forward from
30 probably that December 11th period if indeed that meet
31 that schedule.

32
33 Does that answer your question, Mr. Chair.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Kind of, yeah. Any other --
36 Doug.

37
38 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chair. So you could overrule
39 the Federal Subsistence Board and close that area even
40 though they say to open it? Might as well ask the real
41 question.

42
43 MR. ZEMKE: Mr. Chair. Mr. Blossom. Yes, we
44 probably could as far as -- but there would have to be
45 specific 810 hearings, we'd have to go through the ANILCA
46 810 process to say what's the rationale, why we're -- you
47 know, we closed Russian Rivers Falls. Most cases would
48 be considered health and safety concerns and so it's a
49 possibility, but there would have to be a formal public
50 hearing process, I would assume there would be a

1 environmental document that would analyze various
2 alternatives and if that was a selected alternative then
3 that would be an appealable and then a litigatable
4 decision to go forward. I think our District Ranger says
5 -- you know, he -- when he saw that he go oh, well, this
6 isn't something that he was planning on doing. Again
7 this was a third-party review, in my mind it was done by
8 bear biologists in looking at kind of the bear point of
9 view. And so, you know, bears like to fish unimpeded at
10 a waterfall and that's the point. There's was no input
11 from subsistence users or the recreational users or, you
12 know, recreational fishers or recreationists. You know,
13 there's a bear or there's a waterfall viewing platform
14 right there and so they're -- again that was kind of that
15 -- kind of myopic in my mind, view of taking a look and
16 that they were kind of looking at it as kind of -- again
17 probably more of the important things are looking at the
18 beginning of it is kind of what are bear/human
19 interactions, how they develop and kind of understanding
20 that process. And then from there was their kind of
21 suite of recommendations, looking at kind of the bear
22 centered point of view. But at the same there's probably
23 many other points of view and that's one of the things
24 that they -- this InterAgency collaborative group will be
25 looking for are good ideas about how can manage that
26 Russian River area, kind of to the benefit of all,
27 particularly subsistence users in our view, but at the
28 same time other users also.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Steve. He asked the
31 question I was going to ask.

32

33 (Laughter)

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And now Steve has said
36 something, he said that, you know, it wouldn't hurt to
37 have somebody from the RAC on that collaborative
38 committee. Do we have any volunteers from the RAC who
39 would like to be on that collaborative committee. If we
40 do I'm sure our RAC.....

41

42 MR. GEASE: I would invite Doug and Greg, but I
43 definitely would like to be a part of that process. I've
44 seen lots of planning documents and I'm saying oh, this
45 will never come to fruition, this is an idea that's been
46 just thrown in there. But I would definitely -- I mean,
47 there was some -- it was definitely myopic, it definitely
48 came from a bear only viewpoint. This is an area that
49 has never been a bear viewing area in terms of the Refuge
50 wasn't designed for bear viewing opportunities. And

1 slowly we're getting this creep, this mission creep of
2 oh, this is an area where we should just put the bear
3 first and put human uses of this second. And it's not
4 that that's the commitment from the District Ranger, but
5 it is -- you hear more and more of that type of
6 vocalization and I would like to be a part of the process
7 just to vocalize recreational uses, subsistence uses, and
8 other uses, human uses of that area. And I think Doug
9 and Greg have long-term histories on the peninsula and I
10 think it would be great if we could have some
11 representation of that process.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug.

14

15 MR. BLOSSOM: Yeah, Mr. Chair. I would be glad
16 to have Ricky serve on that if he wants to.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Greg.

19

20 MR. ENCELEWSKI: I would also be glad to have
21 Ricky serve on that one instead of me.

22

23 (Laughter)

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You'd rather have Ricky serve on
26 it than you?

27

28 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Well, you know, I think he's on
29 the right track. We've got him on record, what he stated
30 so that ought to be good.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Well, I think it's
33 important because of the application to subsistence to
34 users and exactly what he was saying, it's -- we have a
35 lot more of that attitude and I'm not saying it's a bad
36 attitude, but we have a lot more of that attitude
37 creeping into our State gradually that things are more
38 important than people. And I would definitely support
39 him and if the rest of the Council would I will appoint
40 him.

41

42 Do I have any objections from any member of the
43 Council for me appointing Ricky to represent our Council
44 at the, what do you call it, a coalition, working group.

45

46 (No objections)

47

48 MR. ZEMKE: It's the Interagency collaborative
49 committee to deal with.....

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.
2
3 MR. ZEMKE: the Kenai River/Russian River
4 confluence area.
5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.
7
8 MR. ZEMKE: The KRRC InterAGency Committee.
9
10 (Laughter)
11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. And you'll accept that
13 position?
14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes.
16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Ricky.
18
19 Okay. Now we have one more item on our agenda
20 and then it's lunch time and we will go on to agency and
21 organizational reports after lunch.
22
23 So the only other item that I have here is the
24 predator control that Chuck brought up and that was the
25 need to put in our annual report again and whatever else
26 you'd like to say on that.
27
28 Chuck.
29
30 MR. LAMB: I just think that there needs to be a
31 lot more cooperation between the State and Federal
32 government and that they come up with a more
33 comprehensive plan and something that's aggressive
34 because, you know, it's like they said that moose and
35 caribou are what feed people, bears don't and the wolf
36 don't and they just need to make a priority on that one.
37 So whatever.
38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, we brought it up to them
40 before and I think it's something that this Council has
41 mentioned and mentioned and I honestly don't feel like
42 the Feds will ever stick their nose into it. They did in
43 the past, I don't know if they ever will again, but I
44 think it's something that we can keep reminding them of.
45 And I think we should put it again in our annual report
46 if that's acceptable to the rest of the Council.
47
48 Do I hear any objections.
49
50 (No objections)

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug.
2
3 MR. BLOSSOM: Yeah, Mr. Chair. In fact I believe
4 at our Copper Landing meeting we discussed that at length
5 and so it's not the first time we've talked about needing
6 that.
7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, we've talked about it quite
9 a few times and we've had it in our annual report a
10 number of times and we get the same response back that
11 they -- you know, that it's out of their -- it's not what
12 -- but I think it doesn't hurt to keep reminding them.
13 And I think the idea of reminding them like what Ricky
14 just said is that, you know, that the game is supposed to
15 be managed for subsistence use, you know, I mean, it
16 feeds people. And we can put that in our annual report.
17
18 Is there any other thing that we do on it,
19 anybody think of anything else that we can do on it or
20 have you got any ideas on that, Chuck?
21
22 MR. LAMB: Is there any way to get maybe the
23 backing of some of the other RACs to do the same thing?
24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Some of the other RACs have done
26 the same thing, but yeah, I mean.....
27
28 MR. LAMB: How about the Board itself, you think
29 they would?
30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I don't know what the new Board
32 will do.
33
34 MR. LAMB: I mean, if they don't.....
35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I know that it's the policy of
37 most of the Departments not to touch it with a 10 foot
38 pole.
39
40 MR. LAMB: Well, then give them the damn 10 foot
41 pole because they need it.
42
43 (Laughter)
44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.
46
47 MR. LAMB: If they don't have the moose out here
48 this whole thing's irrelevant and there's getting to be
49 a lot of areas in this State that are getting turned into
50 just big old predator pits and they're not producing.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.
2
3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, that's true.
4
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, I spent an evening talking
6 to one of the State biologists that had a real lot to do
7 with the predator bear control program and everything
8 else that the State's had.....
9
10 MR. LAMB: Which one.
11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:and like you said -- and
13 like Tom and I were talking about, they've spent more
14 money defending it in court than they've spent
15 implementing the program.
16
17 MR. LAMB: That's right and that's because they
18 don't have a comprehensive, they won't get in there and
19 -- the Feds can help fight this too and they could
20 probably do a better job or an equal job if they'd all
21 get together and go after them.
22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But it has to become a
24 philosophy that comes from the top down that's where --
25 that's where I think that -- that's why I don't hold a
26 lot of hope for them doing anything about it, but I think
27 we still should put their feet to the fire and mention it
28 to them.
29
30 MR. LAMB: I'll give you the matches.
31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anything else on that.
33
34 (No comments)
35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We've taken care of the
37 items that we added to our agenda. We have agency
38 reports for after dinner.
39
40 I don't know how many of you are leaving this
41 afternoon or leaving tonight, I'm going to extend an
42 invitation to you, I'm making a great big pot of soup,
43 we'll have soup and bread at my house, anybody that wants
44 to come this evening can come and have soup and bread at
45 the house. I'll have tea, coffee and water, if you want
46 something else to drink bring your own. And we can
47 visit, we can do anything you want, you can have a bowl
48 of soup and leave or you can sit there and talk hunting,
49 fishing, subsistence, whatever you want to talk. The
50 house will be open and I'm going to ask for -- I'm going

1 to ask for an hour after the meeting's over and I'm going
2 to put a disclaimer in right now because -- for my wife's
3 sake, there's been three sons and their friends running
4 a hunting camp out of the house for the last month
5 without a woman there and I've shoveled it out a bit, but
6 it's not up to my wife's standards. And so anything that
7 you see that's not up to the standards you think should
8 be in a house that's run by a woman, don't blame on her.

9

10 (Laughter)

11

12 MR. CARPENTER: You better get home.

13

14 (Laughter)

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I've been shoveling for two
17 days.

18

19 Donald.

20

21 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I want to
22 extend my thanks and gratitude to the Native Village of
23 Eyak, especially Mr. Robert Henrichs for hosting the
24 potluck he invited everyone to last night. And I was
25 talking to his staff and we're hoping to contribute to
26 the Native Village of Eyak, either their sobriety camps
27 or any function that they like to see donations to. But
28 again I sincerely appreciate Mr. Henrichs' hospitality.

29

30 Thank you.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that invitation was to
33 Council members, staff or anybody else that's interested.

34

35 Anyway we'll see you after lunch, we'll
36 recess.....

37

38 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chair.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug.

41

42 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chair. Do we have anybody from
43 the legal staff here?

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No.

46

47 MR. BLOSSOM: After lunch I was hoping that
48 someone explain this that really know who won.

49

50 (Laughter)

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I wasn't sure of that either
2 when I read it.

3
4 (Laughter)

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Well, maybe if somebody
7 from the staff can give us a little -- you think you can
8 give us an idea of who won?

9
10 (Laughter)

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You will? Okay. How about if
13 we recess until 1:00 o'clock. Is that long enough for
14 you to find a place to eat in this town?

15
16 (Off record comments - local eating
17 establishments)

18
19 (Off record)

20
21 (On record)

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. I'd like to call this
24 fall meeting of Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional
25 Advisory Council back into session after our noon recess.

26
27 At this point in time we're getting ready to
28 start agency reports and I have a request for public
29 comment and we'll take our public comment.

30
31 Start off with Donald.

32
33 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Before we get
34 started, one thing I forgot to mention to you and the
35 Council is that the Southeast Regional Advisory Council
36 extended an invitation for the Southcentral Chair to
37 attend their meeting in Southeast Alaska. And what their
38 intent was to bring up issues of common concerns and
39 possibly think of a joint with the Southeast Regional
40 Advisory Council. But there's a invitation for the Chair
41 of the Southcentral Council to attend their next meeting
42 in Southeast Alaska which will be in Sitka I believe in
43 March.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: In March.

46
47 MR. MIKE: Yeah. So when you get a chance you
48 might want to discuss with the Council members as far as
49 what issues to bring forward to the Southeast Council.
50

1 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With that I have a
4 request for public comment from Gary Patton.

5

6 Gary.

7

8 MR. PATTON: Thank you. Gary Patton. I'm 67
9 years old, I've been following this subsistence issue for
10 years. I have talked at many meetings over the years.
11 All I have witnessed in my 67 years is more of an
12 allocation of our fish over to recreational use. And a
13 lot of different kinds of subsistence going on. When you
14 take a look at the fisheries, whether it was on the east
15 coast, the west coast, whether it was Canada or the
16 United States, we've seen a major decline. These
17 renewable resources are something that should be
18 protected in such a way that we're not allowing all these
19 different types of subsistence uses going on up these
20 rivers, these rivers should be protected. In my opinion
21 I believe that the State should have to build its own
22 recreational use fisheries, get off of our rivers, leave
23 them alone, protect those things from here to eternity.
24 They can do it, we've seen them do it in Valdez, we've
25 seen them do it in Homer, we've seen them do it right
26 here in Cordova. They can expand on this thing and
27 dedicate those -- designate those areas for subsistence
28 use.

29

30 I went up to Chitina here a few years ago and I
31 camped out for a few days because I'd heard all kinds of
32 stories going on up there. I even chartered him, went
33 down the river and in 30 minutes I had my limit.
34 Everybody had their limit. There's no oversight going on
35 up there, there's nobody. Nobody. There was probably
36 about 10,000 fishermen up there, sportsmen, recreational
37 use, subsistence users from everywhere. When I look at
38 the Eyak River today and see how much subsistence use is
39 just going on down the river and when you can go down
40 there and you look down to the bottom there and it's all
41 silver fish, dead fish, from this recreational, sport,
42 subsistence fishing that's going on. It's enough to make
43 you say hey, enough is enough. They are allocating more
44 of these fish over to recreational fishery all the time.
45 But I think it's something that needs to be -- the
46 corporate State of Alaska is going to have to create its
47 own subsistence areas. And my biggest recommendation is
48 that these -- that they stop this recreational, sport,
49 subsistence fishery going on up the river by everybody
50 from everywhere. I couldn't get over what was going on

1 up there in Chitina. They have a little box on the side
2 of the road, when you're leaving there you take your
3 little and stamp how many fish you got. That was the
4 extent of it.

5
6 Well, I know that him was getting hit pretty hard
7 because they were really in a commercial end of
8 subsistence fishing up there. And they would absolutely
9 send somebody down to take a look at how many fish were
10 being brought in by them. But him is only a little, tiny
11 operation going on up there. When I was there and camped
12 out for three days I counted so many fishermen and, in
13 fact, I was so floored between midnight and 4:00 o'clock
14 in the morning this one little 14 foot skiff had 138
15 kings, 138 kings, doing better than our commercial
16 fishermen out here. That's got to stop. Everybody in on
17 this fishery on these rivers, that's got to stop.
18 They're coming from everywhere, the military's all over
19 the place, everybody's up there big time. And I know
20 that they can create areas that will not have an impact
21 on our fishery, our commercial fishery or our own
22 subsistence fishery for the Natives. They're being
23 denied more and more all the time.

24
25 So that's just a little bit of food for thought
26 and I think that the State should have to create its own
27 areas, designated specifically for that and get off of
28 our rivers, protect that fishery with everything it
29 takes. We've already seen the east coast go down, we've
30 seen the west coast go down, now we're seeing Canada's
31 big run of fish going down the tube and it won't be long
32 and everybody's going to be up here more than they
33 already are, I mean, Colonel, and now you can have four
34 or 500 fishermen up here now, sport, you know,
35 subsistence, I mean, they're shipping that fish out of
36 here as fast they can. I seen it down there in Yakutat
37 even where they'd bump people from flying because they
38 had so many fish from this so called subsistence,
39 recreational, sport fishery. And those fishermen are
40 being denied down there as well, but it's happening all
41 over this whole State.

42
43 My recommendation is that the State, the
44 corporate State of Alaska, get busy and create these
45 areas, we got it right down here where we got silvers
46 coming in, they can have kings coming in, they could
47 expand it out this way, they can expand it all over, and
48 designate those particular areas, use -- put these
49 hatcheries to work the way they should be, but lay off
50 these rivers. These economic bases for these commercial

1 fishermen around here should be -- they should be making
2 a comfortable living from it. These expenses to get into
3 this fishery around here, you know, because they're
4 allocating more of it over to these, you know,
5 subsistence use and recreation, everything else, off of
6 our rivers, off of our natural stock and I say stop it,
7 stop it now, don't wait around about it, do it, make them
8 create their own areas. It works. We see it Homer, we
9 see it in Valdez, we see it right here, and there's no
10 reason that they can't put these hatcheries to use and
11 create their own areas.

12

13 Thank you. Any questions.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any questions for
16 Gary.

17

18 (No comments)

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Gary.

21

22 Okay. Then at this point we are going to the
23 Bureau of Land Management, the Anchorage Office and the
24 Glennallen Office.

25

26 MR. CEBRIAN: Mr. Chair. Merben Cebrian, BLM,
27 Glennallen Field Office. I don't see my counterpart for
28 the State office so I'm here to report on the BLM
29 Glennallen Field Office only.

30

31 For the Glennallen Office we have no Federal
32 subsistence fisheries to manage except that the BLM
33 contributes to the in-season management by partially
34 funding the Gulkana River fishtower. And I think Fish
35 and Game is going to report on that, the results of that
36 here.

37

38 I do have a few things to cover regarding the
39 Nelchina caribou hunt. So far we have about 99 caribou
40 harvested, this is as of last week. The quota this year
41 is 1,500 males, 800 females. And approximately 750 were
42 harvested total, including State so far.

43

44 The Federal moose hunt, it's closed. We have 72
45 harvested, that's the highest number of harvest so far.
46 I think we average roughly 62.

47

48 And we had a State Board of Game meeting last
49 week that was a special meeting of the Nelchina Caribou
50 Herd and the State had passed a new hunting scheme for

1 2011, it's a combination Tier I community harvest and a
2 drawing hunt. The particulars of these hunts have not
3 been fully fleshed out, but we do have a lot of time to
4 or the State has a lot of time to deal with that and I'm
5 assuming that the State will be reporting a little bit of
6 that here later on too.

7
8 The BLM Glennallen Field Office received \$18,000
9 for operations in helping with the subsistence management
10 of the Nelchina Caribou Herd in Unit 13, this is a
11 cooperative agreement with the State Fish and Game. This
12 year we'll have the same amount, unfortunately we are
13 under a continuing resolution for budgets so I can only
14 release 17 percent until December, 2010 as far as our
15 funding is concerned.

16
17 Land conveyance, that's still going on, it's
18 continuing in Unit 13. State selected lands are still
19 being prioritized. I don't have the prioritization as of
20 yet, that's in progress. So that's going on.

21
22 And lastly regarding the predator control in Unit
23 13, the BLM is neutral on that issue. We either go for
24 it or against it.

25
26 That's all I have. Mr. Chair.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. What's -- in your
29 opinion what does it look like for the current impact of
30 the land selection on the Federal hunting area?

31
32 MR. CEBRIAN: The way the selections are shaping
33 up, there are lands that are contentious along the Denali
34 Highway, it's been, you know, contentious for a while,
35 but until the -- until we have the final State
36 prioritization which I don't have, it's hard to predict
37 because the State -- it's the State's prerogative to
38 choose any particular parcel of land, whether it be in
39 Unit 20 or any other unit. So it's hard to predict just
40 for Unit 13. The prioritization is statewide so it's
41 difficult to say. It does look like we will have some
42 land in Unit 13, but it's just a matter of not knowing
43 where the State's priorities are and where ultimately the
44 Federal land's going to be.

45
46 Mr. Chair.

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So that's still -- that would --
49 do you expect that to be settled by next hunting season?
50

1 (Laughter)

2

3 MR. CEBRIAN: It's hard to say, Mr. Chairman.
4 This issue has been going on for years and as it stands
5 the State has over -- has over selected and I think the
6 way things are moving forward is that there is an X
7 amount of acres that the State is authorized to have and
8 then there is the over selections and I believe that the
9 way things are progressing is that we deal with over
10 selections first and the State -- perhaps, this is a
11 scenario, would say okay, then we don't need, you know,
12 this particular portion and we could start dealing with
13 that and removing the State selections, those over
14 selected lands. But once again it all hinges on the
15 prioritization.....

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

18

19 MR. CEBRIAN:from the State.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions.

22

23 (Phone interruption)

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: They didn't like what you said,
26 did they.

27

28 (Laughter)

29

30 MR. CEBRIAN: Apparently so.

31

32 MR. GEASE: I have a quick question.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Ricky.

35

36 MR. GEASE: The -- I know along the Denali
37 Highway the State Parks is doing a cultural resources
38 management plan. Do you have such a plan on BLM or do
39 you work in conjunction on any of those selected lands
40 that might go to the State or not to the State, but is
41 there any coordination between such plans for cultural
42 resource management on places along the Denali Highway
43 where there's a patchwork of State and Federal lands?

44

45 MR. CEBRIAN: We have an archeologist on staff
46 and I believe he has more information on that. I don't
47 exactly know where we are with that, but the Tangle Lakes
48 Archeological District, of course, is a well established
49 area and I'm assuming they're working closely together on
50 that.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions.
2
3 (No comments)
4
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. So you said there's
6 -- I had one
7 more question. There's 750 moose taken total counting
8 State and our 99?
9
10 MR. CARPENTER: Caribou.
11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Caribou.
13
14 MR. CEBRIAN: Caribou, yes.
15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, caribou. So there's still
17 750 to go possibly?
18
19 MR. CEBRIAN: Approximately and, you know, we
20 have the, you know, subsistence hunt -- Federal
21 subsistence hunt continuing until March and there's a
22 scheme with the State that I think they're going on with
23 their Tier II this winter.
24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, okay.
26
27 MR. CEBRIAN: Uh-huh.
28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Thank you.
30
31 Okay. OSM.
32
33 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Helen
34 Armstrong, OSM. This briefing can be found on Page 90 of
35 your Council books. It's just a brown bear -- the update
36 on the Brown Bear Claw Handicraft Working Group. And
37 just to begin I want to emphasize it's not an action
38 item, this is just informational, a status of the Brown
39 Bear Working Group to date.
40
41 The Brown Bear Claw Handicraft Working Group met
42 for the third time in July, 2010 and Tricia was your
43 representative at that meeting. All of -- all but one of
44 the Councils, Western Interior, were represented as were
45 the State and Federal agencies. As at the other meetings
46 discussion at the meeting focused on the central question
47 is there a need to change regulations to sell handicrafts
48 made with brown bear claws and if so can regulations be
49 developed that are non-burdensome for subsistence users.
50

1 We had a really good discussion, it lasted the
2 whole day. The -- and it -- after all of that discussion
3 which the details are in the actual briefing and I can
4 over and answer any questions you have if you like. The
5 Working Group came to consensus in principle that there
6 could be regulations developed that would protect the
7 subsistence user and satisfy existing regulatory frame
8 works. The Working Group also agreed that the original
9 proposal that was submitted by the State should be
10 rejected and a new proposal developed. And that was a
11 suggestion from the State representatives.

12
13 This proposal will be developed by Agency staff
14 and the proposal and the staff analysis will be presented
15 to all Councils at a later date. Once the Councils have
16 provided their input it will be voted on by the Federal
17 Subsistence Board.

18
19 I also wanted to add that as you can see in the
20 briefing the -- it actually provides the suggested
21 regulatory proposal that will come before the Council,
22 that in this region that proposal would have essentially
23 no real affect because it focuses on actually sealing the
24 brown bear and in this region the brown bear is -- in
25 some regions it's not required to have it sealed unless
26 it's taken out of the area, but in this region it is.
27 And I think, Tricia, I wanted to say that in particular
28 because you had said that on the -- I had asked that
29 question on the phone. And I think you were wondering
30 why that was. And it just has evolved that way, some
31 areas have put in proposals requesting that they not have
32 to seal the brown bear. This isn't one of those regions
33 that has, I think.

34
35 Any questions, comments.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Helen, where did you say
38 the.....

39
40 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: The briefing is, it's on Page
41 90.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, I got that. I thought you
44 said something there was a -- language of the proposal
45 was.

46
47 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: The -- what the group came up
48 with, their consensus, is on Page 91.

49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

1 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: And the -- it's about the
2 middle of the page and it's in bold. If you intend to
3 sell a handicraft.....

4
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.
6

7 MS. H. ARMSTRONG:incorporating a brown
8 claw the hide must be sealed which includes a CITES tag
9 number and the CITES tag number must accompany the
10 handicraft.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So there's -- it's not
13 saying that the CITES tag number has to be on the
14 handicraft, it just has to accompany it then. We're not
15 talking -- we're not talking laser engraving or tattooing
16 or anything like that at this point in time?

17 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: No, we're not because that
18 would destroy the value of the handicraft. And that part
19 we didn't get to that in the meeting and exactly what
20 that will mean, we have to still work on that part. And
21 we may -- I don't know if we'll pull together the group
22 in person or it'll be teleconference, but that's one
23 issue we have to kind of resolve. It may be -- I think
24 what we've talked a little bit was law enforcement, maybe
25 a sticker that you would put on it. And it would have
26 the CITES tag number which the CITES tag number, those of
27 you who seal and I'm sure Ralph knows that, comes with
28 the sealing which I didn't know, I learned something new
29 in this process.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. So was there any -- you
32 know, if it's not permanently attached was there any
33 discussion as to the fact -- I know the Fish and Game's
34 main concern was illegal take and things like this and if
35 all you have to do is accompany it with a CITES tag
36 number there's no guarantee that it would remain with the
37 original item. And was there discussion on that?

38
39 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: A little bit. I think that
40 that may be just one of the compromises they have to
41 make, you know, that -- yeah, I mean, it -- of course,
42 people could take something and, you know, stick it to
43 another.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Until a point in time if they
46 would -- and this is what we've always said, is, you
47 know, if there's a problem address the problem, but let's
48 see if there's actually a problem, whether this creates
49 a problem or not, I mean.....

50

1 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Right. And actually right now
2 we don't even believe that there are that many people who
3 are making use of this regulation that allows selling
4 brown bear claw handicrafts. And, I mean, that that may
5 change, maybe people will start -- you know, if we --
6 everywhere we go we hear about brown bear issues, maybe
7 people will start wanting to do -- you know, get a brown
8 bear and sell brown bear claws, I don't know. Who knows
9 what will happen. A lot of people aren't aware that it's
10 actually legal. So this is sort of a new direction we're
11 moving in.

12
13 MS. WAGGONER: One of my feelings sitting in
14 these meetings was like you said, we're trying to fix a
15 problem that isn't a problem. But on the other hand what
16 I did get out of this meeting was that if you have the
17 CITES number with the claws, it's kind of like those --
18 the Made in Alaska seal. So if I'm going to purchase
19 something made with claws I have the CITES number, I know
20 it's legal and I know I can buy it. So it's a tradeoff,
21 you know, are we fixing a problem that isn't broke or are
22 we protecting the person that makes the handicraft. So
23 it's kind of working on that balance and to me the CITES
24 number was at least the least intrusive into this
25 handicraft maker.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria, did you have a question?
28

29 MS. STICKWAN: No, I just wanted to.....
30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, I agree with you there, I
32 just -- it's just interesting because it's a long ways
33 away from the first discussions that were being held when
34 they were, you know, predicting large problems with it.
35 And I'm glad to see it going this way myself.

36
37 Any other questions or comments.

38
39 Helen.

40
41 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I just wanted to say it was a
42 really good meeting and I appreciated Tricia's
43 participation and all the Council members, the law
44 enforcement people, the State. I think people had
45 finally come to a point where we could come to some
46 consensus and it was very positive.

47
48 MS. WAGGONER: Yeah, when the meeting first
49 started the State folks basically come on the -- came
50 into the meeting and said we want to take our proposal

1 off the table, we want to work -- to get to something
2 that works. And so it set the tone for the meeting that
3 -- to come up with a working solution. So I thought it
4 was very good on everybody's part, everybody was very
5 respectful and listened and worked together.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Good. That's nice to know.

8

9 Okay. Any other questions for Helen.

10

11 (No comments)

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Helen.

14

15 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. After you.

18

19 DR. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The good
20 news is that you'll be able to deal with the bear claw
21 issue because it will be as a proposal as Helen said, it
22 will come back before all the Regional Advisory Councils
23 and then before the Board. So it's not the end of the
24 story, it's just a -- you're in the middle of a story.

25

26 I just wanted to speak a little bit about
27 something that we have going on at OSM that isn't really
28 in the top 10 list in terms of excitement, but it is
29 important from our standpoint from maturing as a
30 management program. And that is that beginning -- and
31 the briefing for this is on Page 94 and I'm not going to
32 read it to you, I'll just touch on a few key points.

33

34 We have a new permit -- new Federal subsistence
35 permitting system at OSM. In February of 2010 we took
36 the whole system off-line, it just wanted keeping up with
37 where we needed it to go. And it was -- we needed to
38 just take it completely off-line, we told people that it
39 was going to be off-line for probably no more than eight
40 weeks and just at about eight weeks we got a whole new
41 system, revamped, retooled and back on-line. It's
42 allowing people to issue permits, Federal managers to
43 issue permits at their spot. It used to be that OSM
44 would print the permits, send them out and then people
45 would fill them out and god only knows what happened to
46 them, sometimes after they'd gotten them back. So it's
47 a whole system where the users -- the managers can issue
48 the permits out of their Field Stations to the users,
49 it's quick. They issued how many, Merben, in Delta
50 Junction?

1 MR. CEBRIAN: 1,305 in Delta Junction the first
2 time we did the issuing.

3
4 DR. WHEELER: Right. And it was very fast,
5 efficient for the user. They could just come in and get
6 their permits in a matter of minutes as opposed to -- and
7 there were no lines, people were shocked. So Merben is
8 actually a super user of this system, they issued the
9 most per -- the BLM Office issues the most permits. But
10 it's just -- it's a streamlined system. Eventually we're
11 hoping to go to web based harvest reporting, we're not
12 there yet, but I just wanted to give you an update. I
13 know it's not that thrilling, but it is important, you
14 know, as a manager you have to issue permits, you have to
15 have a way of tracking these permits so you can monitor
16 the harvest. Also our analysts when we get proposals in
17 will be able to kind of mess with the data themselves so
18 that they can use that in their proposal analyses. So
19 it's all a way to sort of make our whole system a lot
20 more efficient. We've met with some resistance at some
21 of the Field Stations, they don't want to have to issue
22 the permits, they're not good at being on a computer, but
23 we're getting everybody up to speed slowly but surely.
24 We've dedicated staff specifically to this whole program
25 at the OSM office and they've worked really, really well
26 to get this up and running. So I just wanted to give you
27 a heads-up.

28
29 The other thing is is that we -- our fishery
30 harvest reporting system has been abysmal and we are
31 working to sort of have a fishery reporting system just
32 like our wildlife harvest reporting system. So we'll
33 keep you updated as we move along, but we just wanted to
34 give that update. And if you have any questions about
35 how it's actually used and implemented, like I said
36 Merben's a super user and we can answer questions, we
37 have staff, if you ever have any questions about the
38 system we have staff at OSM, we have a top notch data
39 base manager, designer and other staff that are working
40 on it. So just wanted to give you a heads-up on it.

41
42 Mr. Chair.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Now has this sped up
45 the -- it's sped up the issuing, has it sped up the
46 reporting and the data collection at all?

47
48 MR. ENCELEWSKI: They don't know yet.

49
50 DR. WHEELER: We're in the process, we're --

1 thank you, Greg.

2

3 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Sure.

4

5 DR. WHEELER: Are you working at OSM these days.

6

7 (Laughter)

8

9 DR. WHEELER: No, we.....

10

11 MR. ENCELEWSKI: I got permits, but.....

12

13 DR. WHEELER: You got some permits. We're
14 working on that. The one thing that we do have is it
15 says in our regulation you can't get another permit if
16 you haven't turned in your permit from last year, we have
17 a way of tracking that on-line now, there's certain
18 colors in the data base where people are flagged so if
19 they come in to get a permit they actually can't get a
20 permit until they turn in their data from last year. And
21 we actually did have some citations out at the BLM
22 Office, but enforce -- this isn't for enforcement
23 purposes I will add, it's just for management purposes,
24 but we're tracking things a lot more closely than we
25 have. I will say that in the early years of our program
26 for whatever reason, I think people sort of thought their
27 job was done when they issued the permit, so we're really
28 focused on getting the permits back so that -- because
29 that's what responsible, effective managers do. So
30 that's sort of what we've done with that system.

31

32 Mr. Chair.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Ricky.

35

36 MR. GEASE: You were talking about web based
37 harvest reporting. There's two approaches for a web
38 base, one is your traditional, you go to a web site, you
39 check in, the other one is to give users an application
40 that they can put on phones. Is there any exploration of
41 using an app for iPhones or Smartphones. There are two
42 different ones, they would go into the same data base I
43 would imagine, but it's just a way you would allow mobile
44 users in remote areas not to be tied to a computer which
45 is in a home, but would just be simple, most people -- a
46 lot of people use it for security and protection just to
47 carry a cell phone with them. And it seems like those --
48 that generation of cell phone is becoming more useful.
49 So I was just wondering is there any exploration of doing
50 cell apps or.....

1 DR. WHEELER: Well, if you have AT&T good luck
2 because my experience is AT&T even in Anchorage you can
3 get dropped calls all the time. But I don't know, I'll
4 talk to Roger about that, Roger Dean is our data base
5 manager and we're still working through the finer points
6 of trying to get things going on sort of the traditional
7 system, but I'm sure as things progress if there's an app
8 for that, will be one of our party lines. So we'll look
9 into it.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions on the
12 permit system.

13

14 Greg.

15

16 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I just had a comment,
17 Polly, I didn't want you to think I was laughing at you.
18 But the system in Soldotna isn't quite that fast yet, but
19 they're working on it, it's really good. But I know they
20 had me in there three times and it's pretty neat because
21 you just go in and sit down and they print them right off
22 for you.

23

24 DR. WHEELER: That's just a -- I mean, think part
25 of it is we've done it the same way for a lot of years so
26 bringing change can be kind of scary to people. And
27 we're working through some of the rough spots. We've --
28 like I said we've dedicated staff and said staff will be
29 attentive to these issues out in the Field Stations
30 because that's what we need to do to improve. So I'm
31 glad to hear it's -- some of hiccups are smoothing out.

32

33 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, had me down two times.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any other questions.

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With that, we go on to --
40 I have to turn back, haven't got it memorized. Okay.
41 Tribal and governmental organizations, Native Village of
42 Eyak.

43

44 MR. PALOZKA: Mr. Chair. Members of the RAC.
45 Thank you for time today. My name is Tom Palozka, a
46 travel biologist with NV. I've been working on the
47 fisheries projects there for the past four years and I'm
48 here today to present our 2010 escapement estimate for
49 Chinook salmon on the Copper River.

50

1 We operate our fishwheels from 13 May until 15
2 July and caught a total of 2,348 Chinook of which 1,745
3 were tagged at Baird Canyon, at the lower camp. 917
4 Chinook were caught at the upper camp, just about 10
5 miles south of Chitina with 69 recaptures. With those
6 numbers we came up with an estimate, escapement estimate
7 past the barricade and fishwheels of 22,185 Chinook
8 salmon with a confidence interval of 17,214 to 27,157
9 fish. That's 95 percent confidence.

10
11 As you know the State manages for 24,000, the
12 minimum escapement of Chinook salmon on the Copper River
13 and they're hoping to up that to 26,000 in the future.
14 So based on our estimate we were under escaped this year
15 and that number also doesn't include in-river harvest of
16 fish. Those numbers weren't yet available.

17
18 There's many factors contributing to the low
19 returns. One of which particularly this year and
20 probably going to affect next year, was a hundred year
21 flood in 2006 that affected the out-migration of smote
22 salmon and likely had an impact on the spawning habitat
23 in 2007 brood stock.

24
25 And there's lot of other factors, I just wanted
26 to bring two to your attention that we kind of been
27 looking into more and more is the Bering Sea bycatch in
28 the pollock fishery, the effects of which are not
29 completely understood and known which are likely
30 widespread. And the other one is something Ricky Gease
31 had brought up, is the just the natural cyclic changes in
32 ocean currents and climate of the -- in the Gulf of
33 Alaska.

34
35 And that's about all I have. Any questions.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions. Ricky.

38
39 MR. GEASE: On the '06 flood, what time of season
40 was that and was that matched up with the regular time
41 for smote migration and when is that time?

42
43 MR. PALOZKA: That flood occurred around October,
44 '06 in the mid to late October, I believe. The out-
45 migration would have been a -- not likely occurring, but
46 the affects would probably effect -- effected the out-
47 migration as it occurred later in the year, from November
48 on through March and April. So, yeah.

49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Ricky, I can give you a pretty

1 good example what it did.

2

3 (Laughter)

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Basically it -- basically it
6 straightened a lot of streams out in the Chitina Valley,
7 just flushed them. I mean, flushed them from top to
8 bottom. And so any kind of -- any kind of eggs that you
9 had laid that fall were gone. And the next spring, you
10 know, you wouldn't have had anything out-migrating. You
11 take the Lakinaw River, it built a gravel dam down the
12 Lakinaw River, the Lakinaw literally went underground and
13 so the migration, I think that's what affecting our red
14 salmon on the Lakinaw right now. The migration had no
15 place to go, it just went -- it went -- the water went
16 under the gravel so the fish couldn't go out. And if you
17 go down to the mouth of the Lakinaw River it's a long way
18 from the mouth of the river to the Chitina River now.
19 And it meanders and goes underground and so the amount of
20 gravel was moved up in that country. The Shacinaw was
21 straightened from top to bottom, the Hanageeda was
22 straightened, it washed the dam out on the Tvay and
23 straightened the Tvay out. We lost -- you know, it hit
24 the Tonsina, Bear Creek and that. We lost a lot of fish
25 and a lot of spawning area. And a lot of cover area, the
26 Shacinaw was this was this winding stream with all these
27 nice little deep pools with logs and stuff in it, it's a
28 gravel wash. And the same thing on the Hanageeda, it --
29 the environment's changed drastically and I think we've
30 discovered that the Chitina Valley contributes a lot more
31 king salmon than we ever thought at one time.

32

33 MR. PALOZKA: We also just -- in the river itself
34 at our upper camp, some of our traditional -- not
35 traditional, our past research slates for our wheels are
36 no longer usable and we struggle year to year right now
37 to find those areas that recapture our tagged fish. And
38 that's one of the reasons we had such a low recapture
39 rate this year is the changes in the sinuosity of the
40 river up there and areas that you can actually get a
41 fishwheel in and fish where we're at -- located at.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions.

44

45 Did you do any -- you didn't do radio on
46 steelhead this year, did you?

47

48 MR. PALOZKA: No, we haven't done radio on
49 steelhead, it's been probably seven or eight years and
50 the State was the one doing that. And they had stopped

1 doing that, I don't know if it was -- probably cost
2 reasons, but.....

3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, I think they got the
5 information they wanted out of it. I was just wondering
6 do you keep track of the steelhead that you catch as a
7 bycatch while you're doing the other?

8
9 MR. PALOZKA: We do. We keep track of all our
10 bycatch And incidently this -- the State right now feels
11 that there's only a spring run or a fall run of
12 steelhead, but we feel fresh steelhead as far up as
13 Chitina in May, in late May in our wheels, bright silver
14 fish.

15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fresh run ones.

17
18 MR. PALOZKA: Yeah. So there's likely a small
19 spring run that's largely unknown.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And those wouldn't be fish that
22 over-wintered someplace and then just were making the
23 run?

24
25 MR. PALOZKA: It's a possibility, yeah. But I
26 couldn't say with.....

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And would they stay bright if
29 they stayed in the river over the winter?

30
31 MR. PALOZKA: I wouldn't think so. I can tell
32 you -- just reminded of an observation when the sockeye
33 come in fresh and they're nice and bright. If they get
34 held up and we recapture them several times in our wheels
35 they begin to take on the color of the river and they get
36 that brownish tint to them. So I imagine steelhead would
37 be the same.

38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Ricky.

40
41 MR. GEASE: Just as a -- I don't know if you're
42 aware of it, but there was an effort for National Fish
43 Habitat Partnerships across the country and in Alaska
44 currently right now there are three recognized
45 partnerships and one candidate partnership. The three
46 recognized ones are the Kenai Peninsula Fish Habitat
47 Partnership, the Mat-Su Salmon Partner and the Southwest
48 Alaska Salmon Consortium. The Mat-Su and the Kenai
49 Peninsula and the one that's a candidate is the Anchorage
50 -- Municipality of Anchorage, but this area would be --

1 if you talk about habitat damage there are Federal funds
2 that are available that are matching grants, but for
3 restoration of areas that are damaged either by human
4 impacts, but then also natural impacts. So area where
5 you did have a lot of flood damage and rivers were
6 straightened, there might be potential projects that
7 would go towards that, but I'd encourage you to look at
8 the Fish Habitat Partnership and the Fish Habitat --
9 National Fish Habitat Action Plan. And then a natural
10 area would be the Prince William Sound area plus the
11 watersheds of the Copper River basin.

12

13 MR. GEASE: Definitely.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.

16

17 MS. CAMINER: I think you said minimum escapement
18 was not met?

19

20 MR. PALOZKA: No, we were -- our estimate was
21 22,185 and minimum is 24,000 entering the river.

22

23 MS. CAMINER: So what might the implications be
24 for future and what management actions may have taken
25 place this last year because of that not being met?

26

27 MR. PALOZKA: Management-wise they shut down the
28 dipnet fishery to Chinook harvest then in the Glennallen
29 Subdistrict you have the subsistence fishwheels, but they
30 were not shut down. And there's no way they can
31 selectively harvest sockeye and Chinook with their -- the
32 types of wheels they run there. So that takes a lot more
33 to shut them down. And a sport fishery's on several of
34 the tributaries were largely shut down. I did talk to
35 Mark Somerville and he did not have a sport fish harvest
36 yet for 2010 so I'm not sure what that is.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions.

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, I have one question. Do you
43 feel that the information that was gathered by Eyak was
44 able to be used in in-season management out there on the
45 flats to help do the -- help justify the closures that
46 they did?

47

48 MR. PALOZKA: We share the information and we
49 hope that they do use that in consideration for closures
50 and such on the flats, yes. They do contact us and

1 wonder how our fishwheels are performing specifically --
2 it's mostly at Baird and especially early season because
3 we're usually in before the sonar is in. And that was
4 another factor this year that the river ice and the snow
5 load in the Copper River was pretty extreme, Miles Lake
6 was ice covered until mid May. So and then the ice
7 damming and such, we thought we were preventing a lot of
8 the fish from getting past our wheels, but they never
9 materialized.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And you were kind of expecting
12 a shot when the ice went out then?

13

14 MR. PALOZKA: Yes. Yes, we usually -- that's
15 typically what happens, but it -- we didn't see that this
16 year.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, I was just wondering
19 because I know that they shut the commercial fishery down
20 for Chinook very early and I was hoping that part of that
21 was based on information they were getting from you, you
22 know, from your -- from your study that you guys were
23 doing.

24

25 MR. PALOZKA: Yeah. I don't know directly, but
26 that -- it's a partnership so I assume so.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions.

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

33

34 MR. PALOZKA: Thank you.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: US Fish and Wildlife Service.

37

38 (No comments)

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Nothing more. Come on.

41

42 DR. WHEELER: I can talk.

43

44 (Laughter)

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. US Forest Service.

47

48 MR. ZEMKE: Oh, there's three of us.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I was going to say you guys

1 ought to be able to take -- you're going to be able to
2 take a lot of time.

3

4 MR. BURCHAM: I'll bow out.

5

6 (Laughter)

7

8 MR. KESSLER: Mr. Chair. Council Members. Steve
9 Kessler with the Forest Service. And I'll just kick this
10 off for the Forest Service with sort of a look at the
11 bigger picture. First I wanted to let you know about
12 some of our personnel changes. You probably know Beth
13 Pendleton is our new Regional Forester, she also
14 functions as the Federal Subsistence Board member for the
15 Forest Service and is delegated to be the Secretary of
16 Agriculture for Title VIII of ANILCA. She began I
17 believe it was about last March here. She has a lot of
18 experience in Alaska, she most recently came from being
19 the Deputy Regional Forester in California, but prior to
20 that she had a couple different positions in Juneau with
21 the Forest Service so she's very familiar with Alaska and
22 she's quite familiar with the subsistence program. She
23 replaced Denny Bschor who retired.

24

25 Our Deputy Regional Forester is also new. Her
26 name is Ruth Monnaham, she moved up from the position of
27 the Director for Recreation, Heritage Wilderness and
28 Lands in the Juneau office. So she's quite familiar with
29 Alaska issues also. And she replaces the Deputy Regional
30 Forester, Paul Brewster. He moved over to a position in
31 Research and he is still in Juneau.

32

33 Wini Kessler retired, she was the Director for
34 Wildlife, Fish, Ecology of Watershed and Subsistence.
35 And that position functions as the backup to the Regional
36 Forester and Wayne Owen is the new person in that
37 position and hopefully he'll be coming to one of these
38 meetings in the next years. And Wayne came to us from
39 the Washington office and he's brand new to subsistence
40 and is on a fast learning track.

41

42 Those are sort of the regional changes and for
43 personnel, Steve, I think will talk about some changes on
44 the Chugach.

45

46 I also wanted to let you know a little bit about
47 budget, we had a little bit of discussion earlier on
48 Forest Service budget. Of course we're on this
49 continuing resolution right now so we don't know where
50 budgets will exactly land for fiscal year 2011 which

1 started on October 1st. There was a letter last year,
2 well, earlier this year I guess it would be, that the
3 Southeast Regional Advisory Council wrote to the
4 Secretary of Agriculture through the Federal Subsistence
5 Board expressing concern about the Forest Service budgets
6 for fiscal year 2011. The Secretary of Agriculture
7 responded to the Southeast RAC and said essentially
8 budget level in fiscal year 2011 will be similar to what
9 it was in 2010. I think there was a copy of that
10 actually CC'd to this Council because of the -- this
11 Council's sort of dependence in part on the -- on
12 Agriculture money also. And what that money was is for
13 2010 so we sort of expect for 2011 is a allocation that
14 comes in the Interior and related agencies appropriation
15 bill from Congress and that in 2010 was two and a half
16 million dollars, we expect something like that in 2011.
17 That's what the President's budget request was plus we
18 last year received about 1.3 million additional dollars
19 out of other funds, other Forest Service funds. So what
20 the Secretary's letter says is, you know, expect
21 something similar to that.

22

23 And then there is some expectation that things
24 will change some in 2012, but all of that is sort of up
25 in the air right now until the Congress does what it
26 does.

27

28 And that's all I had sort of from the higher
29 level. And are there any questions for me before we move
30 on to the Chugach?

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions.

33

34 (No comments)

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

37

38 MR. ZEMKE: Okay. Well, Steve Zemke with
39 Supervisor's office in the Chugach Forest and Milo
40 Burcham is our subsistence wildlife biologist here in
41 Cordova as you probably know.

42

43 As far as the personnel, Steve talked about there
44 was changes on the Chugach one as our Forest Supervisor.
45 It's been basically vacant since the beginning of this
46 year, we've had a couple acting in the position, but
47 neither of them didn't -- heavily involved in
48 subsistence, but there is a new Forest Supervisor by the
49 name of Theresa Marcinon is coming and she's probably new
50 to the Forest Service Subsistence Program, she's covering

1 from the South Lake Tahoe, our Lake Tahoe National Forest
2 deals a lot with partnerships and InterAgency workings
3 around the Lake Tahoe issues that they have down there.
4 So she's kind of well involved with partnerships and
5 working cooperatively with people. So though she doesn't
6 have a significant or substantial background on Alaskan
7 issues those -- being able to deal with various agencies
8 and other entities would probably be -- bode her well in
9 kind of dealing with Alaskan issues.

10
11 Also on the Glacier Ranger District we have a new
12 District Ranger there, Tim Sharnon, he's a long time
13 Recreation, Public Services Staff Officer from the
14 Glacier has moved into that position. He's been there I
15 think as that for about a month now.

16
17 So those are probably the two significant
18 personnel changes we've had on the Forest.

19
20 And I guess for the part we'll be discussing --
21 I actually got some white paper just so we could
22 differentiate, we've basically got a summary of kind of
23 the Chugach subsistence activities -- harvest activities.
24 Actually the second page is there's a Cook Inlet Federal
25 Subsistence Fisheries and that's from Doug Palmer,
26 basically detailing kind of the Federal subsistence
27 program. I talk a little bit about it under the first
28 briefing paper, but this a little bit more detailed. And
29 then finally as a -- like a 13 page schedule of proposed
30 actions on the Chugach Forest and most of that's been
31 discussed before though I'll probably touch on a couple
32 of projects that might be of interest to the Council.

33
34 So with that I guess Milo would be, I guess,
35 starting with the Unit 6, kind of the Prince William
36 Sound portion of the Chugach harvest activities.

37
38 MR. BURCHAM: Hello. I'm Milo Burcham with the
39 Cordova Ranger District of the Chugach Forest and I'll
40 just give you a guys a quick update on goings on here on
41 the Cordova Ranger District.

42
43 The biggest issue that we have subsistence-wise
44 is our moose hunt and as Tom alluded to a little bit
45 earlier we got a couple of issues arising here with our
46 moose hunt. It's a super popular hunt and it's one of
47 our major sources of meat here in Cordova. This year
48 there were a total of 33 subsistence permits and 850
49 people put in for those permits. It's a draw hunt which
50 is unusual in the subsistence. And anyway it's very

1 popular in this town and that number of permits that was
2 issued this year was down quite a bit from last year and
3 previous years. And that's where some of our problems
4 are arising. We're a little bit below our population
5 objective of 400 moose, we're probably somewhere between
6 three and 350 right now. But more notably is our
7 bull/cow ratios are quite low. By Fish and Game's own
8 surveys at the end of the season last year or near the
9 end of the season last year we probably had something
10 like 14 bulls per 100 cows which is lower than the State
11 wants to see any of its herds managed at, they want to
12 see them 15 and above and would prefer to see our herd
13 here at 30 to 35 or so. And with those concerns they
14 didn't -- and I started getting comments as soon as the
15 season opened this year and I didn't want to turn a blind
16 eye to those comments and I also don't know how to react
17 to just one person who comes in yelling and saying hey,
18 there's no bulls out there.

19

20 So I actually encouraged people to get together
21 which I think led to this AC meeting that took place this
22 fall and then hearing those concerns we had some money
23 where we could do some flying. I made sure that I got a
24 in-season sex ratio which is something we've never done
25 before, but I was concerned about the reports I was
26 hearing. After conducting my flights I came up with an
27 estimate -- I ended up seeing a total of 150 moose and
28 came up with a bull/cow ratio of approximately 22 bulls
29 per 100 cows which is slightly better than we saw last
30 fall, but still very low. And we went into that meeting
31 with that information and the AC at that -- at this time
32 or at that time decided not to take any action and, you
33 know, not to recommend any in-season closure or earlier
34 closing date for the bull hunt or anything. And so
35 that's where we sit right now. I think we're going to
36 see and I'll be working with Fish and Game to ensure that
37 the quota for next year is a low number so we can recover
38 this herd, we can get the bull numbers back up and also
39 grow the overall herd, you know, back up to 400 or just
40 a little bit over 400 in the future. And we don't have
41 anything to blame but ourselves, I think our quotas have
42 been too high in the last several years. We were well
43 over objective -- we were sitting in a really good place
44 here just a few years ago and I think just overdid it in
45 the last few years. We were issuing over 100 permits
46 just a few years ago. So we got to recover from that and
47 get to -- you know, find our sustainable level from this
48 herd.

49

50 So that's the biggest news I think that has been

1 affecting Cordova subsistence users.

2

3 There's a subsistence potlatch moose permit out
4 there that hasn't been taken yet. There were three
5 designated hunt permits issued for moose this year.

6

7 I've been working hard to increase reporting of
8 mountain goat issuing of permits and also of harvest for
9 subsistence in Unit 6-D which is Prince William Sound.
10 And that's mostly working with Tatitlek and Chenega and
11 I think I've been improving the effort there and getting
12 better reporting. We've issued 10 permits this year
13 between Cordova and Chenega, I haven't heard what
14 Tatitlek has issued yet, but anyway I'm working on that,
15 that's a work in progress. I've heard of two mountain
16 goats taken so far which closed one of our subunits
17 closest to Cordova and two Cordova hunters took the two
18 goats that were reserved in that unit.

19

20 Deer, there's nothing really to report, most of
21 the harvest takes place under State regulations, their
22 bag limit is five. And our customary and traditional
23 determination in Federal regulations is four deer. So
24 for that reason almost all the harvest takes place under
25 State regulations unless there's a shortage which doesn't
26 seem to be indicated right now.

27

28 And then Tim Joyce who had -- who was my
29 counterpart here in Cordova, he ran the fisheries part of
30 subsistence. He's been out of that position for over a
31 year and I've been thanklessly filling in for him for
32 over -- for that whole time now. And this year we've
33 issued 52 subsistence fishery permits for the Copper
34 River Delta, that's more than has been issued in the
35 past. Those permits aren't due to be returned until the
36 end of the year so I don't really have a good report of
37 fish harvested so far. I think I've seen 15 permits come
38 back and they reported 23 coho taken from the delta which
39 doesn't seem like much, but there's a lot more permits
40 that are out there to be returned yet.

41

42 And otherwise I don't have anything else to
43 report. Steve, do you want to go and then we'll take
44 questions?

45

46 MR. ZEMKE: Would you prefer that, Mr. Chair. Go
47 on with the report and then take.....

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Go on with your report.....

50

1 MR. ZEMKE: Okay.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:and then we'll ask
4 questions of both of them.

5

6 MR. ZEMKE: Okay. I'll talk more -- mostly about
7 Unit 7 which is the Eastern Kenai Peninsula on the
8 Chugach Forest. The three activities that you've
9 probably been most involved with are the Unit 7 moose
10 hunt and that's been second year in effect in 2010.
11 Currently there's been 30 permits issued for that, for
12 residents of Hope and Cooper Landing and the report of
13 harvest so far is two moose during that first season.
14 And that doesn't include Ninilchik which is actually a
15 hunt that's on Fish and Wildlife refuge and it's a
16 separate hunt. But I think those numbers are about 45
17 permits and there's been four moose harvested from that,
18 at least according to the new wildlife permit data base,
19 that's where those -- you can get those numbers from.

20

21 As far as the Unit 7 both the moose harvested so
22 far have been from residents of Hope. Cooper Landing
23 which had C&T last year didn't harvest any moose from
24 that hunt either and this year they still haven't
25 harvested any. So I'm not sure what's going on there.

26

27 Though there is a late season hunt for residents
28 of Cooper Landing, but not Hope, and that's for the Unit
29 15-B area over east of Tustumena Lake. And that will run
30 from -- just starting on October 20th and runs through
31 November 10th.

32

33 Another hunt that the Council just passed this
34 last year is the Unit 7 caribou hunt, kind of
35 Resurrection Creek is kind of where the center is.
36 Currently the residents of Hope qualify for that, there's
37 been 15 permits issued for that hunt and there's been two
38 reported harvested so far. That hunt has both a -- kind
39 of a three day report time for -- the have to phone in to
40 be able to report that so that we can administer the
41 quota of five total caribou harvested which was the
42 recommendation of the Council that was passed by the
43 Board. And that season runs through December 31st.
44 There hasn't been any harvest for over a month, I would
45 anticipate maybe some harvest a little further on in the
46 season when people can maybe get snowmachine access to
47 some of the areas, though the access isn't still good
48 with snowmachines at least where the caribou are over-
49 winter, high on the ridges.

50

1 The last one of the hunt or the permits is the
2 subsistence Russian River Falls I call it, subsistence
3 permit fishery. And currently we had -- we got 64 Cooper
4 Landing household permits issued and then there's about
5 148 people on the permits, including the permit holder
6 and then additional household members. And they've
7 harvested 562 sockeye at the Falls and that season
8 closed August 15th. And so those are reported though the
9 reports haven't been turned in yet and so there may be
10 some more sockeye harvest report, but those have been
11 taken under sport or rod and reel methods which they
12 don't have to turn in that until December 31st.

13

14 Likewise there's been 21 Hope resident household
15 permits issued with 69 total qualified fishers on the
16 permit. And they harvested 161 sockeye to date.

17

18 For those permits we actually had meetings in
19 both Hope and Cooper Landing to try to expedite getting
20 permits right out to the people. We have two sets of
21 fishery permit meetings and then two sets of wildlife
22 permit meetings so that people didn't have to come in
23 Moose Pass or Anchorage to get their permits, we -- they
24 could just go right into the community. That works well
25 for them that way, but it doesn't work well for the new
26 wildlife permit data base because we don't have web
27 access at the Cooper Landing Community Center or at the
28 Hope Community Center and so we can't issue those on-line
29 though the permit system works better, we basically have
30 a unique set of numbers that we can issue the permit then
31 and when we get back to the office enter it, so it works
32 well that way though we haven't quite got into the digit
33 or the electronic age to be able to issue them directly
34 out on site.

35

36 Moving on, the next page you'll see the Cook
37 Inlet Federal Subsistence Fisheries, 2010 summary and
38 that's kind of summary that Doug Palmer sent to me last
39 Friday. And basically the numbers are the same thing
40 except for an addition of Ninilchik's reporting there
41 where there was 30 permits issued for the Kenai River and
42 they've harvested a total of 10 sockeye salmon. So
43 Ninilchik isn't a big user of the Kenai River drainages,
44 it's understandable, they'd be using Kasilof.

45

46 They did look at -- they did construct a
47 fishwheel there and it was only on site for about five
48 days and closed down. So I think that's kind of a work
49 in progress and I think in future years they'll be some
50 more interesting details on that.

1 And then kind of moving on, finally go to the
2 schedule of proposed actions. There's -- it's a 13 page
3 document basically kind of iterates kind of what the
4 Forest Service anticipates kind of environmental actions
5 that are coming up. I won't kind of iterate the 40 some
6 plus projects, but probably the cupful. It's kind of
7 organized as the first page is kind of two general
8 nationwide projects that may or may not affect the
9 Chugach Forest. And then after that the projects are
10 ordered by the Cordova Ranger District, Glacier and
11 Seward. And kind of the projects that you might be most
12 interested in are kind of the fisheries or wildlife
13 habitat proposals. And they -- if you look at the table,
14 it'll talk about the project name, kind of a project
15 purpose, kind of a planning status, where the decision is
16 and expected implementation and then probably a very
17 important column is the project contact would have a
18 name, a phone number and a email contact if you want to
19 get directly involved. Again there's kind of the -- for
20 subsistence there's kind of the general fisheries habitat
21 improvements. A lot of those on this one are kind of a
22 backlog of maintenance projects that were done in Prince
23 William Sound, a lot of the fisheries, fishways that
24 we're say at Otter Creek or Salt Lake and some of the
25 others that have kind of fallen not into disrepair, but
26 they have a cycle of maintenance and they're kind of due
27 up. And so those are kind of on-line for the next couple
28 years.

29
30 One of the other ones I know the Council's been
31 interested in in the past are kind of special use permits
32 and there aren't any big ones specifically coming up
33 here, but there's kind of a continual re-up of existing
34 permits and though there are probably some others that
35 are potentially coming on-line and Bruce Campbell on the
36 Cordova Ranger District is probably the primary contact
37 if you need to get involved -- you know, if you have
38 questions on that.

39
40 And then kind of the last one I'd like to iterate
41 is the Russian or not the Russian, the Resurrection Creek
42 II project. And I know Ricky Gease had talked about kind
43 of the National Partnerships Program and that's one that
44 is potentially coming up. And there was a Resurrection
45 Creek I project that was completed and it's been -- you
46 know, it was constructed in 2008, 2009 and '10 and it's
47 worked very well and it may be something that if the
48 Council would -- if they have a summer or spring or fall
49 trip planned and seeing the Anchorage area and being able
50 to get out and take a look at that would be a very good

1 project to look at, what actual kind of large scale
2 restoration can help and as Resurrection II is kind of a
3 continuation of that project. There's another one on
4 Dave's Creek, it's a small fisheries project -- or not
5 small, but a fisheries project that's on the Quartz Creek
6 drainage which drains into Kenai Lake, it's right next to
7 the river. That could be another one that people could
8 take -- the Council could take a look at.

9

10 So if the Council is interested in being able to
11 take a look at those sites, we could probably work to be
12 able to make that happen.

13

14 So with that I guess we're -- that's all I have
15 right now and I guess if there's other things that you
16 might -- questions, we're available right now.

17

18 Steve, did you any other thing that you needed to
19 say?

20

21 MR. KESSLER: Well, I had one other, Mr.
22 Chairman. Just to follow-up with Steve on the Unit 7
23 caribou, I went with Steve to Hope to help issue those
24 permits. And one of the members of the public that was
25 there just expressed how appreciative he was of the
26 Council and how responsive he thought the Federal
27 subsistence process was in order to so quickly get that
28 caribou opportunity on-line there. And he was truly
29 amazed and I think he was one of the proponents of that
30 caribou hunt. It's a situation where it was very
31 unlikely to draw a permit through the State process and
32 now through the Federal permit process he can probably
33 get a caribou every year. So very appreciative of it.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Steve. Just a
36 question on that caribou one. And I notice it goes to
37 December 31st. How much more -- if I remember right most
38 of that country was even pretty hard to get a snowmachine
39 in to. I was just wondering how much accessible is it as
40 winter goes on?

41

42 MR. ZEMKE: Mr. Chair. It does become somewhat
43 more accessible, you can -- for subsistence purposes you
44 can snowmachines. So depending on the snow conditions
45 and normally we don't get sufficient snow depth probably
46 until about December 1st to be able to get access up into
47 that country without significant resource damage because
48 you do have to go through quite a bit of lowland country
49 to get up in the higher areas. But once you get out of
50 the kind of lowland valleys it really does keep steep,

1 it's very avalanche prone and so to be able to access
2 areas where the caribou are it's -- becomes even more
3 difficult during the wintertime to get there. You know,
4 there's some other potentials to land aircraft on some of
5 the ridges or float planes in a couple of the larger
6 lakes there, but most of the subsistence users don't have
7 that opportunity. So it -- I would anticipate some more
8 ease of access, but again we're probably only dealing
9 about that one month period and so I anticipate maybe
10 some more harvest, but probably that's maybe why there's
11 not much activity right at the moment.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now that's the same area where
14 the caribou were caught in that big slide, isn't it kind
15 of? It's not?

16

17 MR. ZEMKE: No, that is kind of the Tustumena
18 Herd, that country there and this is the Kenai Mountains
19 Herd so they actually are two separate herds and there
20 isn't currently a subsistence hunt on that portion of the
21 caribou herd.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions. Ricky.

24

25 MR. GEASE: I understand Rob Spangler is leaving
26 and he kind of head up the large scale restoration ones
27 on the Resurrection and on Dave's Creek. He had
28 mentioned something about potentially doing Cooper Creek,
29 the lower section of Cooper Creek. Do you have any ideas
30 who's backfilling his position and then would they have
31 any plans to put in projects for Cooper Creek
32 restoration?

33

34 MR. ZEMKE: Yes, Rob Spangler is leaving I think
35 January 3rd or so, but Bill McFarland, our hydrologist,
36 would be kind of the main contact for those large
37 projects. And Cooper Creek is kind of in the planning
38 stage, I would assume it would show up on the SOPA (ph)
39 list kind of upcoming relatively soon. The Resurrection
40 II project, you probably know it was looked at trying to
41 get done this summer, at least started, but it got kind
42 of held up in our roadless area review at the Washington
43 office and wasn't -- didn't -- wasn't able to get
44 expedited through quickly enough to be able to let a
45 large contract. And so it had the American Restoration
46 Recovery Act funds earmarked for it, but those languished
47 when it couldn't get that approval for operation in
48 roadless area. But Cooper Creek is in the planning
49 stages and both the -- kind of the FERC, the Federal --
50 or the Cooper Lake portion of it, about kind of the

1 watershed restoration portion of it there, and then also
2 the act of restoration of this -- the slide and some of
3 the banks in the lower area are -- would be upcoming.
4 Again as you mentioned kind of the large scale National
5 Partnerships, that would be one that probably would be
6 proposed through that process, that the Forest Service
7 would be looking for active partners in both of those
8 large scale projects.

9

10 MR. GEASE: I just want to commend the Forest
11 Service for bringing those large scale projects to the
12 Kenai Peninsula. And if you haven't gone and seen that
13 I encourage Council members to because when you're
14 talking about 100 year floods or large scale damaged
15 systems, these are project ideas and examples of large
16 scale restoration on miles of river and restoring access
17 to anadromous populations for spawning and rearing.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Out of curiosity what was the
20 original damage to that part of that river, was it floods
21 or mining or what?

22

23 MR. GEASE: Mining.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mining.

26

27 MR. ZEMKE: Yeah, it was large scale placer
28 mining. At the turn of the century the community of Hope
29 was over 10,000 active miners and they basically turned
30 over almost every rock and that water valley has a lot of
31 -- I think they had hydrologic dredge mining going
32 through there and so this one -- there's tailing piles
33 kind of from one valley wall to the other valley wall.
34 One of the things they did look at was kind of old aerial
35 photos and they could kind of take a look and see what
36 the old channel looked like, there was still some
37 semblance of that, particularly from those earlier aerial
38 photos and they were able to try to fit that back in to
39 that natural sinuosity and then also add large habitat
40 complex features such as long wood, not just a log or
41 two, but large log jams and then large rocks and kind of
42 intertie the whole system and create off channel habitat
43 like was there before. And so there was almost immediate
44 response with coho and Chinook salmon as well as pinks in
45 that system.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.

48

49 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah, thanks. I got a couple
50 questions. Milo, Steve, whoever wants to answer that

1 would be fine. In regards to some of these projects I
2 was looking through there, one of the discussions we had
3 at the last Advisory Committee meeting when we were
4 talking about this -- the subsistence moose hunt out here
5 was the idea that a carrying capacity study is seriously
6 needed for Unit 6-C. And I don't remember the details,
7 Milo, maybe you could bring those up, there was some
8 discussion at least with the people here in town that,
9 you know, they would like to see that, the State would
10 also like to see that, obviously it's a funding
11 consideration, possibly a Ph.D. student or something like
12 that, but it is a crucial piece of information that we
13 don't have. And the people of Cordova would desperately
14 like to have a new carrying capacity study because there
15 is some debate I think between the State and Forest
16 Service biologists and people in town that have some
17 background in this field to what really is the amount of
18 moose that this particular area can handle, you know,
19 from mild to severe winters. And correct me if I'm
20 wrong, Milo, but the last carrying capacity study that
21 we're basically basing the moose population management
22 objective from is -- was done in the mid '80s I believe.
23 So we're talking about significant habitat changes on
24 this side of 27 Mile that have occurred in the last 25
25 years that have totally changed the way that the --
26 personally what I feel, I feel that the carrying capacity
27 of the level of moose that is sustainable could be
28 managed at a higher level. But understandably the State
29 is reluctant to do that because they base -- and, you
30 know, also the Forest Service biologists because they
31 really only have this information to go off of. And I
32 was just curious what does it take to get one of these
33 projects put on this list and do we need to ask for it,
34 does the -- do the people of Cordova need to ask for it,
35 what's the timeline, what's the proper framework to do
36 that?

37

38 MR. BURCHAM: I'll start. Yeah, thanks for the
39 question, Tom. I guess for starters money to go to a --
40 we are -- the Forest Service is trying to find money to
41 do a carrying capacity study right now and one of the
42 places, you know, Tim Joyce has talked about looking is
43 to subsistence and I think that would have to go through
44 the Wildlife Resource Monitoring, you know, money, and
45 that's where I would ask you Steve, you might be more
46 familiar with that process and where the dollars are for
47 that right now.

48

49 Right now we're -- the State, you know, the local
50 Advisory Committee and the Forest Service are working

1 with data, I think it's from the '90s, that estimated the
2 carrying capacity, you know, from -- based on research at
3 between 400 and like 1,200 animals. It's a wide range,
4 but the lower end being during a severe winter and the
5 higher end being mild winters. And the thought of us
6 grasping at 400 for a population objective is that we
7 don't want to see a lot die off, you know, during severe
8 winters. So that's where we are right now and I think
9 that leaves some latitude to change, you know, through
10 the process or management plan and manage for a different
11 number of animals. So I think we already have some
12 latitude to take that and I think we've seen the
13 population at 400 without major resource damage and
14 possibly with some areas, you know, that show high
15 density in the wintertime, but still with some
16 opportunity for -- you know, to carry more moose through
17 the winter. So I think that's also in the talks, you
18 know, for right now and I think it's probably something
19 we'll see within a relatively short time.

20

21 So with that I'll ask you, Steve, or either of
22 you to respond to the money available.

23

24 MR. ZEMKE: Certainly. Well, there's a couple
25 things. One is there have been some body fat contents
26 studies done relatively recently and that gives you a
27 semblance of at least the vitality of the herd, about
28 whether or not it's over grazing its resource and it
29 appears that it isn't the case right now. But you say
30 like we probably need to go beyond that. As Steve
31 Kessler talked about there's, you know, major reduction
32 in funds and in 2009 we had a wildlife monitoring system
33 in place that we're looking at starting to put a call for
34 proposals out, but basically we -- the funding issue hit
35 and actually that was canceled because of that. And then
36 in 2010 that might have a major issue. So right now we
37 probably don't have sufficient funds to be able to deal
38 directly with that issue. I think Milo talked at the end
39 of this fiscal year we had some -- enough money to do
40 some extra aerial flights, but not any kind of large
41 scale research project. But in the future I'd say in
42 2000 [sic], this fiscal year we probably aren't dealing
43 again with a call for proposals for the Wildlife
44 Monitoring portion of it, maybe in 2012 if budgets are
45 restored that might be a significant item that you want
46 to deal with. And certainly if the Council thinks that
47 a significant issue, information gap that needs to be
48 addressed, having it formally in a -- in your letter and
49 asking the Forest Service to conduct that would certainly
50 provide kind of focus for the Forest Service to say this

1 is important information research or monitoring that
2 needs to be done to answer a significant question that
3 direct -- relates directly to an important subsistence
4 hunt.

5
6 MR. CARPENTER: Right. I guess -- I mean, that's
7 kind of the explanation I thought I would get and thank
8 you for that. You know, the only thing that -- and I
9 understand that, you know, money is the root of all evil,
10 right, but the way you get the most information. But
11 some of the projects that you have listed here, at least
12 in the area around Cordova, none of them have to do with
13 subsistence, at least the projects that are on your sheet
14 here. And I guess does it necessarily have to come out
15 of the wildlife funding portion of it or is it something
16 that is important enough to the Cordova Ranger District
17 that there could be money allocated to a study like this
18 for a subsistence project which is not just for
19 subsistence, it's for -- it's a carrying capacity study
20 for the benefit of everyone as a whole. Instead of --
21 could it be taken from the Forest Service dollars from
22 another area and the project be conducted that way?

23
24 MR. BURCHAM: Yeah, and I think there's a
25 shortfall there too. I mean, the District or the Forest
26 does get wildlife money that's, you know, separate from
27 subsistence money and Tim Joyce heads up the District's
28 wildlife program now and he asked me to come here and
29 talk with these guys and see what there was and I think
30 you got that answer, he's having a hard time coming up
31 with the money to fund it, but that is something they're
32 trying to fund right now.

33
34 MR. CARPENTER: Okay.

35
36 MR. BURCHAM: So there is work being done there
37 to get the money to do it.

38
39 MR. CARPENTER: Okay.

40
41 MR. BURCHAM. And I think -- sounds like you've
42 talked to Tim Joyce and.....

43
44 MR. CARPENTER: Oh, I've talked to everybody, I
45 mean, I just wanted to bring this to the Forest side of
46 everybody.....

47
48 MR. BURCHAM: Yeah.

49
50 MR. CARPENTER:it -- because this is kind

1 of a regional meeting, but this a very big concern and
2 this is something that is a very high priority for the
3 people that live in this area. And I wanted everyone at
4 the Forest Service to know what our concerns was, just
5 not Milo.

6
7 MR. BURCHAM: And it a concern with the wildlife
8 program in general, you know apart from subsistence and
9 that's where money for the hydroax (ph), you know, to
10 improve habitat and sort of, you know, increase willow
11 browse on the delta is occurring is through our wildlife
12 program. So we are aware and trying to do things for
13 moose.

14
15 MR. KESSLER: I know this maybe a little bit too
16 detailed, but under Federal appropriation law, there was
17 a split of what we were allowed to do with subsistence
18 dollars versus our regular wildlife and fish dollars and
19 until this last year it was an absolute split so we would
20 only be allowed to use subsistence dollars for that type
21 of work. Because of what happened to our subsistence
22 dollars, some of the language got changed so that now we
23 actually do have more flexibility. The only problem is
24 as these guys have mentioned is that subsistence dollars
25 are down and the wildlife and fish dollars and down. And
26 so it's problematic, but we do have a little bit more
27 flexibility than we used to have to try and, you know,
28 finesse these types of projects.

29
30 MR. CARPENTER: Just one more question. This
31 would be more directed at Milo. In regards to -- you
32 said you'd been doing some work on trying to get the
33 permits that had been issued, like say to Tatitlek or
34 Chenega for these subsistence goat hunts. What
35 percentage do you say on a yearly basis, what amount of
36 permit information do you get returned to you, if you
37 issue 20 tags how many of them actually return the.....

38
39 MR. BURCHAM: Actually for the permits that get
40 issued, I'm generally getting everything back, you know,
41 a hunt report back showing very little harvest in
42 general. Whether that represents the, you know, total
43 number of goats that are really taken, I don't know. But
44 anyway that's what I'm -- I'm trying to increase the
45 numbers of tags that are issued, and it's just hard to
46 communicate with those villages, you know, with once
47 yearly visits.....

48
49 MR. CARPENTER: Sure.
50

1 MR. BURCHAM: which is what I'm doing,
2 flying out and meeting with people and trying to stress
3 the importance of recording their harvest and showing
4 their interest in the subsistence program, lest it be
5 taken away. You know, the State could see, you know,
6 these 17 permits in Prince William Sound going unused and
7 ask to get those, you know, allocated to outfitters and
8 guides which fill their quotas very quickly is why we
9 have this in the first place. So anyway I stress, I
10 continue to stress the importance of documenting their
11 harvest in the subsistence program and it's a little bit
12 of an uphill battle, but I think it's improving each
13 year. And yeah, I'm just going to keep working at it.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.

16
17 MS. CAMINER: Well, I'd certainly like to follow-
18 up on the suggestion that this Council either in our
19 annual report or perhaps at the next meeting, but that we
20 follow this issue closely because it does sound like a
21 very low ratio here and I guess we probably want to know
22 whether Fish or Game or Forest Service or the Board
23 intend to maybe take some further action on it.

24
25 MR. BURCHAM: It is something that we'll be
26 working hard with. I have to say that up until this
27 point I have gone along with Fish and Game's
28 recommendation on the number of moose to be, you know,
29 taken. And I think it's been a pretty aggressive --
30 well, I think it became aggressive when we had our
31 population peak, when we were well over objective and I
32 saw the numbers that the State used and saw where he was
33 going with it and it seemed to make sense at the time,
34 but I think seeing that same information if was up solely
35 to me I probably wouldn't have issued as many tags which
36 might not have got us here so fast, but I will be working
37 really closely with Dave Crawley here this year and make
38 sure that our quota for this coming season is
39 conservative, we're back in a situation where we not only
40 have to improve the bull/cow ration, but we also have to
41 grow the herd back up to 400 or above and I just want to
42 make sure that we're careful, I'd rather fix it sooner
43 than later. And I think we're going to have to just talk
44 more going in -- into the near future. In fact, our
45 subsistence applications will be out if not in November
46 in December, I forget what I said, but our drawing's
47 taking place earlier this year than it has to match the
48 State drawing period. And so those numbers will have to
49 be firmed up here in the next few months.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I have only one question and I
2 don't know if anybody can answer that and maybe Greg can.
3 I see that the fishwheel only got in for five days, but
4 it didn't catch any fish. Was that because of problems
5 with the fishwheel or location?
6

7 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Kind of location, but now I
8 could answer the fishwheel just got built this year, they
9 got it -- they completed it kind of late. I don't have
10 pictures or details on it, but got done kind of toward
11 the end part of July I believe. And then they got it in
12 and from my reports, I mean, I was commercial fishing,
13 but they did fish it a couple times, they didn't get it
14 in the right location and I believe they still had it in
15 slack water. And they ended up pulling it out fairly
16 early. But it's a very nice looking fishwheel, very well
17 built I think and I think it'll work, but we'll probably
18 want to put permits back in for our proposals for nets,
19 they work better.
20

21 (Laughter)
22

23 MR. ZEMKE: Yeah, Mr. Chair. I'm sure Doug
24 Palmer will probably be at the next meeting and he
25 probably has some pictures and that. They -- I've seen
26 the pictures and it is a well constructed fishwheel. And
27 so at the same time I think it was constructed very late
28 in the season and that they were -- got to the point
29 where they just wanted to kind of get in the river to see
30 how it worked rather than -- since it was like middle of
31 July, fishway -- the run was pretty much over and the
32 people probably had most of the fish that they needed at
33 the time. And so it was more about kind of seeing how
34 the process worked and trying to look at least some
35 locations that were good fishing sites.
36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, it's kind of interesting
38 because if you go down the Chitina you see some very well
39 constructed fishwheels, you'd see some extremely well
40 constructed fishwheels, you get some that you can't even
41 understand how they work and they're the ones catching
42 fish. I can remember a couple years ago I went there and
43 this was this little, dinky fishwheel, you didn't even
44 hardly think it would float and it's right between two of
45 these big fancy ones and the two big fancy ones weren't
46 catching anything and they were catching fish hand over
47 fist in it, you know. So I was just wondering if it was
48 location, location, location or if it was -- if you had
49 problems with the fishwheel itself.
50

1 MR. GEASE: Quick question.
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We'll find out in the future.
4
5 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, we'll find out in the
6 future because it really was fished very little and
7 that's not no elaborate one, it was actually a picture,
8 a photo I took off of one in Chitina.
9
10 (Laughter)
11
12 MR. ENCELEWSKI: And then I had an engineer give
13 me a parts list.
14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, I thought maybe you took the
16 picture off the one in Chitina and posted it and said
17 this is the one that we don't.....
18
19 (Laughter)
20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Man, there were a couple in
22 Chitina this year that looked like.....
23
24 MR. GEASE: A quick question. You -- somebody
25 had mentioned that there was some difficulties in Cooper
26 Landing give out permits versus Moose Pass?
27
28 MR. ZEMKE: I'm not sure, I think the difference
29 was that when we actually were issuing permits we
30 couldn't use the new electronic issuing system since
31 there wasn't internet access at the community site.
32 So.....
33
34 MR. GEASE: In Cooper Landing there wasn't
35 internet or what?
36
37 MR. ZEMKE: That's correct. Or either of those
38 sites. And so we issued with a hard copy permit and then
39 came back to the office and electronically entered into
40 the data base.
41
42 MR. GEASE: Okay.
43
44 MR. ZEMKE: So they got -- the permit holders got
45 their permit and report and harvest ticket right at the
46 site.
47
48 MR. GEASE: If I can, can I give a shameless plug
49 or is that against regulation.
50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Give a what?
2
3 MR. GEASE: Can I give a shameless plug.....
4
5 (Laughter)
6
7 MR. GEASE:or is that against regulations.
8 Myfi, they're mobile and you can take those units and so
9 in Hope and Cooper Landing you can actually -- there is
10 mobile internet access now that you can do. They're
11 pretty inexpensive too, they're only like 40 bucks and
12 that's like.....
13
14 MR. ZEMKE: One of the other problems we had were
15 we're probably going to need get some dedicated printers
16 for the system. And we don't need a really expensive
17 one, but we need to have one available so that when we're
18 issuing a permit somebody else doesn't cue up with a
19 permit or a document and at the same time print that on
20 top of our permits. It's just kind of a learning
21 experience as we grow into this system and understand
22 some of those. And the idea about Wi-Fi access at Hope
23 and Cooper Landing at those sites, we -- yeah, with the
24 plug in card it seems reasonable. But when we got to the
25 system it was kind of well, we wanted to make sure we
26 were failsafe and that we could actually get it done
27 rather than have to deal with newer technology. But
28 maybe going to those sites early and just trying to make
29 sure that they work and use that system seems to be a
30 positive step we could take.
31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for the
33 Forest Service.
34
35 MR. ENCELEWSKI: I got one question, Mr.
36 Chairman.
37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, Greg.
39
40 MR. ENCELEWSKI: It's for Milo. Do you guys have
41 predator problems here on the moose or bears, wolves, I
42 know -- or anything like that?
43
44 MR. BURCHAM: We do, but on this side of the
45 Copper River where road access and airboat access is very
46 good, wolves are almost nonexistent and there are brown
47 bears, but probably slightly reduced because of the
48 hunting pressure. So predators aren't a big problem on
49 this side of the Copper River which is where the
50 subsistence hunt takes place. There are definitely

1 established wolf packs on the other side of the Copper
2 River and probably higher brown bear densities and I'm
3 sure that plays in. But this problem that I'm talking
4 about with, you know, lower bull numbers and a low
5 bull/cow ratios is strictly human caused in this instance
6 and I don't think it has much to do with predation.

7
8 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Thank you. Yeah, we have
9 human cause, we have bears, wolves and Doug Blossom.

10
11 (Laughter)

12
13 MR. BURCHAM: We have airboats.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I was going to say we have the
16 equipment that Doug Blossom has.

17
18 (Laughter)

19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But wolves don't seem to last a
21 long time on this side of the river, they come over, but
22 they don't seem to last a long time.

23
24 (Laughter)

25
26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But on the other side of the
27 river we have some pretty good healthy packs, really good
28 healthy packs.

29
30 But anyhow no other questions for the Forest
31 Service.

32
33 Let's take a break.

34
35 MR. BURCHAM: I've got one shameless plug since
36 you started it. If you guys are looking for
37 entertainment tonight, 7:00 o'clock the Prince William
38 Sound Autobahn meeting is in the Forest Service which is
39 just a block up and block over is the -- you might know
40 where the building is. I happen to be doing the
41 presentation. It's.....

42
43 (Laughter)

44
45 MR. BURCHAM:the other hat that I wear is
46 a wildlife photographer, it's my other obsession in life
47 and I'm going to be giving a presentation on wildlife in
48 Denali. So you're all welcome to come to that after
49 Ralph's place.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Break time. Ten minutes.

2

3 (Off record)

4

5 (On record)

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. At this point in time we
8 have Wrangell-St. Elias National Park or the National
9 Park Service, I guess.

10

11 MR. VEACH: Mr. Chairman.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, I skipped somebody. Is the
14 Fish and Game here?

15

16 MR. PAPPAS: No report.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No report from the Fish and
19 Game. Okay. And are you going to fill us in a little
20 bit later on who won that Ninth Circuit case, were you
21 the one that was going to volunteer on that one?

22

23 (Laughter)

24

25 MR. PAPPAS: No, that was.....

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

28

29 MR. VEACH: Mr. Chairman. Regional Advisory
30 Council Members. For the record my name is Eric Veach,
31 I'm the chief of natural and cultural resources at
32 Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve. It's been
33 a few years since I've had an opportunity to attend a
34 Southcentral meeting, but it's good to be back here today
35 and I enjoy seeing all of you again.

36

37 The first item we'd like to provide an update on
38 is the management plan for the Chisana Caribou Herd.
39 You've been briefed on this management plan at your last
40 meeting and my understanding is there was quite a bit of
41 discussion about it at that time, but I'll give you just
42 a really brief synopsis to kind of remind you about the
43 issue and then I'd like to just give an update on where
44 we're at.

45

46 The Chisana Caribou Herd is a small herd, it
47 occurs essentially entirely in Wrangell-St. Elias
48 National Park and Preserve when it's on the Alaska side
49 of the border. It is a transboundary or international
50 herd, it crosses over into the Yukon. And in 2009 we and

1 a number of partners that include the Yukon government,
2 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, White River First
3 Nation, the Kluane First Nation and the U.S. Fish and
4 Wildlife Service began drafting a five year management
5 plan for this herd. And at this point the plan is still
6 draft. Since your last meeting we've put it out for
7 public comments, we've had a couple of public meetings,
8 one in Slana and one in Tok. The one in Tok was well
9 attended. We've gotten a lot of really good public
10 comments on this. We've also solicited comments through
11 a variety of sources, we certainly got a number of email
12 comments. As I said the public meeting in Tok was well
13 attended, we've gotten a lot of information, including
14 some traditional ecological knowledge about the herd,
15 also some suggestions to potentially set some sort of a
16 minimum threshold number for the herd.

17
18 On the Canadian side they're a little bit behind
19 the Alaska side in the process. The Yukon Fish and
20 Wildlife Board is meeting -- my understanding is it's
21 meeting right now and this plan is being presented to
22 them. And it'll be open for public comment on the Yukon
23 side for about 60 days. So by mid December the folks in
24 the Yukon expect to have their public consultation
25 wrapped up. And at that point we hope to get back
26 together as a working group and kind of summarize the
27 public comments and make the appropriate changes to the
28 plan.

29
30 A couple of other things I wanted to mention.
31 The plan calls for a census in the fall of 2010 and that
32 was just completed last week. I don't have any of the
33 numbers for you at this point, I mean, it was literally
34 just completed, but it was completed both on the Alaska
35 side and the Yukon side. And then I might just mention
36 as well that, you know, this is also an issue for the
37 Eastern Interior Council and they've been paying very
38 close attention to it. And my understanding is last week
39 the Eastern Interior Council did pass a resolution to
40 support the planning process.

41
42 So that's really what I have for you for an
43 update at this point and at this point I'd pause and I'd
44 be happy to take any questions you might have on the
45 Chisana Caribou Herd Management Plan.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Just a question. When you're
48 talking a management plan are you talking a recovery
49 management plan or are you talking a harvest management
50 plan or just a combination of the two or what?

1 MR. VEACH: What this plan really does is it
2 recommends a number of actions and this is essentially
3 what I would almost think of as sort of affected
4 landowners by this plan. They're basically agreeing to
5 cooperate and it's a number of recommendations on things
6 that these agencies will cooperate and work together on.
7 And so that includes -- let me just kind of run through
8 the recommendations of the plan here just really briefly.

9
10
11 So one of the objectives is population
12 monitoring. There is a section on harvest and basically
13 the objective here is to cooperatively manage harvest of
14 the Chisana Caribou Herd with Yukon and Alaska management
15 authorities to maintain a stable or increasing
16 population. And so, you know, independently neither the
17 Park Service nor Fish and Wildlife Service nor ADF&G
18 actually has the authority to just simply go ahead and
19 open a harvest on this herd. What this plan would do is
20 it would recommend a harvest strategy both to the Alaska
21 Board of Game and to the Federal Subsistence Board. Now
22 in the case of the Alaska Board of Game, they met last
23 spring and they do have a regulation that they've adopted
24 now to open a harvest on this herd. You deliberated a
25 proposal at your last meeting and the Board's position
26 was to defer action on that proposal at this time. So
27 there hasn't been any action taken by the Federal Board
28 for harvest.

29
30 Let me go on with some of the other
31 recommendations of the plan. It also talks about better
32 understanding of habitat. It talks about essentially
33 obtaining more current information on predators within
34 the Chisana Caribou Herd range and then it also talks
35 about research. And so those are things that again that,
36 you know that the cooperators are such -- you know,
37 they're making recommendations and where they can agree
38 to work together, we're essentially agreeing to work
39 together on the plan.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What was their section on
42 harvest, what did that entail on what you have right
43 there?

44
45 MR. VEACH: The plan at this point recommends a
46 conservative harvest, a bulls only harvest that is 2
47 percent if the population of the herd. So right now the
48 herd is at about 700 animals and the plan recommends a
49 harvest of about 15 animals, total between the two
50 counties. Essentially it recommends splitting those

1 animals evenly between Alaska and the Yukon so
2 essentially you'd have the opportunity to harvest about
3 7 animals either in Alaska or in the Yukon.

4
5 MR. CARPENTER: is it drawing, do they want to
6 have a drawing hunt?

7
8 MR. VEACH: Well, that's not specifically
9 addressed in the plan, however that is the proposal that
10 you saw the last time around, would be a joint State and
11 Federal draw hunt.

12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So what the plan does is
14 addresses what they would consider conservative harvest
15 levels.

16
17 MR. VEACH: Exactly. And, you know, one message
18 that we and the other cooperators kind of conveyed at the
19 public meetings is, you know, you have a plan with, you
20 know, again ourselves, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the
21 Alaska Department of Fish and Game as well as the other
22 cooperators in the Yukon, the Yukon government, Kluane
23 River First Nations and White River First Nation. And
24 you actually have a plan that all six of those
25 cooperators actually agree on. And I think to achieve,
26 that in itself makes a statement about just how
27 conservative this plan actually is.

28
29 MR. CARPENTER: Uh-huh.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What is their ultimate goal for
32 population, have they -- it's part of the plan, you said
33 it was continued to maintain and grow it, what is their
34 ultimate goal, 1,000 animals, less than 1,000 animals?

35
36 MR. VEACH: This plan doesn't specify that at
37 this time, but that is a comment that we've gotten from
38 a number of folks, you know, including AHTNA as well as
39 some of the participants that have looked at this on the
40 Yukon side, is that the plan should specify an actual
41 number, you know, essentially a goal for the herd. And
42 so that hasn't been arrived at yet. I expect since
43 that's something -- you know, particularly since that's
44 a comment that we've heard both in Alaska and the Yukon,
45 that's something that the working group will have to
46 wrestle when we get back together.

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions. Judy.

49
50 MS. CAMINER: Yeah, couple things sort of as a

1 refresher from our last meeting. Are we talking about
2 these caribou being only on Federal land basically?

3

4 MR. VEACH: Basically. You know, I think they
5 have strayed close to the Alaska Highway, I think we have
6 a couple of collar detection survey yet. Essentially
7 they occur entirely on Federal lands.

8

9 MS. CAMINER: Okay. And one other follow-up.
10 The Council spent a lot of time at our last meeting
11 discussing involvement of the local communities and local
12 Tribes and so I'm just wondering if you can give us an
13 update on what's happened between March and now on that
14 front?

15

16 MR. VEACH: Sure. Certainly we've met with the
17 Park, we have government to government relationships with
18 both Chistochina and Mentasta and so we have met with
19 both of those villages and consulted them on this plan.
20 Essentially the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service staff at
21 Tetlin Refuge are also cooperating on this. They've gone
22 and met with the Northway Village Council and consulted
23 them about this plan as well. I expect that we'll
24 probably continue to do more work along those lines.

25

26 One of the other comments that we've gotten on
27 the plan is that it needs to -- that the plan should seek
28 more traditional ecological knowledge. And so that's one
29 recommendation that we expect to make to the working is
30 that in addition to some of the other things that the
31 plan already has specified as objectives to accomplish,
32 we'd like to see an additional objective in there to gain
33 more traditional ecological knowledge and essentially
34 flesh and gather that existing traditional ecological
35 knowledge over the five year life span of the plan.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria

38

39 MS. STICKWAN: So are you getting monies to do
40 this, to do the TEK, are you seeing funds to do that or
41 do you have projects now that you're working on that will
42 include this?

43

44 MR. VEACH: That's a great question. At this
45 point we don't have any funding specifically to go out
46 and gather traditional ecological knowledge. I expect
47 that once the plan is completed and signed that will --
48 it'll be a tool that we can use then to seek funding
49 within the Park Service, you know, we have some
50 competitive sources of funding within the Park Service

1 that we can go after and this plan will be a really
2 strong tool that we can reference to justify seeking
3 funding to go out and gather that traditional ecological
4 knowledge.

5
6 MS. STICKWAN: And are you guys working on
7 getting C&T for the Chistochina too?

8
9 MR. VEACH: It's my understanding that they're
10 working on a proposal, I don't know that that's been
11 submitted. We've certainly offered to help with drafting
12 the proposal.

13
14 MS. STICKWAN: I think that TEK, that's really
15 important to get that knowledge because it'll provide a
16 lot of insight into what happened before 1950, you don't
17 have that information written down anywhere and people
18 from Mentasta and Chistochina can give you that important
19 information. And even before hunting's open, it should
20 -- this TEK should have been gathered before this even --
21 I mean, I don't -- I just don't see how you can approve
22 a -- how anybody could approve a hunt without TEK
23 knowledge, I mean, this plan should have included it from
24 the start. And so you're going to have this hunt open
25 maybe and possibly since the Eastern RAC approved this
26 plan, did they make -- I don't know if they're going to
27 do a proposal or not, but -- well, there is a deferred
28 proposal on -- you know, you're going to have this hunt
29 that possibly pass and you don't have any TEK knowledge
30 from local people who know about this herd before 1950.
31 There's no knowledge of it, there's no -- nothing written
32 down about it. And that concerns the AHTNA people a lot
33 was that this plan was in place -- was done without our
34 input hardly at all, I mean, nothing's been done for our
35 people to give you any input into this, especially for
36 Chistochina and Mentasta, they should have been involved
37 in this. And my hope's in the future that if you are
38 going -- if you do do projects like this that you do
39 consult with Village Councils to get their input. And we
40 were concerned about that threshold like you said, we
41 don't -- we don't believe this hunt should be opened
42 because of the low numbers. And we don't see it
43 benefiting the subsistence users, only seven caribou --
44 you know, who's going to get those caribous is it going
45 to be subsistence users really or is it going to be the
46 guide hunters. We think it's going to be the guide
47 hunters who are going to be able to get the caribou and
48 not the people that really need it.

49
50 MR. VEACH: I guess my response would just be

1 that it certainly isn't the intention of any of the
2 cooperators on the plan to, you know, exclude anyone from
3 the planning process at all. And, you know, certainly
4 AHTNA's provided us those comments and we intend to, you
5 know, give those careful consideration and definitely
6 carry those back to the rest of the working group and get
7 those in. And, you know, at this point as far as opening
8 that hunt, you know, that's the decision for the Federal
9 Board, you know. Our interest at this point is really
10 just kind of getting the plan to completion.

11

12 MS. STICKWAN: So did the Eastern RAC, did they
13 approve of this plan and did they -- are they in favor of
14 opening the hunt then too?

15

16 MR. VEACH: My understand.....

17

18 MS. STICKWAN: Or there's a proposal that was
19 deferred, is -- that's what I'm asking about.

20

21 MR. VEACH: My understanding is they passed a
22 resolution to support the planning process at the Eastern
23 Interior Council meeting. I actually wasn't there.
24 Barbara was there and she and I have both been traveling
25 a bunch and we haven't really crossed paths much since
26 the Eastern Interior Council meeting then.

27

28 MS. STICKWAN: And the other thing I'd like to
29 see our RAC -- a proposal like this there should be like
30 Judy said earlier, that when there's crossover proposals
31 we should be able to sit at our meetings or at least do
32 a teleconference so that we can get information to them
33 and they can get information to us because, you know, we
34 could provide information to our people, to the Eastern
35 Interior RAC, which they may not be getting at all from
36 the public, you know, from the people in Unit 12 that
37 hunt that herd. So I don't know, I'd like to see the --
38 see that happen in the future more this RAC being able to
39 attend the Eastern Interior meetings especially this --
40 concerning this.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: KJ.

43

44 MS. MUSHOVIC: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just was
45 going to mention at this point because I was at the
46 Eastern Interior meeting, that they did support the
47 continuation of the Chisana plan as well as your Council
48 should expect a letter from the Eastern Interior Council
49 suggesting that the Southcentral Council consider the
50 formation of a subcommittee to consider the deferred

1 proposal. And to foster communication between the
2 Councils on this issue.

3
4 MS. STICKWAN: I'd rather see them come to our
5 meeting and not us go to them.

6
7 (Laughter)

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Aren't you asking were they
10 thinking that we should form a subcommittee now, I mean,
11 that proposal's still on the books, right?

12
13 MS. STICKWAN: It was deferred.

14
15 MS. MUSHOVIC: Because it was deferred.....

16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

18
19 MS. MUSHOVIC: Yes. Some of the language that
20 they proposed including in the communication that they'd
21 like to send to you is that they'd like to have the
22 working group complete its consideration to have the
23 information available for the fall 2011 meeting schedule.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. That sounds like a
26 reasonable time period.

27
28 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. Office of Subsistence
29 Management had talked about this issue and because as you
30 remember when the Federal Board met on this, May 18 to 20
31 in 2010, the Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council
32 had supported that proposal for a hunt. This Council had
33 not or had opposed it and the Board ended up deferring.
34 They recognized that the existing proposal may get pulled
35 off and something new might come in, but they had
36 deferred to allow time for the census to be done, for the
37 planning effort to be completed. But it would probably
38 be because there was such differences of opinion between
39 the two Regional Advisory Councils, we had talked about
40 having a subcommittee of both Councils and meet between
41 now and obviously fall to kind of discuss these issues
42 further and maybe some -- come to some sort of agreement
43 on how things should proceed, if they should proceed or
44 not at all. I don't know, I mean, you don't want to
45 presuppose what the Council would do, but what the
46 typical process is is that if there's a request for a
47 subcommittee that goes to the Federal Subsistence Board,
48 the Federal Subsistence Board gives the notion of a
49 subcommittee its blessing and then they can move forward.
50 So if this group wants to do that we can proceed

1 accordingly, we're in a good time because November
2 there's a Board meeting, that request can be put before
3 the Board, members could be selected or not or we can do
4 it over the phone or whatever else. So just to get the
5 wheels turning if this is something that the Council's
6 interested in doing, we can support that and facilitate
7 in any way we can.

8

9 Mr. Chair.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Judy.

12

13 MS. CAMINER: I guess just out of curiosity, I
14 know you said you weren't there, Eric, but I wondered if
15 Barbara or someone else had given this presentation to
16 the Eastern Interior as well?

17

18 MR. VEACH: Barbara Cellarius gave a similar
19 presentation at Eastern Interior RAC.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So that's the thing for us to
22 think about, whether we as a Council would like to
23 suggest to the Board, that would be one thing I could
24 take to the Board meeting if we decide that we would like
25 to see a working subcommittee to deal with this issue
26 since it is a conflict between two Councils. And then we
27 would have to find who would like to volunteer to be on
28 that subcommittee from our Council. And I know Gloria
29 would for sure probably.

30

31 MS. STICKWAN: Yeah, I would be willing to if I'm
32 still on the Council next year. I don't know what's
33 going to happen.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It would be nice if we had two
36 people probably.

37

38 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. Because it's a Council
39 subcommittee, you can have as many members as you want,
40 there's no limit to the members. I suppose it would be
41 good to have equal membership between the two Councils.
42 I don't know if Eastern Interior actually talked about
43 how many people they'd want, but I think that that's
44 within -- well within the purview of the Council. I
45 wouldn't limit yourself to one, think about how many
46 people you want, how many representatives you feel would
47 best serve the interests of the Council.

48

49 Mr. Chair.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Should we go on.

2

3 MR. VEACH: Yes, Mr. Chair. Actually I think
4 next on the agenda is a fisheries report and Molly will
5 give that and then at the end I'd like to speak to you
6 about our ORV EIS.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. I have a couple questions
9 on this handout that you gave to us. The Mentasta
10 Caribou Herd basically looks like it is improving just by
11 the numbers that we see here.

12

13 MR. VEACH: It looks like we had a good year for
14 the Mentasta Caribou Herd. You know, the calf to cow
15 ratio was 25 calves per 100 cows which is an improvement
16 over the last few years. So that was a positive note
17 this year.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, that's better than double.
20 And then on the sheep survey it looks like you
21 accomplished about -- oh, we might say three-fifths of
22 them. And it says 200 groups, but it doesn't say how
23 many sheep that involves.

24

25 MR. VEACH: You know, if the Council will bear
26 with me I'll just give you little background on this.
27 This was a new survey method this year. There's been a
28 lot of thought, a lot of work put into this. This is
29 conducted through our inventory monitoring program. A
30 similar method was used up in Gates of the Arctic
31 National Park. Essentially what this does is the
32 observers fly along a contour line and they count as many
33 sheep as they can see. And then with the use of a GPS
34 they can estimate the distance from where they were at to
35 the sheep and then the statisticians do a lot of work
36 with this and we can actually come up with a population
37 estimate for the survey area. In the past what we've
38 done is basically index counts where we fly the same area
39 that we'd flown in previous years and we see if the
40 number of sheep's gone up or down. And that gives us
41 some idea of a trend, but it doesn't actually give us any
42 real number for the population. Potentially this is
43 going to give us an actual population estimate. And
44 really what I'd say is, you know, the map kind of favors
45 the area that was completed, probably about half of the
46 interior portion of the Park was actually completed this
47 year, weather was tough, we weren't able to get to the
48 area, you know, really along the Chitina River and
49 certainly not south of the Chitina River, but we don't
50 have the final numbers yet, the statisticians are still

1 working on developing those numbers. When we have them
2 we'll share them with you, but we -- the weather was
3 conducive, we were able to get a lot of work done on the
4 north end of the park and we think at least for that area
5 with the small squiggly lines in it we're going to be
6 able to come up with a pretty good population. So if
7 this really works we're pretty excited about having this
8 tool in our tool box to look at sheep numbers.

9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So when it says 200 sheep
11 groups were observed, they took numbers on those groups,
12 it's not that you just keep track of the groups, it's --
13 they actually did a count on the groups that they saw?

14
15 MR. VEACH: That's correct.

16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh. Okay.

18
19 MR. GEASE: Mr. Chair.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Ricky.

22
23 MR. GEASE: Can you explain what the red lines
24 are eliminated from survey list means where you took off,
25 is there some statistical reason that those areas were
26 removed from the survey or was it bad flying areas or
27 what's the reason why certain sectors were taken off the
28 survey list?

29
30 MR. VEACH: You know, that's a good question. I
31 would need to get back with our wildlife biologist and
32 get you a precise answer for that. I think it -- it
33 could be that for whatever reason they maybe weren't able
34 to complete that particular transect, so they started it
35 and then if the weather got bad and they couldn't
36 complete it, that they may eliminated it. But let me get
37 that answer and report back to you at your next meeting
38 there.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Any other question on
41 this.

42
43 (No comments)

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Now we can go on.

46
47 MS. McCORMICK: Mr. Chairman. Members of the
48 Council. My name's Molly McCormick and I work as a
49 fisheries biologist as Wrangell-St. Elias National Park.
50 And I'd like to give you a short report about the

1 fisheries work that we're doing in the Park. There are
2 a couple different handouts that have to do with what I'm
3 talking about, one has a bunch of pictures of the front
4 page and the other is -- looks sort of like this. And so
5 I'll start with the report that has the photos on it.

6
7 We had three projects, three fisheries projects
8 that we were working on in the Park this past season.
9 Two of them are ongoing and those are both of the weirs
10 that we've got, one at Tanada Creek and one in Long Lake.
11 Both of these projects are operated with funding by OSM
12 so they're part of the fisheries monitoring RFP,
13 fisheries resource monitoring program. And the first one
14 I'll talk about is the Tanada Creek Weir.

15
16 This year we counted a total of 5,226 sockeye and
17 16 Chinook that passed through the weir. We have been
18 using an underwater video camera setup at this weir for
19 four years now and it's working really, really well.
20 There was a lot of rain in the Park this year and we did
21 have some problems with high water, but there wasn't
22 every any structural damage to the weir itself so we kept
23 the weir operating throughout the season.

24
25 The second weir that we have is at -- kind of at
26 the mouth of Long Lake which is a lake that flows into
27 the Lakinaw River. And this is the first year that we
28 put in an underwater camera at this weir. And it worked
29 really well. There's actually a picture of the camera
30 box and the fish chute.

31
32 And what these cameras do for us is that it
33 allows us to be more efficient and more accurate in our
34 counting process. It also allows for continuous fish
35 passage, we don't have to close the weir, block the fish
36 from moving through the weir for a certain part of the
37 day, but we leave -- we do leave the fish passage open
38 continuously throughout the day. So that works really
39 well for this fish as well.

40
41 The run at Long Lake is a late run, it's actually
42 still ongoing. It starts about the middle of --
43 beginning of August and we usually shut down the weir
44 around the middle of October. We're going to try to
45 leave it open just a little bit longer this year, the run
46 was late coming into the creek just like it was at Tanada
47 Creek and so we're -- weather permitting as long things
48 don't really start to freeze up we'll probably keep
49 counting there until the end of October this year. So I
50 don't actually have a final count at this weir for you.

1 I do have an update from what I have in this report and
2 as of October 15th 10,642 sockeye had passed through the
3 weir and 323 coho. And by the end of this month I should
4 have a total number of fish counted through that weir.

5
6 I also have a little chart for you that gives you
7 the number of fish that pass through Miles Lake that are
8 counted by the sonar that's operated by Alaska Department
9 of Fish and Game. The escapement this year through Miles
10 Lake was 924,010 fish passing through -- passing by this
11 sonar.

12
13 The third project that we had going on in the
14 Park, fisheries project, is looking at life history of
15 burbot in Tanada and Copper Lakes. This is a three year
16 project that we started last year. And what we're doing
17 with this project is we're implanting archival tags in
18 burbot in both of these lakes and then looking at the
19 vertical movement of the of the burbot throughout the
20 year. So we're looking -- we're recording a pressure and
21 we're also recording an internal temperature. And so
22 this kind of gives us an idea of what temperature ranges
23 they inhabit and what sort of vertical motion -- movement
24 that they do throughout the year.

25
26 In 2009 70 of these archival tags were implanted
27 into burbot in the lake and then -- in Tanada Lake and in
28 2010 we implanted 70 in Copper Lake and then went back to
29 do sort of a recapture project in Tanada Lake and we
30 recaptured 15 tags and we'll download the information
31 from these tags and get some sort of an idea of what's
32 going on with the burbot we hope.

33
34 And then I wanted to talk just a little about the
35 subsistence fishing permits that we issue at the Park.
36 And that is both in the handout with the pictures and
37 then on the other handout too. This year we issued 263
38 Glennallen subdistrict permits, these are Federal
39 permits. We issued 89 Federal Chitina subdistricts
40 permits and then we also issued three permits for the
41 Batzulnetas fishery. The fishing season ends on
42 September 30th, people do not have to have their harvest
43 tickets back in until the end of October so I don't
44 actually have any harvest data yet, but this is the data
45 that we have as far as number of permits that were
46 issued. And then next year hopefully we will be using
47 this new Fish and Wildlife Service permit system and
48 we'll see how that works, we're hoping that it's going to
49 work out really, really well for us. It'll connect the
50 fishing permits with the game permits. And so if you

1 come in and you have either fished or hunted within any
2 of the Federal districts then your name will come up and
3 you'll be able to get the information that we need on the
4 permit really fast and we're hoping that this is going to
5 work out really, really well for us.

6
7 Also in the report I mentioned that we issued
8 five special actions, the superintendent, Mike Jensen,
9 issued five special actions this summer. And what this
10 does is we usually issue these special actions to align
11 the Federal Chitina subdistricts subsistence fishery
12 closures with the closures that the State is doing in the
13 same subdistrict in the personal use fishery. So five of
14 those, we did five of those this year.

15
16 And I think that's about it. Next year we'll
17 have funding again for both of the weirs, we'll continue
18 with the Tanada and Copper burbot life history study and
19 then we've also got some funding from a different source
20 that we're hoping to do a little investigation of
21 presence of absence of a different -- a couple different
22 kinds of smelt down in the Yakutat area which is actually
23 part of -- there's some coastal areas that's part of the
24 Park.

25
26 And I think that's about it if there are no
27 questions.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: One question.

30
31 MS. McCORMICK: Okay.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: When you recover an archival tag
34 do you have to take the burbot.....

35
36 MS. McCORMICK: Yes.

37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:or, I mean, you have to
39 surgically remove it?

40
41 MS. McCORMICK: Yes.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.

44
45 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah. Thank you. I had a couple
46 questions. The Native Village of Eyak gave us some
47 estimates on what they thought the in-river Chinook
48 escape was for the Copper River this year.

49
50 MS. McCORMICK: Uh-huh.

1 MR. CARPENTER: And the information that was
2 presented was that it was slightly below the in-river
3 objective. Understanding that you don't really have any
4 harvest information yet because the permits aren't due
5 back from the Glennallen and Chitina subdistricts in
6 regards to the subsistence fisheries, about how many
7 Chinook salmon might have been taken in those fisheries
8 and taking into account the closures that took place, you
9 know, both in the lower river and the upper river and
10 also the possibility that the 100 year flood could
11 definitely impact the Chinook run next year, do you ever
12 anticipate differentiating between species or limiting
13 species in the subsistence fishery?

14
15 MS. McCORMICK: The way the management plan for
16 the Copper River is set up, the subsistence harvest is
17 usually the last harvest that gets regulated. With a
18 fishwheel it's a little bit -- well, it's very difficult
19 to actually regulate the number of fish you can catch of
20 specific species with a fishwheel. Our fishwheels
21 don't always have a live box and so a lot of times if a
22 fish is caught it's dead by the time somebody comes back
23 and checks the wheel. We check -- there is a regulation
24 that we do have to check it every 10 hours. So it would
25 be -- we would have to change some of the fishwheel
26 regulations before we could actually limit the number of
27 Chinook salmon that could be caught in the subsistence
28 fisheries. In the dipnet fishery this year -- in the
29 State dipnet fishery which is a personal use, sport fish
30 fishery, they did not allow Chinook salmon to be caught.
31 We do also -- we do allow dipnets as a gear type that's
32 used in the Federal subsistence fishery and I don't
33 really think that there really has been much talk at all
34 about limiting one of the gear types and not the other
35 gear types that would be used.

36
37 MR. CARPENTER: Well, I know that there -- in
38 regards to fishwheels that if there -- you know, if there
39 was a regulation proposed change there would be, you
40 know, some undue cost associated with the subsistence
41 user having to modify, you know, their fishwheel. If
42 say, you know, they were asked to put in a live box there
43 would be some undue cost there. But I guess my real
44 question is when do we get to the point, and, of course,
45 the subsistence users are the most important people
46 utilizing the resource, don't get me wrong there, but
47 when do we get to the point to when the Federal managers
48 are going to start looking at some of these Chinook
49 returns and they're going to say, you know, even if the
50 undue costs has to be appropriated from the Federal

1 government to these users when are we going to really
2 seriously look at the Chinook harvest that takes place
3 even in a subsistence fishery because ultimately the
4 resource is the most important thing. And I was just
5 curious, I know that like you said there's a cost
6 associated with changing a fishwheel, but a dipnet, there
7 would be no cost associated with and maybe you can't
8 differentiate between gear groups in regards to
9 subsistence management, but is there ever a point to
10 where you're going to have to limit the subsistence user
11 in regards to the Chinook returns?

12

13 MS. McCORMICK: Well, I can answer -- I guess I
14 can give you an answer, a pretty good answer for part of
15 that question. And if you look back, if you look on this
16 and you look back in 2009 and you look at like the number
17 of Chinook that were harvested by Federal subsistence
18 users in the Glennallen subdistrict, it was six with a
19 dipnet.

20

21 MR. CARPENTER: Uh-huh.

22

23 MS. McCORMICK: Yeah. And it was a fairly low
24 number with a fishwheel, 487. So and then if you look
25 over in the Chitina subdistrict it's even fewer. So in
26 the Federal subsistence fishery there are really very few
27 Chinook, I mean, in the grand scheme of things of how
28 many are harvested throughout the whole Copper River
29 basin or Copper River system there are really very few
30 Federal Chinook or Federal subsistence Chinook that are
31 harvested. I'm not sure if we actually have -- yeah,
32 maybe you can answer the other part.

33

34 MR. VEACH: Why don't I just a couple thoughts.
35 And I think, you know, Mr. Carpenter, you probably
36 remember when we discussed the requirement to check the
37 fishwheels once every 10 hours. There was some
38 discussion at that point in time, and I think that was
39 actually more in front of the Board of Fisheries than it
40 was through the Federal Subsistence Board, about giving
41 users the option to either install a live box or check
42 their fishwheel every 10 years. And one, there was a lot
43 of concern raised by the users that it would be expensive
44 and potentially difficult to maintain a live box, as
45 flows come up or down, you know, the live box might wind
46 up on the bottom of the river, but there was also a lot
47 of concerns raised by the biologist that fish that are
48 held in a live box for any length of time, well, they may
49 be live when you release them, but the stress that those
50 fish have undergone may make them pretty susceptible to

1 mortality once they're released, that they may not really
2 be able to survive long-term after being held in a live
3 box.

4
5 One other thing that I would say is when we look
6 at the relatively low number of Chinook that are
7 harvested by Federal users right now, it certainly --
8 it's never impossible that we would take that step to
9 actually restrict Chinook harvest by Federal users in the
10 Copper River, but I think before it got to that point we
11 would to see the State absolutely close all sport harvest
12 of Chinook salmon. And, you know, this year we still had
13 -- you were able to harvest one fish out of the Gulkana
14 and one fish out of the Klutina. Basically you could
15 take up to two fish out of the Copper River, only one for
16 each tributary. So there was some sport harvest still
17 allowed and so I don't think we're really at that point
18 yet where it was appropriate to restrict a Federal
19 subsistence fishery while there was still some sport
20 harvest occurring in the drainage.

21
22 One thought that I think that we could potential
23 -- I think -- my experience and folks can correct me if
24 I'm wrong, but certainly a number of the users I've
25 talked to really aren't that interested in catching
26 Chinooks, they really want the sockeye.

27
28 MR. CARPENTER: Right.

29
30 MR. VEACH: And I think, you know, if we continue
31 to kind of see this trend where we have low Chinook
32 escapement, the -- you know, we and potentially ADF&G as
33 well could make that effort to kind of educate users so
34 that these are -- this is a vulnerable stock and that
35 potentially if you're starting to catch Chinook salmon in
36 your fishwheel and particularly if you're really not
37 interested in targeting those Chinook salmon, then maybe
38 that's an appropriate time to just stop the wheel for a
39 couple of days, allow that pulse to move upstream and
40 then start again to target, you know, the sockeye which
41 most users are after.

42
43 MR. CARPENTER: Has there ever been any thought
44 given to -- I mean, I agree with you, the idea -- I mean
45 sport fishing should be the first thing that should be
46 shut down if there's a biological concern. Of course the
47 Board of Fisheries has also made that statement quite
48 clear. Has there ever been any concern to the fact that
49 a lot of these waters are Federal waters, has there ever
50 been any -- from you as the in-season manager on the

1 Federal side, to closing down all Federal waters except
2 for non-rural residents, basically taken the State out of
3 the equation and doing it yourself?

4

5 MR. VEACH: No.

6

7 MR. CARPENTER: How come?

8

9 MR. VEACH: Well, you know, we work closely with
10 the State and I guess I would say that the State
11 biologists haven't -- you know, we still feel like we're
12 operating within the management plan. Now obviously year
13 after the fact we can determine that the escapement
14 wasn't met, but in-season we weren't aware of the fact
15 that we weren't going to me the Chinook escapement. And
16 so as long as we're operating within the sideboards of
17 the management plan it wouldn't be appropriate to
18 completely shut down the season. And so I guess -- you
19 know, that's why I say that we haven't. You know,
20 certainly this year the State took the lead, they
21 restricted sport fishing, I mean, at the time that seemed
22 -- I mean, it seemed appropriate and, you know, based on
23 the information that was available it also seemed like it
24 would be adequate, you know. So I -- certainly we didn't
25 think that we had to go above and beyond what the State
26 was doing and take any additional action at that point.

27

28 MR. CARPENTER: The only real reason I bring that
29 up -- well, that was a serious -- I mean, that's a
30 serious thought that I've had over the years, but I thin
31 one of the biggest problems that we have, one concern I
32 have is something that Ricky brought up earlier about
33 ocean -- you know, the ocean sustainability, the food for
34 Chinook, you know, and other salmon species. But one of
35 the biggest problems we have in this State is
36 encroachment into spawning areas and I have never
37 understood why there is such a problem and there's such
38 a lack of the real mentality that letting people tromp
39 around in pristine spawning habitat to catch rotten, half
40 alive salmon just blows me away. And I don't think
41 particularly that the State has been very proactive in
42 dealing with that in lots of areas. Out here is one of
43 the great examples with the coho fishery. And I've
44 always wondered if the Federal managers think that this
45 is a problem and if the State won't do anything about --
46 you know, look at all the examples around the State, you
47 know, a lot of places you can't use bait, you have to
48 have a single hook, you know, there's lots of things that
49 they've done, but in a lot of areas they haven't been as
50 proactive. Do you think that that's a big concern in

1 regards to salmon recruitment into these areas over a
2 long period of time because if you look at the data, and
3 it's a very interesting graph, the commercial harvest the
4 last 10 years has went like this. I mean, it's gone
5 straight down like this. But so have the salmon runs.
6 And when you take the in-river escapement numbers and you
7 take the harvest that has declined dramatically, if the
8 escapement numbers are supposed to be there, where are
9 the fish. And I think a lot of it has to do with the
10 damage that's being done in these spawning areas. That's
11 why I asked if you as a Federal manager would ever take
12 any proactive measures to keep people out of those areas?
13

14 MR. VEACH: The best -- there's a lot to that
15 question and certainly I guess what I would say at a
16 personal level, you know, you talked about seeing folks
17 particularly from out of state, sometimes even outside
18 the US, harvesting these salmon that my cat wouldn't even
19 give a second glance to. You know, it does kind of make
20 you wonder what the motivation is for that. But overall
21 I -- you know, we -- you know, as far as both the Federal
22 manager and the Federal government, you know, we support
23 the State's management plan for the Copper River. I do
24 think that a lot of thought by a lot of really good
25 biologists has gone into that management plan. I mean,
26 ultimately the management plan has been set by the Board
27 of Fisheries, I think that management plan is based on a
28 lot of good advice from again, you know, a number of
29 biologists and also a lot of users that are very heavily
30 invested in the Copper River and to be, you know, very --
31 I mean, very sincerely I don't have any concern about the
32 Copper River management plan. I mean, I think it's a
33 good tool for managing those fisheries. But, you know,
34 like any management plan obviously you -- you know,
35 you're dealing with a very big drainage, a very large
36 mixed stock fishery, and it doesn't mean that you can't
37 have, you know, certain impacts to specific stocks or
38 specific streams. But, you know, again our position
39 would be that that's, you know, really the -- it should
40 be up to the State to take the lead in managing those
41 sport fisheries. As long as those fisheries are being
42 managed within the management plan we don't have any
43 concern beyond that.

44

45 MR. CARPENTER: Okay. Thanks.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. I only have one
48 comment on what Tom was saying right there because I have
49 the same concern when I see what I see going on out here
50 on the road and our coho stocks. I know we've had

1 proposals from our Advisory Committee here in town to
2 close it above the road on the spawning grounds. I used
3 to -- I spent a year teaching school in British Columbia
4 and it was kind of interesting in British Columbia you
5 couldn't fish salmon on spawning grounds in freshwater
6 period. And since then they've taken that off and you
7 all know where British Columbia salmon have gone. Bit
8 it's interesting to me that the same biologists that
9 would say that there would be undue trauma for a salmon
10 in a live box that would then get released and not see
11 undue trauma for a salmon caught on the spawning grounds
12 and fought to exhaustion and then released. And what we
13 saw this year down on the Eyak River is -- we had a lot
14 of sport fishing pressure on the Eyak River, lot of catch
15 and release and we also had a lot of salmon laying on the
16 sand bars and gravel bars on the lower end of the Eyak
17 River that the only reason that they could be there was
18 somehow or another there was some mortality that they
19 swam down the river and died. And I honestly can't see
20 where a live box could trauma them any more than catching
21 and releasing them on the spawning grounds. You know,
22 but that's just personal.

23

24 MR. CARPENTER: I knew we'd get him up here.

25

26 (Laughter)

27

28 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. George
29 Pappas, Department of Fish and Game. The first thing
30 distributed this morning by Donald Mike was this report
31 from Mike Somerville. I believe this is response to a
32 request. It does have some harvest estimates based on
33 45.4 percent of the permits of returned. I'm not sure
34 how this enters into a conversation here, I just want to
35 bring that to your attention, hasn't been mentioned yet.

36

37 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Yeah, I think it's
40 all -- I think our harvests and everything is all within
41 the management plan. I sometimes worry about harvest
42 that's not in the management plan. I just -- I have
43 personal difficulties with the fact that I don't think
44 all fish are reported. And, in fact, I know all fish
45 aren't reported. And so consequently I really appreciate
46 AHTNA working on a survey to see what the compliance is
47 with the reporting. And because my experience is that
48 it's -- permits that are filled out a month after the
49 season that aren't filled out as you go along, that can't
50 be checked at anytime aren't very accurate.

1 Ricky.

2

3 MR. GEASE: I do believe, George, if you can
4 check on this for the Department, I do believe Bob Clark
5 looked at a survey between the two methods of -- was it
6 the log book program and then the statewide harvest
7 survey. So, I mean, there are some surveys where there
8 is a check to see how accurate the statewide harvest
9 survey is and I think it's -- they've found that the
10 statewide harvest for sport fishing actually is pretty
11 accurate because it matches with the log book program for
12 guides which is an actual census of what's going on on
13 the Kenai River and I think that was Bob Clark that did
14 that. Or if you could provide us with that information
15 that would be helpful I think for our next meeting.

16

17 MR. PAPPAS: (Nods affirmatively)

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. I stand corrected, Gloria
20 told me that AHTNA isn't in the process of doing that
21 right now. I thought there was a project on the table
22 with that. There is, isn't there?

23

24 MS. McCORMICK: Mr. Chairman. Yeah, I think it's
25 a joint survey between the survey between the Department
26 of Fish and Game and EcoTrust and maybe somebody else
27 involved in that, I'm not sure, but it is funded by OSM
28 and it's an ongoing survey.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But it's not a partner program?

31

32 DR. WHEELER: No, it's by HDR and Alaska
33 Department of Fish and Game and it's called validity and
34 reliability of harvest data on the Copper River area.
35 And it was actually stimulated from long standing
36 complaints by you, Mr. Chair, that the.....

37

38 (Laughter)

39

40 DR. WHEELER:reliability of the permit data
41 for the Copper River area just isn't very good. So it's
42 a two year project, and it's entering into its second
43 year I believe so we should get findings in about a year.
44 And this Council will certainly get a full report on that
45 project since there's clear interest in it. But we're
46 looking forward to the results of that.

47

48 Mr. Chair.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, in that case I apologize

1 because I thought it was being done under AHTNA and I
2 don't mean to insult them by -- if I'm telling them that
3 they did that.

4
5 DR. WHEELER: But AHTNA's playing a key role and
6 AHTNA's part of the project, yes.

7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's what I thought. They're
9 working in the project, aren't they?

10
11 DR. WHEELER: They're not formal partners but
12 Fish and Game is. We won't implicate you, Gloria.....

13
14 (Laughter)

15
16 DR. WHEELER:but your -- I mean, they're
17 interviewing people in your area and they're interviewing
18 members -- you know, AHTNA -- folks at AHTNA. And it's
19 a multi-method approach, it's using a bunch of different
20 methods to get at this validity and reliability of the
21 current data.

22
23 Mr. Chair.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. My -- I apologize for
26 mistaking how the project was being done.

27
28 Okay. Any more from the National Park Service.

29
30 MS. McCORMICK: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. I just
31 wanted to mention that Barbara Cellarius, our subsistence
32 coordinator was not able to be here, she had a
33 conflicting meeting but there is a report that she has
34 also put together for you. And I can summarize it for
35 you if you like or you can just go ahead and read it
36 yourselves, record she's doing right now.

37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What's the thoughts of the
39 Council. Want her to summarize through it or is it a
40 report that you can read yourself.

41
42 MS. McCORMICK: The title of it is Wrangell-St.
43 Elias National Park and Preserve subsistence coordinator
44 report.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And do we have anything on the
47 ORV.

48
49 MR. VEACH: Mr. Chair. Yes, actually it'll be
50 relatively simple relative to our discussion about in-

1 season management, but you've been briefed a couple of
2 times on the ORV EIS. Just to again trigger your memory
3 a little bit, a few years ago now Wrangell-St. Elias
4 National Park was sued by the National Parks Conservation
5 Association regarding our management of off road
6 recreational vehicles along -- on trails along the
7 Nabesna Road in the northern portion of the Park. Rather
8 than taking that case to court we basically settled with
9 NPCA and agreed to conduct or complete an environmental
10 impact statement looking at the affects of those trails
11 and considering alternatives to our management strategy.
12 That process is nearly complete. We've got a draft EIS
13 out now that's available for public comment.

14

15 This is actually the synopsis or the executive
16 summary, the EIS itself is about the size of the
17 Anchorage phone book. There's essentially five
18 alternatives and they range from no action to, you know,
19 some pretty intensive trail restoration that would
20 involve a lot of improvements, a lot of graveling,
21 potentially some culverts and bridges. And there's some
22 discussion, some of the existing trails are in eligible
23 wilderness. The National Park Service manages eligible
24 wilderness as if it was designated wilderness and so
25 we've addressed that by essentially revisiting our
26 wilderness eligibility determination and, you know,
27 excluding the areas that are basically the trail
28 corridors there. It has some potential to affect
29 subsistence. You know, while the issue really surrounds
30 recreational use, some alternatives could potentially
31 restrict subsistence use if there's further degradation
32 of the trails before we're able to essentially find
33 funding to restore the trails.

34

35 And so in that light I would just mention that
36 the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission
37 has spent a lot of time, they've actually established a
38 subgroup and have spent a lot of time going through the
39 document working with us to produce, let's see, about
40 three pages here of comments on the EIS. And I might
41 just give you just a brief synopsis of those comments,
42 but the comments address monitoring standards, some of
43 the proposed trail improvements, you know, there is some
44 concern with the trail improvements may or may not result
45 in increased use or displacement of wildlife or more
46 hunters. And basically they say that, you know, the
47 development of non-motorized trails and routes should
48 only occur after the OVR trail improvements are
49 completed. It discusses some of the issues surrounding
50 designating trails in wilderness and their comments also

1 do state that the use of aircraft should be authorized to
2 access the National Park for the purpose of taking fish
3 and wildlife for subsistence. I think as many of you
4 know now that right now for the Park -- you know, in a
5 preserve you can use aircraft, but in a Park you cannot.
6 And that was one of their comments that that would be one
7 solution to the some of the trail issue would be to
8 basically identify aircraft as a means of subsistence
9 access.

10

11 And then one other point too that I think is
12 really important to bring forward that the SRC has raised
13 is that, you know, the term recreational ORV use is
14 misleading. The vast majority of non-subsistence ORV use
15 in Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve is by
16 other Alaskans hunting and fishing under general State
17 regulations. And that in many cases these users include
18 former local residents who have moved to urban areas for
19 employment and education which then make them ineligible
20 for Federal subsistence, but are members of families who
21 have customarily and traditionally engaged in subsistence
22 uses in the Park and so they raise that comment as well
23 too. So anyway I just wanted to share that with you.

24

25 We're accepting comments through November 10th.
26 You can get on, you know, our Park web site and basically
27 you can -- there's a number of ways to comment, but
28 really if you have comments or you have more concerns,
29 you can contact me or you can call Bruce Rogers who's the
30 project lead and, you know, you can either call us on the
31 phone and we'll take as much time as you need to kind of
32 go through this with you and answer your questions and
33 we'll certainly take comments either via email or over
34 the phone or, you know, whatever works for you. But I
35 just wanted to get that out there and again we'll accept
36 comments through November 10th at this point.

37

38 I'd be happy to answer any questions.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.

41

42 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair. I guess two points, one
43 for Gloria who's on the SRC, whether you think it would
44 be helpful if this Council endorsed the SRC's comments,
45 that would be my first question.

46

47 MS. STICKWAN: Well, you want an answer now? I
48 thought we did -- we worked on it, we had like two or
49 three meetings I think. Anyway it was passed by the SRC,
50 approved our comments and we had meetings in Tok and the

1 people in Tok and they're using our comments as a base to
2 -- a starting point to -- they're supporting our comments
3 and they're going to add their own comments to ours.

4
5 I guess I would say, yeah, since we said -- but
6 I did have a little bit of concern about the airplane,
7 but, I mean, I guess we saw it as a way to -- the damage
8 to the tundra that airplane use would alleviate that, you
9 know, getting to the -- because it's in an area that it's
10 hard to access with ATV, you can't access it. The only
11 way to get there is to walk or use an airplane. And so
12 that's why we supported airplane access just to be able
13 to get there to hunt. We supported that, but I kind of
14 -- was kind of -- you know, kind of for it and kind of
15 not, but I think I supported it just because I'm
16 concerned about the ATV damage.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Out of curiosity if airplanes
19 were allowed in that area and we ended up having a
20 caribou hunt on the Chisana Herd then airplanes would be
21 allowed by subsistence hunters, not just by -- I don't
22 know if -- I think guides in that camp take airplanes
23 into the Park proper, but they could use it on the non-
24 Park land. But basically it would make that area more
25 accessible to subsistence hunters if there was a hunt on
26 the Chisana Herd, right?

27
28 MR. VEACH: Mr. Chair. Actually the Chisana Herd
29 resides almost entirely in the Preserve and that's open
30 to aircraft. And along the lines of your questions too,
31 the guides that operate in the Park are guiding sport
32 hunters. Sport hunting is only allowed in the Preserve,
33 not in the Park.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right. But this would allow
36 subsistence users to use an airplane in Park proper if
37 something like this passed?

38
39 MR. VEACH: That's the recommendation of the SRC.
40 And it's that -- yeah, that instead of using -- it would
41 be another option to access hunting in the Park. And so,
42 you know, when you look at the Copper Lake Trail in
43 particular right now, that really takes hunters simply
44 into Park land. And so if that idea was adopted, you
45 know, it would give the option say to land a floatplane
46 on Copper Lake which would get hunters basically to the
47 same area that you can reach on an ATV at this point
48 without the damage to the trail.

49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But my next question would be is

1 if you allow airplanes to take hunters into that section
2 of the Park because there was a trail there, then does
3 that -- would that then authorize them to take airplanes
4 into the Park, in other words could you say because there
5 was a trail here you can take an airplane to Copper Lake,
6 but we're just doing that to protect the Copper Lake
7 Trail, but you can't take an airplane into Young Lake up
8 on -- you know, on the way up to Skoleye Pass (ph) or you
9 can't take an airplane into Hanageeda Lake, or you can't
10 take an airplane into you name it, you know, I mean, that
11 -- what I'm wondering is if we're looking at a Pandora's
12 box again.

13

14 MR. VEACH: Well, I think those are excellent
15 questions, Mr. Chair. I -- well, I would never want to
16 sort of speculate on -- the decision maker for this
17 project will ultimately be our regional director in
18 Anchorage and, you know, while I wouldn't want to put any
19 sideboards ultimately on the decision that could be
20 reached by the regional director, the analysis area for
21 this project is essentially along the Nabesna Road. And
22 so at this point the analysis for this document doesn't
23 look at some of the areas say south of the Chitina River
24 that you mentioned. Personally I would be -- I can't see
25 that that would be an offshoot of this document, that we
26 would allow airplane access into -- yeah, someplace like
27 Tvay Lake. I think that, you know, what's being
28 suggested here would strictly be allowing aircraft access
29 into areas that are currently accessed by ATVs.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

32

33 MS. STICKWAN: So my understanding wasn't correct
34 then, it wasn't -- am I wrong here, because I thought I
35 understood something different.

36

37 MR. VEACH: You know, the -- let me just read the
38 comment from the SRC. It says aircraft as a means of
39 subsistence access. The use of aircraft should be
40 authorized to access the National Park for the purpose of
41 taking fish and wildlife for subsistence. This is a
42 management tool that would lessen the use of trails and
43 thereby the trail impacts. Aircraft are a traditional
44 means of access for subsistence in Wrangell-St. Elias and
45 their use should be allowed. Section 811 of ANILCA
46 states the Secretary shall ensure that rural residents
47 engaged in subsistence shall have reasonable access to
48 subsistence resources on the public lands. We're not
49 suggesting the establishment of new airstrips, simply
50 allowing this traditional means of access to be used. So

1 I may be interpreting that -- I may be interpreting that
2 incorrectly. The group may have had a different approach
3 there. But again the EIS identifies an analysis area
4 which is essentially both sides of the Nabesna Road. You
5 know, it's essentially the Nabesna district of the -- of
6 Wrangell-St. Elias National Park. And so it would be
7 really unusual for a decision to extend beyond the
8 analysis area in the EIS, but, you know, at times that
9 happens too. So I don't know, I mean, that's actually
10 not -- I hadn't I guess really looked beyond the analysis
11 area at this point.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The way that's written it
14 doesn't just apply to the analysis area.

15

16 MR. VEACH: Uh-huh.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So, I mean, at least the way I
19 read it, it doesn't just apply.

20

21 Ricky.

22

23 MR. GEASE: From just the idea of aircraft going
24 in, how -- if a subsistence user is going to be faced
25 with the choice of I don't have an aircraft and I have to
26 pay for somebody to go in to use an aircraft or I can hop
27 on my ATV, how much of allowing aircraft use is really
28 going to lessen the impacts on trails. And even if it is
29 -- if it goes down let's say 10 percent or 20 percent of
30 the users, you still have 80 percent use of the use on
31 the trail and should we be focused on making sure that
32 the trail can handle that use.

33

34 The question -- I mean, I think the question
35 would be is it realistic to say that this is an option
36 that's really going to lessen the need to do improvements
37 on a trail. I mean how realistic is that?

38

39 MR. VEACH: Mr. Chair. If you'd like me to
40 respond to that, I would say that that has not been
41 analyzed in detail in the environmental impact statement
42 yet. So, you know, we put out a draft range of
43 alternatives and this is one of the comments that we
44 received from the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource
45 Commission, but yeah, at this point that hasn't been
46 analyzed in detail.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you for a review of those
49 options, that was -- do we feel like we need to make a
50 motion in support of the SRC's options or since we're

1 letting the SRC deal with this with the Wrangell-St.
2 Elias, or do we have anything that we would like to
3 oppose on it or should we just stay at this point in time
4 and see what comes of it?

5
6 MS. STICKWAN: I supported everything except I
7 had concern about the airplane use. It was a -- it was
8 a unanimous decision, but I still felt like, you know,
9 the airplane was, you know, that was a concern I had
10 about this, but I supported everything else that was.....

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Uh-huh.

13
14 MS. STICKWAN: So I don't know what you want to
15 do.

16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear -- Tom.

18
19 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah, I would just make the
20 comment, you know, I -- when I read that, too, I mean, I
21 -- you know, have no reason not to support the SRC, but
22 when I read what they said versus kind of like maybe the
23 Park Service staff might have thought it was the analysis
24 area, I kind of think that maybe the SRC might think
25 something a little bit different than maybe they actually
26 might be dealing with in reality because I have a hard,
27 hard time believing that anybody in Anchorage is going to
28 let airplanes go into the Park and hunt. So while I
29 would -- my opinion would be just to defer to the SRC,
30 you know, we're going to have another time as a RAC to
31 probably comment on something like this, but it seems
32 like maybe there's some miscommunication somewhere, at
33 least that's my opinion, but.....

34
35 MS. STICKWAN: I don't think there was
36 miscommunication, I just think that it wasn't -- I just
37 think that it really wasn't -- it was kind of hard to
38 talk about for me, you know. It was a -- airplane was
39 discussed, it was really supported by some people on the
40 SRC.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

43
44 MR. VEACH: Well, and just kind of as a point of
45 clarification too. You know, Bruce Rogers is actually
46 our project lead on this, I will certainly when I get
47 back to the office I'll communicate with Bruce that
48 that's the intent of the SRC. And Bruce may actually be
49 more clear on that than I am. I mean, Bruce and I
50 haven't had a lot of conversations about that. So this

1 may simply be my interpretation and not Bruce's as well.
2 But I will certainly raise that issue with Park staff and
3 Bruce and our park superintendent Magus as well.

4
5 MS. STICKWAN: But this would be setting a
6 precedence for airplane use, I mean, if you allow it
7 here. Then it'll be allowed in other Park -- you know,
8 in McCarthy and everywhere else too, airplane use, you
9 know what I'm saying.

10
11 MR. VEACH: I mean, I'm speculating a little bit,
12 but I would obviously -- I think that's a very good point
13 is that if you open the Park up on Nabesna Road certainly
14 it's reasonable to expect that users are going to ask the
15 same question that if this works off the Nabesna Road why
16 wouldn't it work off the McCarthy Road.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other -- Judy.

19
20 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair. Maybe it would be
21 useful if all the members could get copies of this or see
22 comments and then have a chance if anybody wants to write
23 in before the deadline we can do that. I think one thing
24 from our past discussion and Bruce was at the meeting,
25 and I believe the draft is a little tilted away from this
26 than what we were seeing before, but just this concept of
27 well, if the trail's in good shape it can be used, if
28 it's not in good shape subsistence users and everybody
29 else has to wait until there's money to fix the trail and
30 then that makes you wonder how long might that be or is
31 that another way to simply close the trails. And so I
32 hope that the EIS is moving off of that a little bit and
33 not make the trail use so dependent on the Park getting
34 money to fix up trails.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, aren't some of the options
37 to close those trails?

38
39 MR. VEACH: Yes. And certainly the -- yeah,
40 closing some of the trails is definitely an option that
41 has been analyzed here. And I would just mention that
42 the comment Ms. Caminer just made is -- that has been the
43 one that we've received numerous times at the public
44 meetings that I've attended.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.

47
48 MS. STICKWAN: I just want to say I supported
49 that except for the airplane uses, that's what I want.
50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, I'm not -- I wasn't
2 opposing the airplane use, I was just stating that the
3 way it read to me is it wasn't a case of just asking for
4 airplane use in that area, it was pointing out that
5 subsistence users have traditionally used airplanes in
6 the Park prior to the Park's existence for lack of a
7 better way of putting it and people in -- some of the
8 people involved there I'm sure look at an airplane, they
9 don't have ATVs, they have an airplane. And I'm sure
10 some of them feel that if an ATV is a proper subsistence
11 tool and probably more people have -- if you go back to
12 the '50s, probably more people had an airplane than an
13 ATV. And, I mean, ATV is a fairly recent subsistence
14 tool compared to if you go back. You don't have to --
15 you can go back a long way with an airplane. And I read
16 that basically as pointing out that the airplane was a
17 subsistence tool and they're asking for airplane access
18 because it doesn't do the damage that an ATV does. And,
19 I mean, that's how I would read it if I saw it.

20

21 Ricky.

22

23 MR. GEASE: I just want to point out that's a
24 slippery slope because then any user can make that same
25 argument.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. I'm not making the
28 argument, what I'm saying is that's what it says to me.

29

30 MS. STICKWAN: I think that was the intent of
31 what our group said is exactly what you just said, that
32 it could be opened. It could go the other way too.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right. Yeah. With that I think
35 our consensus is kind of to leave the SRC's comments as
36 the SRC's and to comment on it as it comes back to us,
37 right?

38

39 Do I have any objections to that.

40

41 (No objections)

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Thank you.

44

45 MR. VEACH: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Other business. Identify
48 Council topics for January 19th to 21st, 2011 Board
49 meeting. Boy, that's not very far away. We've
50 identified quite a few topics in the course of the day.

1 I think or coordinator, I saw her writing on a few of
2 them that we came across. We've identified some topics
3 for our annual report. Does anybody on the Council have
4 some topics particularly that they would like to see on
5 the January meeting at this point in time.

6
7 Gloria.

8
9 MS. STICKWAN: I would like to see us see the OSM
10 include wildlife research projects.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Wildlife research projects.

13
14 MS. STICKWAN: Yeah, you know, how they do the
15 fisheries monitoring, they should be see -- tell the
16 Federal Board that they should start including wildlife
17 research too.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We got special -- there was a
20 special funding set up for the fisheries monitoring
21 program, wasn't there. There is no program like that set
22 up for wildlife research so it has to come under a
23 different budget or a different funding scenario.

24
25 DR. WHEELER: Actually that was one of the -- or
26 funding for wildlife projects is actually in the
27 recommendations, kind of increasing the capacity to do
28 research within OSM, but there's pretty broad --
29 widespread recognition that there is a need for wildlife
30 research similar to what we have for fisheries research,
31 but you're correct in that when the Federal government
32 assumed management authority for fisheries on Federal
33 public lands there was a slug of money put in there and
34 it's been retained through time although there hasn't
35 been any additional funds, it's been flatlined. So we --
36 there -- we definitely need additional funding to do
37 wildlife research, in fact, one could argue that some of
38 the wildlife needs that we have surpass some of the
39 fisheries projects that we actually fund, but that's the
40 -- that's what we're looking at. We definitely could use
41 additional funding and there's recognition that
42 additional funding would be needed in order to do
43 wildlife research projects.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. In line with what Gloria
46 was suggesting, would it be helpful if we as a Council in
47 our meeting took up like we did with the fisheries, even
48 if it hasn't been requested, and come up with some
49 priorities from this Council of things that we think need
50 done and then forward them?

1 DR. WHEELER: Well, it would probably -- or you
2 could include them in your 2010 annual report on projects
3 -- area, I mean, I think we already heard some moose --
4 some needs for moose studies around here, around Cordova
5 area and I think putting something like that in your 2010
6 annual report makes it part of the permanent record too
7 that has to be responded to.

8
9 MS. STICKWAN: Well, if you could suggest
10 projects then I think you should do something about
11 Chistochina too for their C&T.

12
13 DR. WHEELER: Again I think just to bring it up
14 into the forefront, the best bet is probably to raise
15 those issues in your 2010 annual report. You could have
16 eight topics saying you encourage wildlife research to be
17 done, a few priority needs that you can think about are
18 moose around -- in Unit 6 and customary and traditional
19 uses of moose and Chistochina area although that has --
20 that was the subject of a lawsuit, I think that that
21 topic has been addressed on the part of the Federal
22 Board.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

25
26 DR. WHEELER: And actually speaking of that, Mr.
27 Chair. If I could, if you'll just indulge me for a
28 minute, I'm not a lawyer so I'm not going to speak to the
29 subtleties of the Chistochina lawsuit, but you do have a
30 summary back there and what I will say is that the
31 Chistochina -- there's certainly differences of opinion
32 about who won and who didn't win, but the court decision
33 was in favor of the Federal Subsistence Board and it
34 affirmed the process that the Federal Subsistence Board
35 uses for making customary and traditional use
36 determinations. So I'm not going to get into the other
37 pieces of that, but that's the bottom line from our
38 program's standpoint.

39
40 Mr. Chair.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It affirmed the decision that we
43 made?

44
45 DR. WHEELER: That's correct.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And the process that we....

48
49 DR. WHEELER: And the overall process that the
50 Board used to get there.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. That's what I thought I
2 read too.

3
4 Ricky.

5
6 MR. GEASE: Two points. One is even though
7 there's not a funding source for wildlife, we can write
8 a statement to say that we would like to see a
9 prioritized list of wildlife research projects across the
10 State so that if there was the opportunity to get funding
11 either through the Federal government or private
12 foundations, that a list of -- a ranked, prioritized, you
13 know, research proposals across the State in the
14 different regions was available.

15
16 The second component as one of the -- taking off
17 my RAC hat and putting on my executive hat, but, Chris,
18 we did file an amicus brief, and I will point out that in
19 the decision the Federal legal decision it was very clear
20 that the point that we were trying to make in the amicus
21 brief is that it is for a community, in an area, for a
22 species, during a period of time. And that the decision
23 when you need clarification for life history surveys or
24 for annual census, that those are important for
25 documenting in addition to oral histories that can be
26 recorded and documented. So when you read through the
27 decision making process I would say that the Federal
28 Subsistence Board decision was upheld despite some legal
29 advice from the Federal Subsistence Board saying that
30 that is not important, the Federal court said that that
31 process is important and you have to document and show
32 that those -- that's what the law says and that's what
33 the law requires.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now what I -- I'm -- I was under
36 the -- what I was trying to get at right now because we
37 got off the subject just a little bit, Gloria was
38 presenting something to put on our topic for our January
39 meeting. And that was wildlife funding for proposals.
40 Was that just a general one or was it specific proposals?

41
42 MS. STICKWAN: Well, we have the fisheries
43 monitoring program, we should have one for wildlife is
44 what I'm trying to say.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And should we put that on our
47 January topic or should we put that in our annual report?
48

49 MS. STICKWAN: Whatever this Council thinks.
50

1 DR. WHEELER: Mr. Chair. I think there's a
2 little bit of confusion here. The Council topics for the
3 January 19 to 21 Board meeting, that's the Federal
4 Subsistence Board meeting where they're going to be
5 dealing with the fisheries issues. Your next meeting
6 which is actually the next topic, is winter -- is -- will
7 be after that meeting.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh.

10
11 DR. WHEELER: So I think Donald usually puts this
12 on the agenda to see if there's something the Council
13 wants to raise before the Board when the Board meets to
14 address the fisheries topics or the fisheries proposals.
15 But your next meeting will be in February or March,
16 whatever.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

19
20 DR. WHEELER: So just to clarify there. Mr.
21 Chair.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'm not.....

24
25 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

28
29 MS. CAMINER: But could that not also mean before
30 the meeting starts or at the end of the meeting when kind
31 of the Chair goes around and asks each of -- the Chairman
32 of the Federal Subsistence Board asks each of RAC Chairs
33 if they have anything to bring up.

34
35 DR. WHEELER: Absolutely, yes.

36
37 MS. CAMINER: Yeah. So I think a lot of these
38 topics that we asked Ralph to try to bring up at the
39 November meeting will most likely could also be asked at
40 the January meeting because there may have been some
41 progress at that point on all of these points following
42 up on the subsistence review. So I think all the topics,
43 I mean, including the one Gloria's brought up, would be
44 great just what's the follow-up and feedback. And I also
45 think the topic of coordination among the RACs could be
46 something that you bring up also.

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, I think that's a good time
49 also to bring up this wildlife funding and the need for
50 prioritization on it. So that's good. So we can add

1 that and the coordination between the RACs and then what
2 -- and then a review on the progress that's been made on
3 the other ones.

4
5 MS. CAMINER: I guess one other one. I know we
6 tried to do that for this meeting, but you could invite
7 the new Chairman to our March meeting perhaps.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's a good one.

10
11 Okay. Any other topics that anybody has burning
12 issues to present to the January meeting.

13
14 (No comments)

15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Then we need to decide
17 when our winter meeting is going to be. And we have a --
18 oh, I got a fall schedule here, I don't have a winter
19 one.

20
21 MR. GEASE: That's what we got to pick, is the
22 fall.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Winter one's already picked.
25 Yeah, you're right. Okay. So our winter one is
26 scheduled for March 16th through 18th, right, or 16th
27 through 17th. So basically got to figure 15th through
28 18th. And that's an Anchorage meeting.

29
30 Okay. Now our fall meeting doesn't have to be an
31 Anchorage meeting unless everybody wants it there. And
32 we have a set of windows in front of us.

33
34 MR. CARPENTER: We should have it at Hiland Lake.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think that's an excellent
37 idea. Got room in the cabin for all of us?

38
39 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah.

40
41 MS. WAGGONER: Since it's during moose season
42 where is the good moose hunting at that time?

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Is it during moose season?

45
46 MR. CARPENTER: It's always during moose season.

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Boy, all these other ones
49 picked all the good times, didn't they.

50

1 MR. GEASE: 14th and 15th.
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Of.
4
5 MR. GEASE: September.
6
7 MR. GEASE: The problem is all these days are in
8 the middle of something, but can we -- I would suggest
9 the 6th and 7th of October.
10
11 MR. LAMB: In Anchorage.
12
13 MR. GEASE. Wherever, I'm -- but that's a good
14 time because we're not -- it's after moose season.
15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I would prefer to see it in
17 October myself.
18
19 MR. GEASE: 6th.
20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The 6th and 7th doesn't compete
22 with anything else that you have to take care of, does
23 it?
24
25
26 MS. CAMINER: Could we do it earlier in that
27 week?
28
29 MR. CARPENTER: Do it the 3rd and 4th.
30
31 MR. GEASE: 3rd and 4th.
32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Does -- is it going to conflict
34 with staff? No. Okay.
35
36 Okay. Well, you guys pick a time and where.
37
38 MR. LAMB: Up around Cantwell in the Park.
39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: How about Paxson. No, the
41 season's already closed up there.
42
43 MS. WAGGONER: Talkeetna or Cantwell.
44
45 MR. LAMB: Cantwell.
46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Cantwell sounds good. Did we
48 have one in Cantwell before?
49
50 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah, we had one when Gilbert was

1 on the.....

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. They had a nice lodge up
4 there if I remember right.

5

6 MR. LAMB: I think Jack River Inn's still open
7 isn't it, and then Keith down in the old part of
8 Cantwell's still -- he's got a bunch of Accos moved in a
9 few years ago, I think, make a real good bar.

10

11 MR. GEASE: Can I ask that staff look into
12 Cantwell and Talkeetna and we postpone it then and make
13 a decision in the spring.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Can we do that? That would be
16 good. I know the time we went to Talkeetna there was
17 real good service there and a very nice place to stay and
18 good place to eat. So after this little fiasco here in
19 Cordova I prefer to pick someplace where at least you
20 guys can have breakfast.

21

22 Okay. Let's pick the day and then we'll check
23 between Talkeetna and Cantwell.

24

25 MR. GEASE: I think we said October 3rd and 4th.
26 Does that help you?

27

28 MR. CARPENTER: I'm not sure I'll be still on
29 here, it would be helpful if I could do it at the end of
30 week. I got a meeting right dead center and a major one
31 on the 5th in Anchorage that I need to be at.

32

33 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So if we go 3rd and 4th you
34 can go back to Anchorage.

35

36 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Or do the 6th and 7th either
37 one.

38

39 MR. CARPENTER: Either one, either side I guess
40 for me.

41

42 MS. CAMINER: I'm going to be out of town.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Judy can't do the 7th
45 because she's going to be out of town. Can you do the
46 3rd and 4th.

47

48 MS. CAMINER: Can we do it out of town.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

1 MR. ENCELEWSKI: How about the 3rd and 4th?
2
3 MR. CAMINER: Anytime earlier in the week would
4 work.
5
6 MR. GEASE: 3rd and 4th.
7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Let's put 3rd and 4th down.
9
10 Okay. Do we have any other business that anybody
11 knows that needs taken care of?
12
13 (No comments)
14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Before we adjourn I'm going to
16 make an announcement, I just found out some people don't
17 know how to find my place. You walk right down Main
18 Street and you just keep right on going and you come to
19 Hollis Henrichs Park, that's Robert Henrichs' dad. When
20 you get to Hollis Henrichs Park you take a left and it's
21 the first house down the street on the left-hand side of
22 the road. Right across it from you'll Ilanka Clinic, the
23 parking lot for Ilanka Clinic's right across the way.
24 Now you're all invited and we'll have -- we'll have food
25 enough for everybody, nobody has to go hungry.
26
27 So then we have something here that's within the
28 keeping of Federal regulations limitations, but, Donald,
29 will you come up here?
30
31 MR. MIKE: No.
32
33 (Laughter)
34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Would you please come up here.
36
37
38 Donald, we.....
39
40 (Applause)
41
42 MR. MIKE: I was hoping I'd just -- probably a
43 card, and I appreciate all the work that I've been
44 involved with the Southcentral Council, but like Ms.
45 Polly Wheeler was saying, the foundation of the program
46 is individuals like Mr. Lohse, Tom, Judy, James, Ricky,
47 Chuck, Greg, Doug, Tricia and Gloria. You are the
48 foundation of the program, you're what makes this program
49 work and I'm just here to help provide technical support.
50 And I really appreciate working with the Southcentral and

1 I've really enjoyed it.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, we may be the foundation,
4 but there's got to be something underneath us otherwise
5 we would topple over. And I hate to say it, Donald, if
6 it wasn't for you guys we wouldn't get much done.

7

8 Thank you, Donald.

9

10 (Applause)

11

12 MR. CARPENTER: Motion to adjourn.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: A motion to adjourn is in order.

15

16 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Second.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and seconded.

19 The meeting is adjourned. And I thank you all for
20 coming.

21

22 (Off record)

23

24

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
)ss.
STATE OF ALASKA)

I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public in and for the state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 162 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the SOUTHCENTRAL FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, taken electronically by Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC on the 19th day of October 2010, beginning at the hour of 8:30 a.m. in Cordova, Alaska;

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

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

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 28th day of October 2010.

Salena A. Hile
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My Commission Expires: 9/16/14