

00172

1

2

3

4

5

6

SOUTHCENTRAL FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
REGIONAL COUNCIL MEETING

8

9

10

VOLUME II

11

12

Anchorage, Alaska

13

March 6, 2002

14

8:30 o'clock a.m.

15

16

17 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

18

19 Ralph Lohse, Chairman

20 Fred H. Elvsaaas, Vice Chair

21 Fred John, Jr.

22 Susan Wells

23 Robert Churchill

24 Gilbert Dementi, Sr.

25

26 Coordinator: Ann Wilkinson

00173

1

P R O C E E D I N G S

2

3

(On record - 8:35 a.m)

4

5

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Call this meeting to
6 order. Proposal 20. Pat, would you introduce it for us,
7 please.

8

9

MS. PETRIVELLI: Proposal 20 is very
10 similar to a proposal that was submitted last year by
11 Bill Stockwell, but that proposal was deferred because of
12 the Kenai rural determinations and then eventually
13 withdrawn. And then Mr. Stockwell re-submitted in a
14 different version -- well, like I said, very similar.
15 The customary and traditional use determination deals
16 only with ruffed grouse this year and that's what I'll be
17 talking about, and the methods and means for in-season
18 limits for spruce and rough grouse will be presented by
19 Donna Dewhurst after me.

20

21

With the customary and traditional
22 determination request that Mr. Stockwell made, he
23 requested a negative determination for ruffed grouse in
24 Unit 7. When I did the analysis, the Federal lands in
25 Unit 7 consist of the Chugach National Forest, the Kenai
26 National Wildlife Refuge and then other lands in Unit 7
27 are the Kenai Fjords National Park, which is closed to
28 subsistence uses. The proposal starts on page 61.

29

30

The communities involved in looking at
31 the use that would be affected by a negative
32 determination are the communities located in Unit 7 and
33 then, of course, Whittier, which is in Unit 60. Recent

34 studies that have been conducted in Unit 7, the table is
35 on page 64 showing their use of grouse, and those studies
36 were conducted in 1990. It does show a use of grouse,
37 but when these studies were conducted, there were no
38 ruffed grouse on the Peninsula. The ruffed grouse were
39 introduced in 1996. So this use is just reflective of
40 spruce grouse. It just shows that the people use spruce
41 grouse and there are no available statistics. No recent
42 household surveys have been done to say whether they've
43 used ruffed or spruce or even any harvest monitoring data
44 to indicate the level of use. Actually, the level of
45 ruffed grouse is so minimal that it's very highly
46 unlikely that ruffed grouse have been integrated into the
47 use patterns of any households in Unit 7 or in Whittier.

48
49 In looking at the eight factors that are
50 considered for customary and traditional use, the first
00174

1 factor of long-term, consistent pattern of use with the
2 fact the ruffed grouse were introduced in 1996 and
3 there's so few of them, it's just highly unlikely that
4 any long-term, consistent pattern of use has been
5 developed in any household in any of those communities.
6 For the other factors, two through eight, no data was
7 available relating to those factors.

8
9 In light of that information, I made the
10 recommendation to support the proposal for the negative
11 determination for ruffed grouse in Unit 7, which would be
12 consistent with a negative determination for ruffed
13 grouse in Unit 15, the other unit on the Kenai Peninsula.
14 That concludes the analysis.

15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Pat?
17 I have one if nobody else does. Pat, this is really a
18 two-part proposal right here because it proposes no
19 subsistence priority for ruffed grouse, but it also
20 proposes a reduction in bag limits for spruce hen.

21
22 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes. And Donna
23 Dewhurst, the biologist, will be doing the seasons and
24 limits and that's analyzed in B.

25
26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. There's no
27 questions. Is Donna here?

28
29 MS. PETRIVELLI: Did you want the B?

30
31 MS. DEWHURST: We usually do them
32 separate.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, we're going to take
35 this is a two-part proposal?

36
37 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes. Of course, in B,
38 there's the no Federal open season, but that wouldn't
39 normally go along with a negative determination also.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I have one question.
42 Are ruffed grouse even found on Federal land?

43

44 MS. PETRIVELLI: They are found on
45 Federal lands.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: They are found on
48 Federal land?

49
50 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes. A very small
00175

1 amount. We do need the biologist. I just know the
2 people.

3
4 MS. DEWHURST: They did a drumming count,
5 a booming count in the spring and I think they heard one,
6 so basically there's no viable population known on
7 Federal lands and there's virtually no viable population
8 in Unit 7, regardless of Federal lands. The introduction
9 hasn't gone that well.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And there's no guarantee
12 that there will be a viable population.

13
14 MS. DEWHURST: It's been a while since
15 the introduction, so it's going slow.

16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Susan.

18
19 MS. WELLS: I read over this proposal and
20 I guess there was an A and B, but I didn't see them as
21 separate in the write-up. I found a lot of the
22 information that was given pertaining to Unit C was based
23 on evidence from 15A, which is my area, and this is a
24 resource that I have traditionally hunted with my family,
25 so I guess I'd like some explanation why the data from 15
26 has been extrapolated over to 7.

27
28 MS. PETRIVELLI: For the B portion of the
29 analysis?

30
31 MS. WELLS: Well, I read them as both. I
32 didn't see the distinction between the two.

33
34 MS. PETRIVELLI: Oh, okay. So the
35 biological background. With mine, it's just the eight
36 factors, the customary and traditional use. With that
37 determination, once that determination is made, then it's
38 just separate. With the customary and traditional use
39 determination, it just affects the users. It would deal
40 with the ruffed grouse only. If the Council makes its
41 recommendations on that negative determination, then it
42 would just clarify the B portion that calls for the no
43 open season.

44
45 MS. WELLS: Thank you.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any thoughts or comments
48 on the C&T portion then of the ruffed grouse? I didn't
49 realize it's only been since 1996 that they were
50 introduced, so they haven't even been there for one full
00176

1 cycle. Does anybody know where they were introduced
2 from? Mr. Churchill.

3

4 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, a little bit of
5 history on this is that this is part of a project that's
6 done in coordination with Department of Fish & Game and
7 some folks off the local Fish & Game Advisory Committee
8 in Cooper Landing, specifically Will Troyer, who is a
9 retired ADF&G biologist that specializes in grouse
10 research. This is an attempt to create a population
11 that's sought after by mostly hunters who are not looking
12 for a subsistence style hunt.

13

14 As a matter of fact, they asked for and
15 got a reduction in bag limit at the last Board cycle and
16 my understanding is, based on the drumming counts, the
17 information that's being brought forward today, they're
18 going to ask for a closed season. I don't have that in
19 writing, but they're certainly discussing that because
20 there are so few ruffed grouse.

21

22 And it isn't an attempt to parallel or to
23 combine the spruce and the ruffed grouse. They
24 definitely see them as two different birds, two different
25 uses. This is aimed at this area with a hope of
26 eventually getting a population that I think probably
27 could separate some users in a very positive way, where
28 you have sport hunters who are going to be out hunting
29 ruffed grouse when the populations will sustain a hunt,
30 that's probably going to be at least seven or eight years
31 from now, and not be as interested in the spruce grouse,
32 which has been a traditional subsistence food source.

33

34 To me, it makes sense to protect this
35 population as best we can to allow it to grow. There's
36 been a lot of time and effort dumped into habitat issues
37 that benefit both species, so I just see this as a real
38 win/win. It is new. As Donna said, the drumming counts
39 -- I had understood there was a grand total of two, but
40 I'm not going to argue over one versus two, but it is
41 small and I think Donna is right on target with this.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob, can I ask you a
44 question? Were the ruffed grouse in the Mat-Su
45 introduced at the same time or were they earlier?

46

47 MR. CHURCHILL: No. Much earlier.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Have they managed to
50 come up with a viable population there yet or is it still
00177

1 also in the same kind of status?

2

3 MR. CHURCHILL: No, I think the
4 population is much healthier out in the Mat-Su Valley, at
5 least my experience with them.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Were these from the
8 Delta or Tok area to start off with?

9

10 MR. CHURCHILL: I don't know where they
11 came from.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So they've basically
14 been on the Kenai six years.

15

16 MR. CHURCHILL: Correct.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Five, actually.

19

20 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah. They're coming
21 into their sixth year. Again, I know a lot of the source
22 of this information was Will Troyer, who's been down
23 there a long time and knows the resource well.
24 Anecdotally, I think the concern -- I hunt grouse quite a
25 bit and I've certainly seen -- I think the spruce are
26 cycling down. It isn't that they're in any huge danger,
27 but that's the logic behind reducing the bag and
28 possession limit. There is just an issue. I'm not
29 really sure that's going to restrict any households. I
30 was talking this morning, my history is you tend to eat
31 grouse fresh, you don't usually freeze them. You can,
32 but that's been the habit that I've most commonly
33 experienced. I've got a pretty healthy appetite and 20
34 grouse were a lot for me.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I have one question. It
37 says that they weren't present on the Kenai Peninsula
38 until being relocated there in the mid-1990s. Relocated,
39 in my understanding of the English language, means that
40 you put something there that was already there at one
41 time. Was there any indication that ruffed grouse ever
42 were located on the Kenai Peninsula?

43

44 MS. DEWHURST: It's my understanding, no.
45 It was an actual introduction. It's not a re-
46 introduction. Relocated just means going from one place
47 to another, generally, in the language. It's my
48 understanding that was a new introduction for the Kenai.
49 Other parts of the state, I believe, they were present,
50 but for the Kenai they weren't.

00178

1 MR. CHURCHILL: Mr. Chair, that's my
2 understanding, too, that this was a new population. They
3 were seeing how it was going to take off. Arguably, it
4 may not, but we want to give it every chance to do so. I
5 agree with Donna. I understand they've never been on the
6 Peninsula.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That difference would
9 make a lot of difference in whether -- I mean if it's a
10 re-introduction or a relocation and they had been present
11 prior, that would make a lot of difference on a C&T
12 finding. If this is the first time they've ever existed
13 there and they've only been there for five years, that
14 also affects whether you find a C&T on them. Any
15 comments from the rest of the Council? Any questions for
16 Pat? Fred.

17

18 MR. ELVSAAS: Yeah, I was just wondering.
19 As I understand it, the ruffed grouse are primarily grain
20 feeders and so forth. When these things happen, like
21 locating something new into an area, what is the
22 potential for them making the spruce grouse decline?

23 What if the ruffed grouse expand and explode, like grouse
24 are known to do? They run in cycles. Are they a danger
25 to the spruce grouse?

26

27 MS. DEWHURST: That exact issue was a
28 very hot debate back before they did the introduction. I
29 remember reading quite a few articles. The actual
30 introduction on the Kenai was controversial partly for
31 that reason, but, in general, spruce grouse and ruffed
32 grouse have habitat differences. The spruce grouse
33 prefer spruce areas and they actually will eat the seeds
34 out of the spruce cones, where ruffed grouse are more
35 deciduous, willow/alder/thicket type birds. They usually
36 like the thickest, nastiest cover they can possibly find.
37 I mean that's been my experience with ruffed grouse
38 hunting back east. You find the thickest cover with the
39 most brambles and nettles and that's where you're going
40 to find the ruffed grouse. They're usually not in the
41 spruce. So there is some habitat differences that would
42 just naturally keep them separate.

43

44 MR. ELVSAAS: The only thing that crossed
45 my mind here was in the event this was to happen, we
46 would certainly have to look at ruffed grouse replacing
47 spruce grouse if they were lost to subsistence uses. I
48 don't envision that happening, but it's something we have
49 to keep in mind down the road. That's probably 12 to 20
50 years from now. But, anyway, thank you.

00179

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fred, in answer to that,
2 from what she says, there's definitely some habitat niche
3 difference in the way they use it over the course of the
4 year, but they also have some overlap, too. But if you
5 go up to the Delta area, out of the same thicket you can
6 shoot a spruce hen, a sharp tail and a ruffed grouse.
7 All three of them in the same place or in the same
8 general vicinity. They may prefer a little bit different
9 cover or a little different place to winter, a little
10 different place to hide, but you can drive down the same
11 gravel road and find all three of the grouse, so there's
12 some overlap, too. Bob.

13

14 MR. CHURCHILL: I agree with the Chair,
15 but I also know their feeding patterns seem to be
16 different. When I hunt ruffed grouse or even sharp tail,
17 I hunt them differently. In my experience hunting grouse
18 throughout the state, I've never seen a decline in spruce
19 grouse anywhere where you have them in common. It's just
20 never been an issue. I know it was a concern. As Donna
21 said, it was a real concern, but I've never seen it
22 happen.

23

24 I was lucky enough to be up in some
25 Athapaskan villages and they have some real legends and
26 histories of the ruffed grouse and it's, I know, a bird
27 that's been there a long time in conjunction with the
28 spruce grouse. So I don't see that as a real danger. We
29 should be concerned, but, obviously, if somehow the
30 ruffed grouse population on the Peninsula took over and
31 we had a dramatic decline in spruce grouse, we'd need to
32 look at that.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: There's one other thing.
35 If the ruffed grouse are there 50 years from now or maybe
36 even less than that, by that time a customary and
37 traditional use of them will develop, whether we want to
38 or not. It will develop. Rural residents in the area
39 will end up making use of them because they do in other
40 parts of the state. But you have to have some birds
41 there in order to have that opportunity. Well, let's go
42 right down the list. Alaska Department of Fish & Game.

43

44 MR. MACHIDA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For
45 the record, my name is Steve Machida. I'm the management
46 coordinator for Southcentral Region Division of Wildlife
47 Conservation. Terry Haynes, who is normally the one that
48 you have contact with on these proposals had to go back
49 to Fairbanks, so I'll be taking his place for this
50 proposal and the next one on comments.

00180

1 Basically, we support the proposal.
2 We've listened and reviewed the staff analysis. Didn't
3 find any points of disagreement. I think the one point
4 that we would add is that one of the components of this
5 proposal is to align the State and Federal bag limit and
6 season. Any time you can do that it's beneficial to
7 users just to avoid confusion and help keep things the
8 same as far as seasons and dates. Anything that can be
9 done to lessen the confusion between State and Federal
10 regulations, we would support. Thank you.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions?

13

14 MR. MACHIDA: One thing I can add is
15 there was a question about where these birds came from.
16 They came from the Clear area, south of Nenana.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions?
19 Thank you. Do we have any other agencies? No other
20 agency comments. Fish & Game advisory comments, do we
21 have any? No written ones. Okay. Summary of written
22 comments.

23

24 MS. WILKINSON: No, there are no written
25 comments.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: There are no written
28 comments, not just advisory comments. This sounds like a
29 real controversial proposal judging by how much
30 participation we have in it. Public testimony. I'll
31 look through it again, but I have no requests for public
32 testimony on this one either to the best of my knowledge.
33 No, I don't. Okay. Which brings us up WP-02-20A,
34 Federal subsistence priority, customary and traditional.
35 A motion to put this issue on the table is in order so
36 that we can discuss it as a body.

37

38 MR. CHURCHILL: So moved.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved. Do I
41 hear a second?

42

43 MR. ELVSAAS: Second.
44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
46 seconded. How are you putting it on the table? Are you
47 putting it on as written?

48
49 MR. CHURCHILL: As written.

50
00181
1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Putting on as written.

2
3 MR. ELVSAAS: We're on A?

4
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We're on A. No Federal
6 subsistence priority for ruffed grouse in Unit 7.
7 Discussion. Bob.

8
9 MR. CHURCHILL: Just for the record, I
10 think the proposer has done their research. I know from
11 talking to the proposer they've got a lot of local
12 knowledge on this. This creates or hopefully will
13 eventually create an alternative use that actually
14 compliments the different users in the area. It seems to
15 be a responsible thing to do from a habitat and resource
16 perspective and I'd like to support it. Obviously, the
17 Chair's comment that it doesn't appear to be terribly
18 controversial, folks haven't objected to it and the only
19 thing we've heard is positive, both from the staff and
20 ADF&G and all other input, so I intend to vote for it and
21 support it.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fred.

24
25 MR. ELVSAAS: What does ANILCA say about
26 newly-introduced species and how long it had to be
27 around?

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pat.

30
31 MS. PETRIVELLI: I don't think ANILCA
32 addresses it. It just talks about customary and
33 traditional use of the resources and the eight factors
34 look at defining what customary and traditional use are.
35 Now, when we look at the appendix, it has how we've dealt
36 with introduced species. The Subsistence Management
37 Program has dealt with it, so the Federal Subsistence
38 Board and the regional councils have recognized customary
39 and traditional use of transplanted species, but they
40 were species that had been there longer periods of time
41 and that became integrated. Our program calls for it to
42 look at the community use of species and there are so few
43 ruffed grouse that haven't been integrated into any
44 pattern of community use. But ANILCA doesn't address
45 transplanted species, just the use of it, whether it's
46 introduced or just customary and traditional use.

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, I was looking at
49 that appendix and we have species that were introduced
50 that have no customary and traditional that were

00182
1 introduced back in the '60s and we have species that have

2 customary and traditional, but most of them have been
3 there for over 50 years. I find it pretty hard to find a
4 customary -- much as I know that if they are there, they
5 will become customary and traditional if they do take,
6 but it's awful hard to find customary and traditional
7 finding on a bird that we're not even sure exists. The
8 fact that you heard two drumming doesn't mean there were
9 two hens to go with them. It's totally possible that
10 you'll have none of them by next year.

11

12 MS. PETRIVELLI: And I have to admit on
13 page 67 there's an error on that table and it will be
14 corrected by the Board. For bison and Delta, there is no
15 Federal subsistence priority for bison in Delta, and then
16 the remainder of that unit that doesn't include Delta
17 where there are no bison, there's no determination. So
18 that's an error in the table.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I was looking at the
21 bison both in the Delta area and the Copper River area,
22 Chitna area and there was no determination for those
23 either and they were introduced quite a bit further back
24 than the grouse were, anywhere from the '20s to the '60s,
25 depending on where it was at. With that, any further
26 discussion? If not, the question.

27

28 MR. CHURCHILL: Call the question.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Call the question then.
31 All in favor of the proposal as written, signify by
32 saying aye.

33

34 IN UNISON: Aye.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
37 saying nay.

38

39 (No opposing votes)

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. Now
42 we'll go on to WP-02-20B, reducing the bag limit from 15
43 to 10 and possession limit from 30 to 20.

44

45 MS. DEWHURST: We've already done quite a
46 bit of discussion on B. Generally, the Board likes these
47 separated. If there's a C&T issue and then a subpart B
48 issue, they usually like to keep them separate. This
49 basically has been described, it's a reduction in the
50 daily take and the possession limit. It's still pretty
00183

1 liberal. Ten per day, 20 in possession is still a fair
2 amount. It would line up with the State. And then with
3 ruffed grouse we would go to a no open season. The
4 reduction in the bag was for spruce. As mentioned, there
5 is evidence they're declining and, as Susan mentioned,
6 the evidence that we give in the paper is primarily from
7 Unit 15, but all indications are 7 is paralleling and we
8 have better information from 15, so that's why we were
9 quoting the better information. There is no intent to
10 follow this proposal into Unit 15 at this time. This is
11 purely a Unit 7 proposal.

12

13 So the recommendation is basically to
14 support the proposal. We would line up with the State.
15 We don't feel that it would produce any undue hardship on
16 the subsistence users since the bag is still quite
17 liberal. If somebody accidentally shot a ruffed grouse,
18 they could always claim it under State regulations, so
19 there's no danger of setting up an enforcement situation
20 there. Then the only other recommendation is to add some
21 language to our reg book, just kind of clarifying putting
22 a diagram in to clarify identification for folks since
23 ruffed grouse are new for a lot of people in Alaska. So,
24 basically, we're supporting it.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Donna, can I ask a
27 question. You said spruce grouse are declining. How do
28 you say that an animal that is cyclic is declining? I
29 mean they crash and they come back and spruce grouse have
30 a tendency to be hunted along the road system, you have
31 the whole interior system where they're not hunted. I
32 know back in the '50s they found out bag limits and
33 micromanaging it season by season have no effect on the
34 population when you're dealing with a cyclic animal. It
35 would be just like putting a bag limit on snowshoe hares.
36 When the season is high, it doesn't make any difference.
37 When the season is low, it doesn't make any difference.
38 When the season is low, you're not going to get them.
39 When the season is high, you're going to have more than
40 you know what to do with.

41

42 Personally, I just wonder -- now, this is
43 to align it with the State season basically, State bag
44 limit and possession limit. I, honestly, find that when
45 the season runs, like where we are right now, when the
46 grouse have crashed, it doesn't matter how big the bag
47 limit is, you're not going to get it. And when the
48 grouse are in full cycle, it doesn't matter how big the
49 bag limit is because you're not going to be able to
50 affect the population of grouse because we only hunt
00184

1 strips and the grouse live all the way to the top of the
2 mountain, on both sides of it. So I just wondered if the
3 main reason is to align it with the State.

4

5 MS. DEWHURST: Speaking purely as a
6 biologist, I agree with you 100 percent. We deal a lot
7 with these cyclic populations; lynx, grouse, caribou. In
8 an ideal world, I think the better way to deal with this,
9 just purely as a biologist and taking all the politics
10 aside, would be to pick a mid-level regulation and just
11 stick with it through the cycles, but generally politics
12 won't let us. When the numbers go up, people want to
13 take more. When the numbers go down, somebody is
14 screaming saying take the bag down, so we're always kind
15 of chasing our tail on these things and following the
16 cycle and we're usually one step behind the cycle. I've
17 dealt with that a lot since I've been in this program,
18 especially with lynx, but we've kind of cleaned that up a
19 little bit recently.

20

21 Yeah, it's true. This is primarily to

22 line up with the State. The request came in and I tend
23 to agree with you, Ralph, that if we left the bag limit
24 high, chances are people wouldn't get the animals anyway,
25 so it probably wouldn't be an effect. When I look at the
26 guidelines in our program, there is evidence of a
27 conservation concern because they're on the down cycle,
28 so there is evidence to support reducing the bag, but in
29 reality, it probably won't have that much of an effect on
30 the population. In reality, we are dealing more with
31 just lining up with the State. So, yes, I agree with you
32 100 percent on that. That's the case with a lot of
33 these.

34
35 Like with caribou, you can imagine with
36 Nelchina, if we tried to propose one regulation and stuck
37 with it, it would never happen, even though we know
38 caribou are notoriously cyclic in population, just like
39 these others. It's just kind of like politics forces us
40 to do one thing, but if we went with the pure biology, it
41 would make more sense to just pick something in the
42 middle and stick with it long term.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I can understand because
45 of the fact that even lynx, when the cycle is low, if
46 you've got enough pressure, you can knock them down so
47 they don't recover, but when you're dealing with animals,
48 like rabbits or grouse, that have large clutches or
49 multiple birth groups during the course of the
50 summertime, that cycle is going to be the overriding
00185

1 factor no matter what. What people have to remember is
2 that cycles cycle. I mean in the years that I've watched
3 the hare cycle up where we live, some peak cycles are
4 higher than other peak cycles and it has nothing to do
5 with who's taking the rabbit because there's nobody there
6 taking them, it has strictly to do with the strength of
7 the cycle.

8
9 I have real difficulty with these micro-
10 management ones on these kind of species. For one thing,
11 if a subsistence user was out there and had an
12 opportunity to take 15 of them, I see no reason to cut
13 their bag limit down unless there is an overriding issue
14 on it. On these, I have a real difficulty with these,
15 but I'll let Bob speak.

16
17 MR. CHURCHILL: I guess I have a question
18 to Susan. That's the way I look at it, is trying to hit
19 a middle ground with that. I don't know what the
20 traditional method of catching grouse, spruce grouse is
21 on the Peninsula. It would seem to be a reasonable bag
22 limit, but I don't know. Her family has a history of
23 this. I'd be curious of her opinion if that, in fact,
24 would be a reasonable middle ground limit for catching
25 spruce grouse.

26
27 MS. WELLS: Well, I'm glad you brought up
28 Unit 15 because we're talking specific to 7. So, is this
29 change here going to set a precedent for the other maybe?
30

31 MS. DEWHURST: No, it won't. There's no

32 history of doing it. We treat each unit totally
33 separate.

34
35 MS. WELLS: Isn't that kind of confusing
36 for users in different units?

37
38 MS. DEWHURST: Well, we're lining up with
39 what the State regulations are for those different units.

40
41 MS. WELLS: Traditionally, when we catch
42 spruce hen, it's a fresh meat dinner, so I don't know
43 that we've ever, my son or I, got more than 10 at a time,
44 so I don't know that that would be an impact, but there
45 may be those that rely on them or store them for winter.
46 I've only frozen a few for a very short amount of time,
47 so it wouldn't impact me directly. But I guess I really
48 disagree with the politics. I think we need to stick
49 with the biology. It's been an issue probably with every
50 resource we have, the biologists have to fight the
00186

1 politicians to do what's right for the resource.

2
3 I just want to make sure. So this change
4 would not in the future then impact 15?

5
6 MS. DEWHURST: Not unless somebody in 15
7 specifically asks for it and we've had no requests or
8 even mention of it in any time since I've been in the
9 program, so there's not been any interest at all in
10 changing 15's regs.

11
12 MS. WELLS: Can you also address a little
13 bit about -- 7 has already had the problem with the
14 spruce bark beetle, so that issue in 7 has been -- that's
15 kind of done and it's moved west?

16
17 MS. DEWHURST: That's hard to say. I
18 mean I've flown extensively over that area. I'm a
19 private pilot and I fly down in that area all the time.
20 Boy, just this past summer flying from Anchorage down to
21 Seward, you can fly for half an hour, 45 minutes and not
22 see a live spruce tree. It's just amazing how much kill
23 is down there. It's hard to imagine there's too much
24 left to kill because it's been mostly done. There's
25 probably some patches of younger trees around, but I
26 think the worst is over. Judging from what I've seen
27 flying down there, it's amazing how extensive it is from
28 the air.

29
30 MS. WELLS: So that is also having an
31 effect on.....

32
33 MS. DEWHURST: Oh, it's a big impact on
34 spruce grouse.

35
36 MS. WELLS:the spruce grouse, which
37 would be part the cycle, too.

38
39 MS. DEWHURST: And this bag limit is
40 reasonable. It's a mid level. Actually, I don't
41 consider this a low-level bag limit. I would consider

42 this more a mid level, that this could be something we'd
43 be able to live with for a long term. I really don't
44 think this is that restrictive. I tend to agree with you
45 folks. My experience shooting them, to get 10, you're
46 doing good to get 10 a day, unless somebody is better
47 than I am.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fred.

50

00187

1 MR. ELVSAAS: My experience with the
2 spruce grouse is we hunt them for fresh meat. I was
3 trying to think if I'd ever gotten more than six in one
4 day and I don't recall getting more than six in one day.
5 But, in turn, others do get quite a few when they spend a
6 day out hunting and I just hunt for what I need, not for
7 the whole day hunt. In our area, like Ralph said, we
8 hunt primarily along the roads and where the creekbed
9 gravel is in the mornings and so forth, so there's large
10 areas that aren't hunted.

11

12 I don't think the proposed limit is
13 unreasonable, but, on the other hand, do we want to be
14 changing it around. As I understand, Unit 15, which is
15 where I am, has a set limit and now the State has set
16 Unit 7 at a lower limit, so we want to be in parity with
17 the State so there's no discrepancies, but my question is
18 why. You know, just because the State did something
19 doesn't mean the Office of Subsistence Management should
20 be jumping to the State's idea. I don't have heartburn
21 over it other than the fact that we're doing it because
22 the State did it.

23

24 MR. CHURCHILL: I can speak to why the
25 proposers are doing this. It has a large part to do with
26 the habitat. My experience is the same as Donna's. I
27 fly down for work to the Peninsula and in this area it is
28 hard to find live spruce trees anymore. I think that's
29 having an impact and will on the long term and I'd
30 certainly defer to the Department, but I think it's
31 having a long-term effect on these populations. I guess
32 in 7 I'm not concerned with it. I don't see the same
33 things in any of the sub-units within 15 at this point,
34 although I don't spend the amount of time. You guys know
35 it better than I. But 7, it's pretty dramatic in the
36 habitat impact, which I think is different than just the
37 normal cycling that the Chair speaks to. I agree, it's
38 funny, but caribou and Arctic hare, to try and follow
39 those cycles, good bloody luck, you know. I mean we're
40 not going to ever do that.

41

42 But I think this is enough different,
43 given all the damage to the spruce trees in this
44 particular unit, and it doesn't sound like we're
45 unnecessarily restricting anybody with this, that it
46 might be the responsible thing to do. Then, if the
47 habitat comes back and supports the more normal cycle,
48 then we can always revisit it. It seems to me there's
49 very few negatives and it might be a responsible thing to
50 do to the resource. My experience is the same as Susan.

00188

1 I mean these are things that I eat fresh and not too late
2 in the year either.

3
4 MS. DEWHURST: If you recall, I think it
5 was two years ago we worked on a very similar proposal
6 for ptarmigan and my recommendation at that time was not
7 to follow, not to reduce the bag because there really
8 wasn't any evidence. It was just a typical ptarmigan
9 cycle and I didn't see any reason to reduce the bag,
10 where I tend to agree with Mr. Churchill. In this one, I
11 think, yes, spruce are cyclic -- spruce grouse are
12 cyclic, but, in this case, we do have a habitat damage
13 situation we're dealing with. They will come back, but
14 it will be a slower comeback because the habitat has been
15 so dramatically changed. So I fully expect them to come
16 back, but it will probably be a little bit more delayed
17 at this point until they can either adapt to the fact of
18 the loss of the spruce or we start getting some spruce
19 coming back, but that is their primary habitat.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Donna, I think you hit
22 the proper word when you made the mistake though and that
23 is that spruce are cyclic. If you go back into history,
24 extend over a couple of these life

25
26 MS. DEWHURST: It used to be fire and
27 now, in this case, it was beetle kill, but,
28 traditionally, in the past, it was fire kill.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Susan.

31
32 MS. WELLS: One other thing I was
33 concerned about is in the harvest information. This
34 change is being based on -- I mean we actually have no
35 harvest data collected on the grouse in 7 in over 30
36 years.

37
38 MR. CHURCHILL: Excuse me, isn't Table 2
39 out of 7 on page 64?

40
41 MS. WELLS: I'm reading this off of 70.

42
43 MR. CHURCHILL: Just for clarification,
44 isn't that what the chart is on 64?

45
46 MS. WELLS: Unh-unh.

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's more percentage
49 of household use than it is harvest.

50
00189

1 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yeah, that's just
2 household use.

3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That has nothing to do
5 with quantity.

6
7 MS. PETRIVELLI: Well, it doesn't say
8 where they obtained the resource, so it just says that
9 they harvested that amount. In its percentage of
10 household, it doesn't show -- oh, and then the pounds,

11 but it doesn't say where.

12

13 MR. CHURCHILL: And I would guess -- and
14 I'd defer to folks that live there, but I doubt that I'd
15 drive down to 15 to hunt spruce grouse myself for the
16 food value.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any further discussion?
19 If not, question is in order.

20

21 MR. CHURCHILL: Call the question.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Question has been
24 called. All in favor of Proposal WP-02-20B, reducing the
25 grouse limit from 15 to 10 and possession limit from 30
26 to 20.....

27

28 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Who made the
29 motion?

30

31 MR. ELVSAAS: I don't think there's a
32 motion.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, we haven't had a
35 motion on that yet? Oh, we're still in.....

36

37 MR. ELVSAAS: Agencies.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Agencies. Oh, well, I
40 like to get things done in a hurry today. Okay.

41

42 MR. CHURCHILL: I'd like to move to put
43 that on the table.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: First we have to go
46 through the rest of the agencies. We were still on
47 Donna. We need Alaska Department of Fish & Game comments
48 and other agency comments. Do we have any? You guys
49 caught me on that one.

50

00190

1 MR. MACHIDA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The
2 comments we provided earlier were for both, so we don't
3 have anything to add.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: In other words, Fish &
6 Game Department supports this proposal.

7

8 MR. MACHIDA: That's correct.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Do we have
11 any Fish & Game Advisory Committee comments? Written?

12

13 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman, there are
14 no written comments.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I have no public
17 testimony before me. I'd like a motion to put WP-02-20B
18 on the table.

19

20 MR. CHURCHILL: So moved.

21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second?
23
24 MR. ELVSAAS: Second.
25
26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
27 seconded. It's on the table. It's open for discussion.
28 If there's no discussion, question is in order.
29
30 MR. CHURCHILL: Question.
31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All in favor signify by
33 saying aye.
34
35 IN UNISON: Aye.
36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
38 saying nay.
39
40 IN UNISON: Nay.
41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion fails. Do we
43 need a roll call on that one?
44
45 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman, how many
46 people were opposed?
47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Three. Two were for.
49
50 MS. WILKINSON: Thank you.
00191
1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Am I correct? That's
2 what I heard. Should I have a show of hands? I heard
3 two and three. Nay, nay and there was a nay over here?
4 So two for, three against. Motion fails. Okay. With
5 that we go on to WP-02-48.
6
7 MS. DEWHURST: Last, but not least. This
8 one, for those that have been on the Council for a couple
9 years, we visited this a couple years ago. We've had a
10 lot of requests for the Feds to take over the moose hunt
11 in Unit 6C primarily for dissatisfaction of State
12 management. When we visited this two years ago, we came
13 up with a compromise that the Federal subsistence program
14 would take over the very small, limited cow hunt, which
15 was five permits, and leave the rest alone. The rest was
16 very well dictated by -- they have a good cooperative
17 group down there; they have a management plan, they were
18 working within their management guidelines and we really
19 didn't feel at that time any need to mess with it.
20
21 Two years later it resurfaces. Different
22 group presenting it. My first question when I found this
23 out was, okay, what's new, what's changed. Basically
24 what happened is, with the bull permits under the State
25 program, of course, everybody in the state is eligible
26 and that's worked out fine for a number of years.
27 Generally, the folks in Cordova ended up getting better
28 than 50 percent, usually 60 to 70 percent in some cases,
29 of the permits and they were quite content with that.
30 But because moose have declined in a number of parts of

31 the state, especially along the coastal zones, the number
32 of areas Anchorage hunters and Fairbanks hunters can go
33 to get their moose has been declining in the past couple
34 years. So, being savvy, they're starting to look and
35 say, well, what's left and they realize this Cordova hunt
36 was one of the few left still available to them, so there
37 was an influx in the number of people putting in for the
38 drawing permits. Well, these really aren't drawing
39 permits, but that's how they're managed, is you put in
40 for them and they draw a certain number of names.

41
42 So the percentage this year that the
43 Cordova folks got out of the number of permits dropped
44 considerably just because there was a big influx in
45 outside permits, so the Cordova folks were quite
46 concerned and trying to figure out a way to get around
47 this. As it was phrased to me, they very reluctantly
48 said maybe we should put some of this into the Federal
49 subsistence season. That was mentioned two or three
50 times to me, which was kind of interesting. They said
00192

1 they really didn't want to, but they couldn't see any way
2 around it.

3
4 And they gave this a lot of thought and a
5 lot of discussion locally. There has been more than one
6 meeting in Cordova talking about this and I'll give them
7 credit. They didn't come out and say we want it all.
8 They looked at the land status and looked at what
9 percentage were Federal lands and what percentage were
10 State lands and said let's divvy it up based on land
11 status. So that's where the 75%/25% split came from, was
12 the land status. Basically about 75 percent of the lands
13 down there in Unit 6C are Federal.

14
15 They didn't get greedy with this.
16 They're basically saying that way, if we put those bull
17 permits into the Federal system, they're guaranteed that
18 that 75 percent of the permits will go to Cordova
19 residents because, basically, they're the only ones that
20 have C&T in our program, so it was a guaranteed
21 percentage of those permits. Then the other 25 percent
22 that are left, then it's still a gamble. Chances are
23 Cordova folks will get some of those, too, but the
24 percentage will vary.

25
26 So that's where this all came from. It
27 really wasn't a biological issue. This is more an
28 allocation issue that came up. That's one aspect.

29
30 The other aspect was a date change
31 request and that was a request to go to September 1.
32 September 1 has been the long traditional starting date
33 for that hunt. Where August 15 came from was when we did
34 the Federal proposal two years ago, the Native village of
35 Eyak requested August 15th. I talked to some folks there
36 and I asked them where that came from and they said at
37 the time they thought there might be some commercial
38 fishermen that would want to go moose hunting while
39 they're out fishing, but, in reality, they realized that
40 wasn't a real viable aspect because of where they're

41 fishing and where the moose are that really there isn't
42 that much of an overlap. So, when I discussed it with
43 them, they were willing to support the September 1 start
44 and they were the ones that originally came up with the
45 August 15 and they basically said, no, it's okay, you can
46 change it to September 1, we realized it really wasn't
47 that significant of a difference. So that's the other
48 aspect of this proposal, the request.

49

50 Now, if we go to page 81, we'll go to the
00193

1 conclusions on this. Another issue came up as I was
2 researching this that surprised me and I'm glad we caught
3 it. It was a close catch. We dealt with this in other
4 areas, but the State is doing a radio collaring effort,
5 has been doing a radio collaring effort on moose cows in
6 the area. Traditionally, they capture them in November
7 and they're using capture drugs.

8

9 There are some very strict Federal laws
10 on the use of capture drugs and having a human harvest of
11 those animals because of the risk of the capture drugs
12 being in the meat. The bottom line was OSM wasn't aware
13 prior to this of that situation and we were kind of
14 hanging out there last year because we had the season
15 open when the capture drugs were being used.

16

17 The reason we lucked out was the very
18 savvy State biologist knew about all this and he knew
19 that all the cows had already been taken prior to his use
20 of the capture drug, so it wasn't an issue, but we were
21 kind of dancing on the border because, technically, our
22 season was still open and we're not supposed to have any
23 harvest allowed during a time when capture drugs are
24 being used. That is a public safety issue. So, when I
25 became aware of that, I quickly realized that we needed
26 to change the cow season and march it back. The old
27 season went through December 31st. March the cow season
28 back to October 31st, which would line up with the State.

29

30 There's no history of cows being taken
31 after October 31st anyway, so it probably isn't an issue.
32 There, again, I discussed it with the Native village of
33 Eyak, who had originally done these proposals a couple of
34 years ago. They didn't have any heartbreak with it. At
35 the public meetings locally, we haven't had any real
36 heartbreak with it expressed. This way it would make us
37 legal with the existing radio collaring efforts in
38 November. We'd only do that to the cow season because
39 that's all that are being radio collared, are cows. They
40 get a huge amount of information from that program, so I
41 really wouldn't want to do anything to jeopardize the
42 State's program with the radio collaring. So that's my
43 recommendation on cows.

44

45 Because of that I split the cows and the
46 bulls in our program, which we hadn't in the past. So
47 you'll see with the cow season it would be September 1
48 through October 31 and that earlier closing date is
49 because of the radio collaring effort in November. But
50 with the bull season, I'm recommending to stick with the

00194

1 requested December 31 close.

2

3 Now, we did have some discussion and some
4 requests to line up with the State there. The State
5 season closes October 31. When I looked at it, I
6 couldn't see any strong justification to go there. If
7 anything, there's strong justification not to because
8 this season would enable people to harvest bulls after
9 the rut. As far as subsistence users, that's a good
10 thing. So I didn't see any biological reason to justify
11 reducing the bull season back to October 31, even though
12 we don't line up with the State on that one.

13

14 So the way this is written, the cow
15 season would line up with the State, even though the
16 State doesn't have currently a cow harvest under their
17 management. The bull season, the starting date would
18 line up, the ending date would not. And then we put the
19 language in saying that basically the local Forest
20 Service office would -- we'd delegate down to them as far
21 as dealing with permits and dealing with allocation
22 issues because they are working very closely with the
23 State under that management regime that's been set up and
24 the cooperators and it was felt that, as we talked about
25 with the Park Service in Mentasta Lake, we feel that from
26 all our information the Forest Service in Cordova has a
27 very good working relationship with the local people
28 there and with Fish & Game, so we felt in that case it
29 might be better to delegate down to them in the future
30 dealing with these issues so we don't keep bringing them
31 to the Federal Subsistence Board. So that's where that
32 language came in at the end.

33

34 In general, we went through a lot of
35 iterations in the analysis on this, or at least I did. I
36 went through several versions, but I think we got it
37 lined up now and I think most the folks I talked to
38 seemed fairly happy with the conclusions and I did a lot
39 of research on it and talking to a lot of folks and I
40 didn't hear any strong negative aspects on this other
41 than there are still a few folks out there that say
42 they'd like us to line up on the bull season. But I just
43 didn't see a justification for cutting out that winter
44 hunt. That concludes my analysis.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any
47 questions for Donna? Bob.

48

49 MR. CHURCHILL: Donna, if I am reading
50 this material right and remember it correctly, the herd
00195

1 is stable and possibly growing, there's no habitat issues
2 in terms of food, there's no real strong predation issues
3 with this herd, is that correct?

4

5 MS. DEWHURST: Yeah, it isn't really a
6 biological issue at all. This was purely a user
7 allocation issue. That's why I say there wasn't any
8 justification for reductions of seasons biologically.

9

10 MR. CHURCHILL: If I can follow up. No,
11 I wasn't concerned with that. I was just indicating that
12 once that herd hits the population of 400, there's going
13 to be more opportunity for everyone to hunt. I think the
14 figure of about 30 additional animals would be added to
15 the hunt mix if I remember correctly.

16
17 MS. DEWHURST: Yeah, you're correct and
18 that was part of our reason for writing in this language
19 to bring it down to the Forest Service because we were
20 basically told next year there will probably be some
21 changes. So, anticipating that, to try to prevent us
22 talking about this again next year at this meeting, we
23 thought it would be better to delegate it down to them so
24 they could deal with those changes.

25
26 MR. CHURCHILL: And the reason probably
27 then for the percentages rather than absolute numbers.
28 Okay. Thank you.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
31 Donna? Thank you, Donna. You did a very good job
32 presenting it. Alaska Department of Fish & Game.

33
34 MR. MACHIDA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
35 Just a couple comments related to the staff analysis.
36 The first thing is that there's a correction that needs
37 to be noted or an addition that needs to be noted under
38 estimated population size on page 78. The data quoted is
39 360 moose for population size for 6C. We just did a
40 census last month and the new population figure is 340
41 moose with 20 percent calves in the population. The
42 previous data, 360 moose, was from last year and the calf
43 percentage there was 11 percent. That's just a data
44 correction.

45
46 Another correction that concerns the
47 moose radio collaring study that Donna talked about.
48 Even though this is a study the State is working on, it's
49 actually a cooperative study with the Forest Service
50 office there at Cordova. I mean basically it's a 50/50
00196
1 cooperative study. The Forest Service is using
2 subsistence management money for the study because it's
3 designated for their Subsistence Management Program.
4 That's an addition.

5
6 Maybe just a little bit of background
7 concerning why the study is necessary, why we're doing
8 it. One of the problems that this population has, not
9 only the 6C population, but the 6B population as well, is
10 they've had a recurrent problem with recruitment, low
11 recruitment. It hasn't been quite as noticeable in 6C,
12 but even in 6C the recruitment levels have been all over
13 the board. This year it was 20 percent, but last year it
14 was only 11 percent.

15
16 The neighboring 6B, the recruitment
17 levels are usually below 10 percent, 7, 8, 9 percent, so
18 there's been a concern by our staff and also by the
19 Cordova people of why is our recruitment level so low.

20 This radio collaring study was initiated to try to answer
21 those questions to find out when calves are born to cows,
22 what happens to them during the summertime, why are they
23 lost. We had some interesting results from the study so
24 far. It just started last year.

25

26 One of the things we've learned and we've
27 always thought it to be the case, but it was verified
28 that moose in the Copper River Delta are perhaps the best
29 conditioned moose in the state. We use a special
30 ultrasound machine to look at moose and evaluate body
31 condition. In terms of fat content and body condition,
32 they are basically off the scale compared to the rest of
33 the state, so they are in very good condition. So the low
34 recruitment is certainly not a habitat problem. It's not
35 because the habitat there is poor. We suspect that it's
36 predation, primarily bears, and that's probably going to
37 be the conclusion that we'll have from the study.

38

39 The other concern that we had with the 6C
40 population is that we expected the numbers to reach 400
41 sooner. Part of the management plan that was done with
42 local residents was that once the population hit 400,
43 then harvest could be increased, but it just never seems
44 to quite get there. I mean it gets close, but it kind of
45 hovers around that 350 animal range. In order to get a
46 better handle on what's going on, then that requires
47 collaring of animals and looking not only at calf
48 mortality, but also adult mortality. So we expect this
49 study to go on for at least several more years.

50

00197

1 The comments that we have relative to
2 this proposal. Our area biologist in Cordova was
3 involved with the discussions with George Koval and the
4 local advisory committee and we don't really have any
5 problem with the proposal as far as permits go, the 75/25
6 split. This matches fairly well the management of lands
7 in 6C. Approximately 80 percent of the land in 6C is
8 Forest Service land managed by the Federal Subsistence
9 Program, so the split seems to be workable from that
10 standpoint. The only potential problem we see with the
11 Federal permits is that most of the land along the road
12 system is private land. I mean it's under State control,
13 so individuals that draw a Federal permit, they're going
14 to be much more restricted in where they can go to get
15 their moose, so that's a potential problem. Then, again,
16 there is Federal land once you get past the airport. In
17 the past, there's always been a fair number of moose that
18 have been taken between town and the airport. The only
19 individuals that can hunt that land right now would be
20 those with a State permit.

21

22 The only recommendation that we would
23 have is for the bull season to go with the same closing
24 date that the State has of October 31. Currently, for
25 the bull season, bull hunters normally have a 95 to 100
26 percent success rate. In normal years, hunters usually
27 get their moose by the middle of October. Just looking
28 at the harvest statistics, the few odd individuals that
29 didn't get their moose usually were from out of town. In

30 fact, in the last five years that I've looked at the
31 data, they were all from out of town. From what we could
32 tell, virtually all Cordova residents that get a permit
33 get a moose and they've always gotten them before the
34 middle of October. I mean we don't see a big problem as
35 far as hunter opportunity with closing it on the last day
36 of October. Thank you.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions?

39

40 MR. ELVSAAS: Am I correct, you said most
41 of the moose are taken by October 31?

42

43 MR. MACHIDA: That's affirmative. That's
44 correct. As I mentioned, this hunt has an extremely high
45 success rate of 95 to 100 percent. From what I could
46 tell from the harvest statistics, this harvest is usually
47 done by the middle of October and certainly by the end of
48 October.

49

50 MR. ELVSAAS: So, in fact, by leaving it
00198

1 open until December 31 wouldn't affect the herd that
2 much. There may be one or two that didn't get one and
3 wanted to wait till after the rut and then they could get
4 their moose at that time. So it really wouldn't be a big
5 factor in the size of the herd then.

6

7 MR. MACHIDA: No, it wouldn't be a big
8 biological factor. Again, as I mentioned in previous
9 testimony, any time that we could improve consistency
10 between State and Federal regulations, we see that as
11 beneficial and that would be the primary consideration.

12

13 MR. ELVSAAS: Thank you.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

16

17 MR. CHURCHILL: Steve, if you could
18 comment, is the bull/cow ratio still 15 per 100, roughly?

19

20 MR. MACHIDA: That's the management
21 objective. One of the problems that we have with
22 managing the Cordova population is that we almost never
23 get surveys or census seasons done before December. I
24 mean the snow in the Cordova/Prince William Sound area
25 usually comes late. I mean usually we're not out there
26 doing census season until January, February. Even though
27 bull/cow ratio data is collected, it's not reliable just
28 because a significant number have dropped their antlers,
29 so we don't even use it.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.

32

33 MR. CHURCHILL: And the other thing that
34 interested me, you seem to be indicating the Department
35 of Fish & Game is comfortable equating allocation of the
36 resource with land ownership. Was that what I was
37 understanding you to say?

38

39 MR. MACHIDA: Yes. As I mentioned, our

40 Cordova area biologist was involved with the discussions
41 that George Koval and the advisory committee had along
42 with discussions with the Forest Service and he sees this
43 as a workable alternative because he knows that people in
44 Cordova are dissatisfied with the current state system as
45 far as having non-local residents come there to hunt. He
46 sees that as workable.

47

48 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you very much.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

00199

1 MR. CHURCHILL: Just for a point of
2 information, one of the reasons the success rate on moose
3 harvest in Cordova is so high is the moose hunt in
4 Cordova is a community effort. If you have a moose tag,
5 everybody that drives out the road is your spotter. If a
6 moose is out there some place and everybody knows in town
7 who has a tag, and if you have a tag, somebody is going
8 to give you a call and tell you when there's a moose
9 available. So the community really works together. The
10 community worked together on putting moose there and the
11 community works together on harvesting the moose. If you
12 look at the statistics, the moose are well-shared in the
13 community and I think that's part of the reasoning behind
14 the thought of keeping at least a percentage of the moose
15 for the community. For the record, that was drive out
16 the road, definitely not fly out the road and spot them.
17 No, I'm just teasing.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, basically most of
20 it is. Any other questions for the biologist?

21

22 MR. JOHN: I've got one. You said you
23 guys wanted to align the Federal date for season opening
24 with the State down there in Cordova?

25

26 MR. MACHIDA: Yeah, that's our
27 recommendation for the bull season.

28

29 MR. JOHN: I just got a comment on that.
30 Most of the time, because like where I live, you know, in
31 Mentasta and a lot of other places I know of, when
32 there's a State hunt, you know, we don't have a Federal.
33 I get what you call a Tier 2 permit, probably one bull or
34 one moose. During the open season, I'm a local hunter,
35 but I never did get a moose during the regular season.
36 What my concern here is that the subsistence hunters --
37 we usually try to give them either five days ahead of
38 time before the regular State season opens or five days
39 after the State season to give them a little advantage
40 after the craziness is gone out of the hunting season,
41 but that's just an advantage. That's the only reason I
42 brought it up. That's why I always push a little ahead
43 of State season or a little bit behind time and my reason
44 for that is just for the subsistence hunter to have a
45 chance to get their moose.

46

47 MR. MACHIDA: Well, having a different
48 season would certainly be an advantage in a place where
49 you have a general hunt where you basically have an

50 unlimited number of hunters that can go to an area. This
00200

1 is a problem in any road system hunt. But this hunt is a
2 permit hunt. I mean the number of people that are going
3 to be out there is really limited, so we see it as a
4 slightly different situation.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Correct me if I'm wrong,
7 but this is probably the most successful permit hunt in
8 the state, isn't it?

9
10 MR. MACHIDA: That's correct. There's a
11 few other hunts that approach 100 percent. Some of the
12 muskox hunts. Those approach 100 percent. But as far as
13 a moose hunt, to my knowledge, this is the only one that
14 even gets close to that.

15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So basically there's 20
17 permits out there and there's 20 hunters out there.
18 There's no general hunt. Any other questions for the
19 biologist? Any other agencies, Forest Service or
20 anything that has comments on this? Fish & Game Advisory
21 Committee, written or verbal.

22
23 MS. WILKINSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
24 The Copper River/Prince William Sound did send in a
25 written comment. They support this proposal with the
26 following amendments. Quote, that bull harvest in Unit C
27 be changed from statewide draw of 100 percent to a
28 statewide draw of 25 percent allowable harvest to be
29 determined by winter surveys and the remaining 75 percent
30 would become a Federal subsistence drawing conducted in
31 conjunction with the Federal subsistence cow drawing by
32 the U.S. Forest Service, also determined by winter
33 surveys. Only one subsistence moose may be harvested by
34 household. End quote.

35
36 The advisory committee discussed this
37 proposal at a public meeting and the amendment was
38 approved by the proponent. The advisory committee
39 believes that these amendments will provide more
40 opportunity to area residents that the percentages used
41 follow historical averages and consider private land
42 ownership conflicts. That's the end of the comment.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. That's all
45 the written comments we have?

46
47 MS. WILKINSON: No, sir. There's one
48 other, but I think Mr. Mark King from the Native Village
49 of Eyak is here. I didn't know if he wanted to testify.
50 If he doesn't, I have one.

00201
1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mark, did you want to
2 testify on this one? Then we don't have to read your
3 written comment.

4
5 MR. KING: The only thing I have to say
6 about it is the one per household and I'm not sure how
7 that's going to be written into the permit through the
8 Forest Service. That wasn't the case with the State

9 drawing. Do you have any idea of how that's going to be
10 done?

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's a good question.
13 Donna.

14

15 MS. DEWHURST: That was a request that we
16 add that. That was actually an amendment to the original
17 proposal and that came, my understanding, from the local
18 meeting in Cordova. It was widely requested because they
19 felt that in some cases households were getting two and
20 three permits and they wanted it restricted one per
21 household. So, basically, what we would do under the
22 Federal system, it would be -- it's only going to be one
23 Federal permit per household, so somebody could
24 potentially get a Federal permit and a State permit, but
25 they can't have two Federal permits.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Would all members of the
28 household be able to put in for the permit so that a
29 larger household has bigger odds of getting a permit.....

30

31 MS. DEWHURST: Correct.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:than a smaller
34 household, but only one will be drawn per household.

35

36 MS. DEWHURST: Right. And depending on
37 if two were drawn -- let's say a cow permit and a bull
38 permit were drawn for the same household, generally we
39 give that household the option of which they would prefer
40 in the case where we have different sex hunts.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We've done that in other
43 subsistence hunts, limited animals by the household
44 rather than by the individual.

45

46 MR. KING: I'm just curious about how
47 you'd do the State combined with the Federal permit. Is
48 there any way if you got a State permit and got a Federal
49 permit both.....

50

00202

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: As an individual, you
2 can't have more than one moose in the State, so you, as
3 an individual, could not have a State and a Federal
4 permit. You, as a household, could have a State and a
5 Federal permit.

6

7 MR. KING: That was the concern I had and
8 I was just curious how that could be addressed.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Other than voluntarily,
11 probably it couldn't. I don't think there's any
12 mechanism to tie the two drawings together. They don't
13 even take place at the same time. Bob.

14

15 MR. CHURCHILL: I guess a question for
16 the Chair. Is there a real problem with one household
17 taking two or three moose?

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: There has been. We've
20 had times in Cordova where some households were
21 particularly lucky. I mean the moose still get shared,
22 but it's kind of funny to go read the chart and you see
23 the same name repeated three times. So it can happen
24 under the old system. You've seen it, haven't you, Mark?
25

26 MR. KING: Oh, yeah, I've seen it quite
27 often.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And then we've also seen
30 it where the same household gets drawn year after year
31 after year and other households don't get drawn. I mean
32 it's because of the luck of the draw. But this would at
33 least limit it on the Federal side to one per household.
34 I don't think we have any mechanism to tie the two
35 together, do we?
36

37 MS. DEWHURST: Not under Federal
38 regulation. All we could do would be regulate how we
39 manage our own permits. But there, again, it could be --
40 usually, in cases like that, like we've gotten into that
41 situation with muskox up north. Generally, there's
42 enough community pressure that people voluntarily don't
43 take multiple if they know that they're going to be
44 ostracized in the community. Usually that's enough to
45 regulate it in many cases.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do you see a problem
48 with it, Mark?
49

50 MR. KING: No. I was just curious about
00203
1 how you were going to address that issue on the Federal
2 side. If that's how you're going to do it, then that's
3 the way I'd personally like to see it done.
4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We have somebody that
6 might be able to answer your question.
7

8 MS. WELLS: Can I ask you, Mark, you were
9 wanting the one moose per household?
10

11 MR. KING: Right.
12

13 MS. WELLS: There is the potential for
14 some, if they got a State and a Federal permit, to have
15 two.
16

17 MR. KING: Right.
18

19 MS. WELLS: But you're looking at
20 supporting this one moose per household.
21

22 MR. BURCHAM: My name is Milo Burcham and
23 I'm the Forest Service subsistence wildlife biologist at
24 Cordova. I just wanted to add, if this would help the
25 discussion here, that I do the drawing for the moose, the
26 five cow moose drawings that we've done in the past and
27 the drawing is done locally and it's very simple to
28 coordinate with the State if that was necessary or if

29 that would help your concern.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doesn't the State
32 drawing take place first?

33

34 MR. BURCHAM: I just arrived about when
35 the drawing took place this year. Our drawing,
36 applications had to be in by the end of May and we issued
37 permits on July 10th, I believe, this year. I think
38 that's roughly the same time that the State drawing was
39 taking place.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Mark?
42 So, basically, the Native Village of Eyak supports the
43 proposal as it's written other than the question over how
44 to prevent more than one per household?

45

46 MR. KING: Right.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You know, if that's a
49 community concern, that probably could be affected
50 through just delaying the Federal drawing until the State
00204

1 drawing comes out. Then, if somebody has drawn that has
2 a State permit.....

3

4 MR. BURCHAM: Just this past season two
5 Merits, I believe, drew Federal cow tags. I don't know
6 if they were the same household or not, but the same
7 family, and another name Holbrook drew a State permit and
8 a Federal permit. Again, we have to square up the
9 household definition here, but I did notice those names
10 came up and that was just in a drawing of five cow moose
11 that we did.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
14 either of them? Thank you. That's all of our public
15 testimony, so a motion to put WP-02-48 on the table
16 either as written or as modified is in order.

17

18 MS. WELLS: So moved on the modification.

19

20 MR. CHURCHILL: Second.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
23 seconded to put WP-02-48 modified Federal regulation,
24 which reads one cow by Federal registration permit only
25 September 1 through October 31. One bull by Federal
26 registration permit, limit of one moose per household.
27 Annual Federal registration permit quotas will be
28 announced by the U.S. Forest Service, Cordova Office, in
29 consultation with the Alaska Department of Fish & Game.
30 Harvest allocation will be based on the Federal
31 Subsistence system managing 75 percent of the bull
32 permits and 100 percent of the cow permits. Season
33 September 1 through December 31st. Discussion,
34 amendments, anything? Susan.

35

36 MS. WELLS: I'd just like to say that I
37 think this is a very fair use of a resource. There was
38 an input from the local people and all agencies and I'm

39 very supportive of it.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

42

43 MR. CHURCHILL: I guess I have a
44 question. We're voting to continue the hunt through the
45 31st of December, is that correct?

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Unless an amendment is
48 offered.

49

50 MR. CHURCHILL: No intent from my part.

00205

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any further discussion?

2 If there isn't, the question is in order.

3

4 MR. CHURCHILL: Call the question.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
7 called. All in favor of WP-02-48B, as modified, as I
8 read it, signify by saying aye.

9

10 IN UNISON: Aye.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Opposed signify by
13 saying nay.

14

15 (No opposing votes)

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. Let's
18 take a coffee break.

19

20 (Off record - 10:00 a.m.)

21 (On record - 10:20 a.m.)

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: At this point in time, I
24 would like to thank everybody who helped get the
25 proposals finished and everybody that testified for the
26 staff and putting their time in and brought us the
27 information and for being patient with the way the Chair
28 sometimes called for votes on motions that weren't on the
29 table yet, things like that. I'd just thank you all for
30 your help and your patience in this. Now we're going on
31 to number 11 in our agenda, which is a call for proposals
32 to change Federal subsistence fisheries regulations.
33 This is the time period where you can put those proposals
34 in and this would be for 2003, if I'm correct. The
35 closing date for those proposals, does anybody have that
36 off the top of their head? Pat, could you give us that?

37

38 MS. PETRIVELLI: I think it's March 29th.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I guess I could look at
41 Tab E and it would tell us. March 29th is the closing
42 date for putting proposals in for changes to fisheries
43 regulations for 2003. Here's what it says. If you'd
44 turn to Tab E in your book, the proposal period opened on
45 January 7. The proposal period closes March 29th.
46 Public comment period begins May 6th and goes until the
47 Board acts on them, but we will have our regional
48 advisory fall meeting sometime between September 9th and

49 October 11th. For your public input to be effective, it
50 would be nice to have it by that time. And the new
00206

1 regulations go into effect on March 1st, 2003. With
2 that, unless somebody has some further comment. Pat, did
3 you want to say something on it?

4
5 MS. PETRIVELLI: I just wanted to mention
6 that there were two actions that the Board took that
7 would be submitted as proposals that the Office of
8 Subsistence Management are submitting as proposals and
9 they had to do with C&T determinations made last year.
10 One is the C&T determinations for Chitina, which I don't
11 have a copy of, and then the other one, which I do have a
12 copy of, this says for the C&T determinations for
13 freshwater fish on the Copper River drainage and I put a
14 copy on there. There's extra copies on the back table.
15 The minority staff committee recommendation was to
16 include Lake Louise and Paxson in the freshwater fish
17 determination for C&T and the Board said that they would
18 like to have a full analysis of the factors for those
19 communities and for us to submit a proposal, so this
20 proposal will be submitted and an analysis will be looked
21 at for your consideration next fall.

22
23 The one to do at Chitina was to include
24 Delta Junction in the C&T determinations and that was
25 presented at the Eastern Interior Council meeting, since
26 Delta Junction is in the Eastern Interior Region, but
27 they would be added to the Chitina sub-district for C&T
28 if -- well, the analysis will be presented next fall.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's for the Chitina
31 sub-district on salmon.

32
33 MS. PETRIVELLI: On salmon.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's not for the
36 freshwater fish....

37
38 MS. PETRIVELLI: No.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:in the Copper River
41 drainage.

42
43 MS. PETRIVELLI: No. So that's just for
44 your information.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

47
48 MS. PETRIVELLI: If you have any comments
49 on this, just get back to me and let me know if you want
50 to include other communities that may have been left off.
00207

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, correct me if I'm
2 wrong, but I think that we've decided as a Council that
3 when we include communities like Kenny Lake and Chitina
4 and McCarthy and Copper Center, we also include the road
5 system between those communities. So, if you're not
6 actually in the community, if you're between the
7 communities, like it's Chitina, residents of McCarthy

8 Road and McCarthy, we used to put that in separately.

9

10 MS. PETRIVELLI: For certain communities
11 that are residents -- zone communities of the Wrangell-
12 St. Elias National Park, they.....

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: They have boundaries
15 that include that.

16

17 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yeah. Their boundaries
18 are not as clearly delineated so that it does include the
19 residents in between. The new additions, like the ones
20 that were recently added, they are talking with the Park
21 Service and we're clearly delineating boundaries. But
22 the original 18 do include those areas in between.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Thank you. Any
25 other questions for Pat? Thank you, Pat. Okay. With
26 that, we're going on to a very non-controversial subject,
27 customary trade with Pete. And I promised him I'd keep
28 my mouth shut because last time I put my foot into it.

29

30 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair, what I've just
31 passed out is actions taken by other regional advisory
32 councils up to this date just to give you a perspective
33 on how these councils have acted on the issue of
34 customary trade. For the public, I also placed about 40
35 copies on the back table as well. So, with that, Mr.
36 Chair, with your permission, I'll start with my
37 presentation.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You have my permission
40 for sure.

41

42 MR. PROBASCO: Well, good morning,
43 Council. I'd like the Council to focus their attention
44 to Tab F and it's titled customary trade. Here you'll
45 find a briefing paper prepared for the Regional Advisory
46 Council summarizing the actions taken by the Federal
47 Subsistence Board in developing this proposed rule. We
48 are asking today for your specific input and
49 recommendations on the proposed customary trade
50 regulatory changes.

00208

1 My presentation will cover five areas.
2 It will be the history and background of why the
3 customary trade is before, summary of board actions taken
4 during the December meeting, tribal consultation,
5 schedule of events or the timeline, and it's important to
6 pay attention to that because it has changed from what
7 has been printed in your booklet, importance of regional
8 council input and discussion of the proposed regulatory
9 language the Federal Subsistence Board put forward.

10

11 Title 8 of ANILCA specifically identifies
12 customary trade as a recognized part of subsistence uses.
13 The term customary trade is defined as a cash sale of
14 fish and wildlife resources to support personal or family
15 needs as long as it does not constitute a significant
16 commercial enterprise.

17

18 The important thing we found during our
19 work as a customary trade task force is having people
20 understand the distinction between barter and customary
21 trade. Barter is also provided under Title 8 and barter
22 is different from customary trade. Whereas customary
23 trade is exchange of subsistence resources for cash,
24 barter is defined as the exchange of subsistence
25 resources for something other than cash. An exchange of
26 subsistence resources as customary trade may involve
27 fish, shellfish or wildlife resources, this proposed rule
28 that's before you for your comments deals only with fish.
29

30 In late 2000, the Board established a
31 customary trade task force composed of representatives of
32 the 10 regional councils, fishery biologists, enforcement
33 personnel, anthropologists and others. Your Chair, Mr.
34 Ralph Lohse, was your Council representative to the task
35 force. This task force was charged with developing draft
36 regulatory language defining the intent of regulatory
37 trade as defined in ANILCA.
38

39 In developing the draft language, the
40 task force identified three different types of customary
41 trade. The first being a transaction between rural
42 residents, the second being a transaction between rural
43 residents and others, and others is defined as all
44 commercial entities other than fishery businesses and
45 individuals other than rural residents. The third part
46 of customary trade that the task force focused on was
47 purchases by fishery businesses.
48

49 You will recall preliminary draft
50 language was developed by the task force and then
00209
1 circulated for review by the regional councils during
2 their last fall meeting cycle, the 229 federally-
3 recognized tribes and for general public review. The
4 task force met one more time to consider all comments
5 received and eventually draft language that was presented
6 to the Board on December 12th of 2001 asked Option 1 of
7 the six options the Board considered. These six options
8 are briefly summarized in your booklet, again under Tab
9 F, page 2. The task force option was Option 1.
10

11 During the review of the draft task force
12 recommendations by the regional council, seven of the 10
13 councils made specific regional recommendations. Your
14 regional council recommendation, along with others, can
15 be found on page 12 of Tab F. Included as part of the
16 task force draft language was a \$1,000 cap for the
17 exchange of salmon for cash between rural residents and
18 others. The regional council comments generally agreed
19 with the monetary cap, but also suggested regional needs
20 and differences. Some regional councils thought that the
21 \$1,000 cap was too high, others thought it was too low.
22

23 Several council members expressed concern
24 about allowing sales of subsistence-taken salmon in areas
25 experiencing subsistence shortages and limited fishing
26 opportunities. In recent years, areas such as the Yukon
27 and Kuskokwim Rivers have had poor salmon

28 returns, requiring managers to reduce subsistence fishing
29 schedules and, in some instances, closing subsistence
30 fishing. Some regional councils were also concerned that
31 the draft language restricted barter between rural
32 residents and others.

33
34 During the December 2000 meeting, the
35 Federal Subsistence Board took action to start the
36 process of refining the Federal regulations on customary
37 trade. The Board considered six options for a proposed
38 rule regarding customary trade and those options are in
39 detail starting on page 8. After hearing the report of
40 the task force and the six options, comments from the
41 regional council chairs, ADF&G, Alaska Department of
42 Environmental Conservation and other members of the
43 public, the Board decided to implement Option 5 and to
44 initiate the formal rule-making process with this
45 proposed rule.

46
47 Option 5 supports in part the
48 recommendations from the Customary Trade Task Force and
49 Regional Advisory Councils by allowing unlimited
50 customary trade between rural residents and prohibiting

00210
1 customary trade or barter with fishery businesses.
2 Because most customary trade among rural subsistence
3 users occurs between local users and involves only small
4 amounts of fish, the Board does not believe that this
5 rule will create nor result in additional fish being sold
6 in the commercial market. Likewise, nothing in this
7 proposed rule would displace, supersede or preempt State
8 or Federal food and health safety laws and regulations
9 governing the processing, handling or sale of fish.

10
11 The Federal Subsistence Board is
12 initiating tribal consultation with the 229 federally-
13 recognized tribes. The consultation is conducted
14 pursuant to the Department of Interior Alaska policy on
15 government-to-government relations with Alaska Native
16 tribes. The consultation period is open from February
17 1st through April 29th. This tribal consultation is
18 initiated in close cooperation with Alaska intertribal
19 councils.

20
21 Mr. Chairman, I'd like to focus on a time
22 schedule now at this point.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pete, can I ask you a
25 question?

26
27 MR. PROBASCO: Sure.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You just said February
30 1st through April 29th. Mine says March 29th.

31
32 MR. PROBASCO: Correct.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So you have corrected
35 it? I mean it's changed?

36
37 MR. PROBASCO: Yes. And thank you for

38 that. The time schedule has been changed from what's
39 written in your book and that's primarily due to the fact
40 that the publication of the proposed rule in the Federal
41 Register was delayed in Washington, D.C. during the
42 review process. So the regional council meetings, which
43 are occurring now, will go through the end of March 2002.
44 Tribal consultation will also occur during that period.
45 Public comment period ends, as it states in your book,
46 March 29th; however, that's been changed to April 29th.
47

48 The Federal Subsistence Board meeting has
49 been changed that will address customary trade from May
50 to sometime in June. The publication of final rule,
00211

1 depending upon if the board passes a final rule, would be
2 in July and if that time schedule stays, the final rule
3 will be effective in August.

4

5 The proposed rule that is now before you,
6 we would like you to specifically address each of the
7 three sections and make specific recommendations on those
8 three sections. You can reference the six options that
9 were developed by the regional councils, by the staff
10 committee, by others and use that in your deliberations.

11

12 Mr. Chairman, I'd like to focus your
13 attention on the proposed rule to help you understand the
14 proposed rule a little bit better, if possible. You'll
15 notice that there's three sections, A-11, A-12 and A-13.
16 A-11 is the first part of the proposed regulatory
17 language and that's on page five. It deals with the cash
18 sales of subsistence harvest fish between rural
19 residents. In summary, this section of the proposed rule
20 establishes no limits on cash sales between rural
21 residents.

22

23 A-12 or the second section of the
24 proposed rule allows for customary trade between rural
25 residents and others. Again, others is defined as all
26 commercial entities other than fishery businesses and
27 individuals other than rural residents as long as
28 customary trade does not constitute a significant
29 commercial enterprise.

30

31 And the final section A-13 prohibits the
32 sale of subsistence-taken fish to fishery businesses
33 licensed within the state of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, that
34 concludes my presentation and I'll look for questions and
35 deliberations on this topic.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.

38

39 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, a question to the
40 Chair. Is there a written definition of the fisheries
41 business, what it would include?

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes.

44

45 MR. CHURCHILL: Where might I find it?

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's under Alaska

48 Statute AS 43.75.011. It's Alaska law.

49

50 MR. CHURCHILL: Would that include places
00212

1 like restaurants or is it just more or less canneries?

2 Is that what it's focused on?

3

4 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair, Mr. Churchill.

5 You get into -- depending upon how the restaurant

6 conducts its sales and what they do with the fish, in

7 most cases, restaurants are not licensed as fishery

8 businesses. However, that's where the State -- if you

9 remember earlier in my presentation, this regulation does

10 not supersede the requirements of fish to meet the health

11 requirements, so there's very specific regulations if a

12 person elected to sell something to a restaurant and how

13 it was utilized would have to meet those requirements as

14 well.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Pete. Pete,

17 I have a question on this one right here. Under 12, what

18 12 has done in this one here is it generalized it at the

19 end where we said as long as customary trade does not

20 constitute a significant commercial enterprise. That was

21 the whole crux of the whole -- or the part that took the

22 time in all of the meetings. We came out with different

23 scenarios from different areas. Is this then to leave it

24 like we talked about, that different areas may come up

25 with their own definition of what constitutes a

26 significant commercial enterprise in their area?

27

28 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair, that is

29 definitely one of the options and we would hope that the

30 Council specifically looks at trying to define A-12

31 either for their area or how they would recommend to

32 define it statewide. Both options are open to the

33 Council. This is where the Federal Subsistence Board has

34 really wrestled on what to put forward as a proposed

35 rule. A-12 is a compromise from all the various -- you

36 have the six options before you and you listened to the

37 various deliberations, so A-12 is a compromise of all

38 those various options and it's hoped to get further

39 direction from the councils and public and agencies how

40 to define A-12. Mr. Chair.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Pete. One

43 more comment on that. Basically, the suggestion is to

44 put this forward in this undefined manner so that, as

45 we've talked about in the past, we may be able to take

46 into consideration regional differences. Each council,

47 what we're looking for is we're looking for direction to

48 do like we did, where we put forward our ideas on what

49 would constitute that significant commercial enterprise.

50

00213

1 MR. PROBASCO: That's correct, Mr. Chair.

2 You'll notice that on the handout I gave you that some

3 councils specifically did address A-12, Eastern Interior,

4 Bristol Bay, et cetera.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, we did, too, in

7 our fall meeting.

8

9 MR. PROBASCO: Yes, in your option. And
10 those are listed also in the booklet.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So, unless we wished to
13 revise ours, what we did would stand until we made a
14 revision in it.

15

16 MR. PROBASCO: I would encourage you,
17 that if you still feel that your earlier recommendations
18 are still what you would like to move forward, that you
19 take specific action moving those forward. Mr. Chair.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.

22

23 MR. CHURCHILL: Just a question. What
24 were some of the factors that this committee discussed as
25 far as local determinations on what's significant in one
26 area and significant in the other, things that vary a
27 lot? Like gasoline will vary a tremendous amount area to
28 area. If you could help me. What were some of the
29 factors that were discussed as far as determining area by
30 area of what would be significant in one area versus
31 another?

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: One of the ones you hit
34 was the price of gas, the price of living conditions.
35 Also other economic opportunities and just the fact that
36 basically we could come to, for lack of a better way of
37 putting it, Pete, as different regional areas, we could
38 come to no universal conclusion as to what was acceptable
39 in all 10 areas. There was some consensus between areas,
40 but, as it points out in here, there was the extremes
41 from going from one end, where the \$1,000 that was kind
42 of settled on by the working group was considered way too
43 low, and there was other areas it was considered way too
44 high. This is something that consensus hasn't been
45 reached on. Other than having some higher power make a
46 decision and put something on it, I don't think it ever
47 will be reached simply because we're dealing with people
48 who live under different conditions and have different
49 economic opportunities and different economic pressures
50 on the resource. I mean in some areas commercial fishing
00214

1 is the mainstay of the area and other areas there is no
2 commercial fishing. Some areas don't have any salmon to
3 speak of. Pete.

4

5 MR. PROBASCO: The other thing I'd add,
6 Mr. Chair, to your statements for Mr. Churchill is the
7 task force, as well as some of the councils, really
8 wrestled with the fact that they wanted to safeguard
9 traditional practices, but also not be so liberal that it
10 invites an obvious avenue of abuse. Somebody coming in
11 under the disguise of subsistence but really doing a
12 commercial venture, so they really wrestled with that as
13 well. Mr. Chair.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That was the fear of a
16 lot of traditional users. We heard that from the Yukon,

17 we heard that from the Copper River, we heard that from
18 Bristol Bay. In other areas, that wasn't a fear. But,
19 basically, what would happen is if you made it too
20 inviting, mostly areas that had access to other people
21 had a larger fear of it because if you make it too
22 inviting, people will do it for the cash value.

23

24 As you'll notice, what our council came
25 up with is we recognized that subsistence should be for
26 family food first, so we basically worked into the idea
27 that it had to be taken for food for the family, but a
28 surplus could be sold, so that's where we came up with
29 the idea of 50 percent. No more than 50 percent of what
30 you took could be sold, so that at least you had to take
31 some first for your own family. That was a fear that was
32 expressed. Then there were other areas that just wanted
33 it unlimited because there were no other economic
34 opportunities.

35

36 Again, this \$1,000 that was settled came
37 only on salmon. That's as far as we could get. We dealt
38 with whitefish in some areas and pike. Each area had a
39 different fish that they were involved in. I personally
40 don't see, unless some higher power makes a decision, I
41 don't see where we ever will have consensus in the areas.
42 And that's what I see happened here, is we took out even
43 the consensus that we had and we put back in the original
44 language, which says as long as it does not constitute a
45 significant commercial enterprise, which is where the
46 heartburn with the enforcement was to begin with because
47 that is an undefinable term. We had attempted to define
48 it and, as councils, we all came up with slightly
49 different definitions. So where to go from here. This
50 is a step. Two issues out of the three are taken care
00215

1 of. The most controversial issue, I look at it and I see
2 it's still on the table. Am I right, Pete?

3

4 MR. PROBASCO: I would concur with you,
5 Mr. Chair.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Basically what was
8 decided that we had total consensus on was that the
9 exchange between rural residents was unlimited. We had
10 total consensus on the fact that subsistence fish
11 shouldn't enter the commercial market. That was total
12 consensus from the committees. It seems to have been
13 pretty good consensus, I see, from all of the different
14 councils that have reviewed it. We didn't come up with
15 consensus on what happens when a rural resident wants to
16 trade with others and we looked at things like trading
17 fish at the AFN convention, selling fish to your relative
18 that's in town, things like that. Everything from family
19 to others who have no relationship at all. And tried to
20 come up with a means of keeping it from being a
21 commercial enterprise, but we couldn't come up with a
22 definitive.

23

24 We came up with a tentative definitive
25 one and we brought that to all of the councils. Our
26 tentative one originally just said, if I remember right,

27 Pete, and correct me if I'm wrong, that the sale of
28 salmon would not exceed \$1,000 per year per household
29 member.

30
31 MR. PROBASCO: Correct.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That was our original
34 tentative one. That went to the councils and, if you
35 look, you can see what the councils have all come back
36 on. Then we have some additional council recommendations
37 here. Fred.

38
39 MR. ELVSAAS: You said household member.
40 How do you define that?

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That was as close as we
43 could come as a working group to coming up with a
44 consensus. In fact, we even had to correct the word
45 household member to.....

46
47 MR. PROBASCO: Family.....

48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We took it from
50 family.....
00216

1 MR. PROBASCO:to household.
2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:to household member
4 because we started thinking that extended families -- how
5 do you say somebody is family. The household member that
6 was settled on was if they live in your house, they're a
7 household member. We recognized at that point that at
8 \$1,000 limit per household member there were households
9 that could have a very nice income because there were
10 extended families living in an individual household.
11 There were other families that were one or two people.

12
13 I think we kind of came to that consensus
14 with the idea that a larger family would have greater
15 opportunity, but we didn't know how to get around that,
16 so we didn't. But that was a consensus that was reached,
17 but that consensus was reached so we had something to
18 take to the councils, take to the tribes for their input
19 and, as you can see, what came back was everything from
20 \$400 to unlimited. I don't see very many places that it
21 says household member on any of them. There was no
22 definition of a household on most of these other ones.
23 So, where we're back to is we're back to how do we define
24 significant commercial enterprise. Right, Pete?

25
26 MR. PROBASCO: That's correct.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that's going to have
29 to either be up to us as an area, as a region, region by
30 region, or something that we can all live with as a state
31 or possibly a combination of the two, which would be a
32 state-type definition with regional exceptions. And that
33 was one of the things that was proposed, was that we have
34 a basic limit and region by region, for individual
35 fisheries, exceptions could be asked. So those are three
36 options that you can deal with it on.

37

38 Now, I told you I was going to keep my
39 mouth shut, so I probably put my foot in it a couple
40 times. I'll turn it back to you, Pete.

41

42 MR. PROBASCO: I think you've done very
43 well, Mr. Chair. As you can see on the latest actions by
44 the councils, as Mr. Lohse has pointed to, there are
45 various options that have been presented to address A-12.
46

47 I think the one thing that has been drawn
48 from these discussions, other councils have wrestled with
49 the commercialization or the potential of
50 commercialization of customary trade and subsistence. So
00217

1 some councils have looked at trying to limit it to dollar
2 value. Some have gone as far as saying we don't want any
3 subsistence fish to enter commerce at any point and
4 that's very similar to what the North Pacific Fishery
5 Management Council is doing with halibut subsistence.
6 They're allowing a dollar value, but it can't enter
7 commerce at any point.

8

9 So your options are wide open as far as
10 your recommendations. Your specific recommendations
11 during the fall meetings is on page 12 under Cook Inlet
12 and Prince William Sound area and that's where Mr. Lohse
13 summarized that you did establish a \$1,000 annual limit
14 for salmon. However, at least 50 percent of all fish
15 taken under subsistence regulations must be kept for
16 families personal use. Mr. Chair.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Pete. At
19 this time, I think it would be worthwhile if we kind of
20 went over the actions that have been taken that are in
21 front of us. Just look at some of the modifications that
22 have been made. Well, wait a second. Do we need a
23 motion on the table so that we can put a recommendation
24 out? We can leave our previous recommendation stand.
25 That's an option we have. I see Seward Peninsula did
26 that. Or we can come up with a new recommendation or can
27 we just do nothing at all?

28

29 MR. PROBASCO: Well, Mr. Chair, if you
30 were to do nothing at all, does that mean you have no
31 recommendations and your recommendations that you did in
32 the fall are no longer going forward?

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's what I was
35 wondering. If we did nothing at all, that means that the
36 recommendations we made in the fall would be dead.

37

38 MR. PROBASCO: That's my opinion. I
39 think you need to specific.....

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So, if we wanted to
42 maintain the recommendations we made in the fall, we'd
43 need a motion to that effect.

44

45 MR. PROBASCO: Right. And if I may, what
46 I would suggest is to put your recommendations in the

47 fall on the table and then you can amend them.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And then we can do our
50 discussion from there. That's what I was wondering. I
00218

1 was starting to think what I was going to read here was
2 part of the discussion. So, with that in mind, I would
3 appreciate a motion to put the recommendations we made in
4 the fall on the table. Susan.

5

6 MS. WELLS: Motion.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second?

9

10 MR. CHURCHILL: Second.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been seconded. Now
13 we can discuss this issue. I would like, as the Chair,
14 first of all, just to start off this discussion by taking
15 a look at what some of the other councils did. First
16 off, Bristol Bay Regional Council basically left it
17 pretty close to where they were to start off with. They
18 were in the \$400 range to start off with in the
19 discussions and they cut it down to per household, not
20 household member. They specifically crossed out member
21 and limited it to household and they went to \$500 in
22 Section 11 and \$400 in Section 12. In other words, the
23 trade between rural residents they limited to \$500. The
24 trade between rural residents and others they dropped
25 down to \$400 and they supported 13 as written.

26

27 Seward adopted 11 and 13 and stuck with
28 their recommendations on 12. If we take a look at that,
29 Seward's recommendations on 12. Where is that?

30

31 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman, it's on
32 page 11 at the very top of the page, Norton Sound/Port
33 Clarence.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. The total cash
36 value of salmon taken in the Norton Sound/Port Clarence
37 area exchange and customary trade or barter by each
38 household member to others is not limited. So they went
39 to an unlimited. They suggested an unlimited for Section
40 12.

41

42 Eastern Interior, crossed out eggs
43 because the trade in eggs was one of the problems they
44 had on the Kuskokwim/Yukon River, if I remember right.
45 They had the transaction between rural residents is
46 permitted and they didn't put a limit on it and they
47 dropped eggs. Between others they dropped eggs and they
48 said to individuals other than rural residents is
49 permitted as long as it is used for personal or family
50 consumption of the individual who purchases the fish. In
00219

1 other words, they wanted the fish that went to others to
2 be to the end user. So, instead of limiting it as a
3 percentage of the fish they took, they limited it to
4 being to the end user.

5

6 If we go on to the North Slope.....
7
8 MR. PROBASCO: A-13 you'll notice that
9 Eastern also addressed the use of commercial dog team
10 and defined commercial dog team right before the North
11 Slope.
12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, they did. Okay.
14 Did they limit it? It's not available to be done, right?
15
16 MR. PROBASCO: That's correct, Mr. Chair.
17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So they added
19 something to the commercial fishery thing to add
20 commercial dog teams, a business that leases, rents,
21 races or otherwise provides services with their dog or
22 dog teams for money or remuneration. Cannot receive
23 subsistence-caught fish.
24
25 And the North Slope recommended adopting
26 Sections 11 and 13 and Section 12 with the deletion of
27 the words as long as the customary trade does not
28 constitute a significant commercial enterprise. Now, I'm
29 not sure how that fits in. Pete, could you explain that
30 one to me?
31
32 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair, I wrestled with
33 that language as well and I did not attend that meeting,
34 but I would read that to mean that Section 12 there would
35 be no limit.
36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Because it just
38 says or from a rural resident to individuals other than
39 rural residents is permitted. Okay. So that runs the
40 gamut. At this point in time, I'm wondering do we have
41 any members of the public or agencies that would like to
42 add comments to our discussion here before we go on. If
43 that's okay with the rest of the Council. Is there one?
44 Gloria.
45
46 MS. STICKWAN: I just thought maybe a
47 range for a significant enterprise instead of a dollar
48 amount from 1,000 down to 200.
49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Use a range instead of a
00220
1 set figure?
2
3 MS. STICKWAN: Yes. And that would
4 include all of these figures and then this paper.
5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. I think that's a
7 good idea myself. Put a range there and then we can use
8 that and then the individual regions could decide where
9 in that range they wanted to be. Am I correct on that,
10 Gloria?
11
12 MS. STICKWAN: Yes.
13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: In other words, have a
15 range for the State and then have the individual regions

16 decide whether they want it at the high end of the range
17 or the low end of the range. Okay. Are there any
18 agencies that want to put any comments in?

19

20 MR. BOSS: Good morning, Mr. Chairman.
21 My name is Greg Boss, Fish & Wildlife Service Staff
22 Committee member. As you get into the discussion of the
23 various options, one of the things I suggest that you
24 address as well is the permitting requirement or
25 recordkeeping requirement. If you recall, following the
26 fall council meetings, the task force developed some
27 wording that would require a permit. If there was to be
28 a \$1 cap on the amount of fish sold to others, a permit
29 requirement was needed to be able to track that to be
30 able to enforce that provision.

31

32 That language was not reviewed by the
33 council at the fall meeting and it raised some concerns
34 among the councils, the council chairs if you recall, as
35 well as among some staff that the Board was a little bit
36 apprehensive about taking action on the language
37 requiring a permit or recordkeeping, putting that into
38 the proposed rule without some input from the council.
39 Consequently, that's one of the main reasons why the
40 language in paragraph 12 simply referred to customary
41 trade not being a significant commercial enterprise. It
42 held a status quo on that provision until the Board could
43 receive additional input from the council.

44

45 So, as you move forward in looking at the
46 options and if you're going to recommend a cap, you may
47 want to provide some recommendation regarding whether a
48 permit requirement is necessary or a recordkeeping
49 requirement, which is a little bit simpler and less of a
50 burden to subsistence users.

00221

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions on that?
2 I know that that was one of the big discussions in the
3 task force and that was another one that we didn't reach
4 any consensus on either. In fact, that was one that,
5 when it went to the councils, caused a lot of discussion
6 among the councils.

7

8 I think that's something that -- what
9 we're going to have to do is we're going to have to put
10 that on the table in the future as an agenda item because
11 it's awful hard to take that -- you know, while we're
12 trying to wrestle with the one thing, it's hard to, at
13 the same time, wrestle with how are you going to or what
14 kind of tracking mechanism is needed without having time
15 to go to the subsistence users and say, here, what are
16 some options that you can suggest for a tracking
17 mechanism.

18

19 I think that's going to almost take a --
20 maybe not another task force, but that's going to take
21 another proposal and comment period time. I mean I'm not
22 ready or we, as a council, are ready to deal with that at
23 this point in time. I mean just dealing with the trade
24 aspect is enough to try to deal with. We don't even know
25 if a permitting system is needed if there's no -- you

26 know, some of these councils obviously think no
27 permitting is needed if it's unlimited.

28

29 MR. BOSS: That's correct, particularly
30 with regard to customary trade between rural residents.
31 I think in the middle provision it allowed customary
32 trade with others, rural residents and others. If there
33 was to be a cap established, enforcement agencies felt it
34 was important to have some provision for recordkeeping or
35 permitting in order to establish whether or not that cap
36 had been exceeded. The way this has been presented as a
37 proposed rule, in a sense, hides that issue. You have to
38 look at the options, the six options, to find the
39 language or a reference to a permitting requirement. So
40 it's unclear whether the proposed rule, in itself, the
41 way it's worded, will attract comments from the public
42 regarding the permitting requirement, but it was a pretty
43 important issue. As you recall, the task force spent a
44 lot of time discussing that and making its final
45 recommendation to the Board to include a permitting
46 requirement. I think the Board will be looking very
47 carefully at whether to have language requiring a permit
48 or some sort of recordkeeping requirement in those
49 instances where a cap is established, a dollar cap.

50

00222

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any
2 questions? Are there any other agencies that would like
3 to speak to this? Any other individuals that would like
4 to put in public comment on it? All right. Hearing
5 none, I guess we'll go on with our discussion with Pete
6 and our deliberation on the motion that we have on the
7 table. Pete.

8

9 MR. PROBASCO: Yes, Mr. Chair. When I
10 was sitting back there, I got some feedback from some of
11 my co-workers and further clarification of a summary of
12 the regional council actions taken to date. You'll note
13 under Bristol Bay they made it very clear that without a
14 tracking system of permits, Bristol Bay Subsistence
15 Regional Advisory Council does not support their actions
16 on A-11 and A-12.

17

18 Under Eastern Interior, that is the
19 council that really wrestled with allowing customary
20 trade of subsistence harvest fish to enter commerce at
21 any point. Under A-12, you'll note that they removed any
22 commercial entity other than fishery businesses as well,
23 so it's just strictly rural residents to others and
24 others would just be non-federally qualified subsistence
25 users and made it very clear that commercial entities
26 would not be allowed to purchase fish.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Of any kind.

29

30 MR. PROBASCO: Of any kind, Mr. Chair.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Everything from
33 restaurants to grocery stores to dog teams.

34

35 MR. PROBASCO: That's correct, Mr. Chair.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any comments for any
38 Council members? Let's go back and take a look at the
39 action we took originally in trying to address the
40 concerns that were expressed to us. What we came up with
41 is we left the household member in there. We didn't drop
42 it to household as some other regions did. We kept a
43 \$1,000 cap on it as was suggested by the task force and
44 that was for salmon. But we added the other, which was
45 that 50 percent of all fish taken under subsistence
46 regulation must be kept for a family's personal use. In
47 other words, basically, what we're saying is you can't
48 sell more fish than you use. That was our way of trying
49 to say, if I remember right, that we recognized
50 subsistence as food for the family first, but that
00223

1 subsistence is always made use of extra for trade and
2 barter and that's where we got.

3

4 Now, we can review this, we can change
5 it, we can decide if we want to leave it as household
6 member, we can decide if we want to leave our last
7 section in there on the 50 percent, we could decide
8 whether or not we needed to expand Section 13, like
9 Eastern Interior did, to include all commercial
10 enterprises of any kind, right down to dog teams.
11 Currently, what we have limited in 13 for ourselves is
12 just commercial enterprises that are required to be
13 licensed by the State of Alaska. So those are some
14 things that I see now. Susan.

15

16 MS. WELLS: Well, one thing that really
17 concerns me here about having -- well, in the Cook Inlet
18 right now there is a major battle over allocation and
19 it's hard enough for a subsistence user to even get some
20 fish, so I have major concerns with being able to sell
21 it. But I have not talked to the user groups at all, so
22 in this process the user groups will have input or have
23 they already had input?

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: They've had input and
26 they'll have input until April 29th. As far as not being
27 able to sell it, by ANILCA, it is available to be sold.
28 It's a subsistence resource. This is a process trying to
29 define what is a significant commercial enterprise. If
30 we take the words significant commercial enterprise,
31 we're taking it right out of ANILCA. Right, Pete?

32

33 MR. PROBASCO: That's correct, Mr. Chair.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So that is included in
36 ANILCA. So there's no way that we could say there will
37 be no sale of subsistence caught fish. We recognize the
38 problem, just exactly what you say, and that's what the
39 Yukon/Kuskokwim is wrestling with also, is that there may
40 not be enough fish even to supply subsistence needs. At
41 that point in time, it seems wrong to sell some fish when
42 you can't even provide enough for your own needs and that
43 was one of the ways that we tried to address it by the 50
44 percent part. We wanted to make sure that the fishery
45 was operated for food first and that there had to be a

46 surplus. So, yeah, we recognize that and the
47 Yukon/Kuskokwim has the same problem. Got any
48 suggestions on what we can do about that?

49

50 MS. WELLS: I'm not going to fight the
00224

1 people in our area on ANILCA for sure. That's very
2 sacred in our area. I think I do have concerns about
3 household member, too, the term member. It also
4 increases the amount of fish. The 50 percent, it
5 increases that. Knowing the problems with the
6 allocations down there, I have concerns about that as
7 well. I don't think our -- I don't think the sale has
8 been an issue down there. Was there any testimony or
9 input on actually needing the income from fish?

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The whole thing you're
12 dealing with on the Kenai is you have very little Federal
13 subsistence waters available anyhow. It hasn't been an
14 issue down there from the standpoint of needing it for
15 cash. It's been an issue of how do you even get
16 subsistence fish.

17

18 MS. WELLS: Exactly.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I mean that seems to be
21 the question. Pete.

22

23 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair, I just want to
24 clarify on the record my earlier statement. ANILCA
25 specifically addresses customary trade as a cash sale, so
26 where you get the language of significant commercial
27 enterprise is in the regulations and that's why we're
28 looking at A-11, A-12 and A-13. Mr. Chair.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So those words are not
31 used in ANILCA, it just authorizes cash sales.

32

33 MR. PROBASCO: That's correct. That's
34 how customary trade is defined.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Fred, you started
37 to say something before?

38

39 MR. ELVSAAS: Yeah. You know, that's
40 true. The Cook Inlet area is very restrictive, but, on
41 the other hand, there are significant Federal waters in
42 Cook Inlet that now we're working on opening those and
43 looking to the future. Hopefully we're going to have a
44 cooperative agreement with the State and the Feds and the
45 tribes on fisheries management. The logical thing in
46 fishing in Cook Inlet is to do that, but throughout
47 Alaska it's a reasonable thing.

48

49 We're not there yet, but I think, in
50 looking at that, we have to recognize that these

00225

1 provisions need to be in place. I think what we worked
2 on at the last meeting with the rules, I see no need to
3 change it. I think, if we put this in, it allows it.
4 There are Federal waters in the Cook Inlet, there are

5 plenty of areas in the Copper River drainage. Those are
6 our two main things, of course, in Prince William Sound.

7
8

9 So, when we look at that, I think it's
10 necessary that we adopt something. Make a position here
11 and make our recommendation to the Board and go with it.
12 Then we don't have to reinvent this all over again if we
13 ever get the State to recognize co-management and
14 subsistence. So my recommendation is to stay with what
15 we have and apply it and not change anything at this
16 point. Just let it fly and then down the road we can
17 address it if need be. Otherwise, it will be fine.

18 Thank you.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Mr. Churchill.

21

22 MR. CHURCHILL: I'm appreciating the
23 concern Susan is expressing. Might that not be addressed
24 by what the Eastern Interior folks recommended, saying
25 that sale is used for personal or family consumption of
26 individuals who purchase the fish? I mean might that not
27 address that concern, where we're still keeping it in
28 that vein where it is primarily for personal consumption.

29

30 MS. WELLS: And that may be one thing
31 that the non-subsistence users could support and also
32 within the co-management, too. I mean that might help
33 bring the entities together.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I see where that could
36 tie in very good with our idea of the fact that fish
37 should be taken for family and personal use. Those two
38 could be combined to where you said at least 50 percent
39 of all fish taken under subsistence regulations must be
40 kept for a family's personal use and fish sold must be
41 used for personal or family consumption of the individual
42 who purchases the fish and tie those two together. Fred.

43

44 MR. ELVSAAS: I just want to say, you
45 know, we're talking about sale. I have fished
46 subsistence for over 50 years now and I have yet not
47 found a family or friend or anybody willing to pay me for
48 what I get. (Laughing)

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, I agree with you
00226

1 on that, Fred, because, to me, in general, it's sharing,
2 not selling. But recognizing that in other areas of the
3 state and maybe even in our own area we don't know how
4 everybody else is dealing. The law does provide the
5 opportunity for it and, in some areas of the state, like
6 it was pointed out, the cost of obtaining the subsistence
7 food, whether it's hooligan in Southeastern or whitefish
8 in the North Slope, the cost of obtaining it necessitates
9 the sale of some of it just to pay the expenses so you
10 can afford to go out and take it.

11

12 When we had the household member thing, I
13 heard one of you over here kind of under your breath and
14 I was wondering if anybody had any comment on the idea of

15 household member, like I see -- I guess it was Bristol
16 Bay changed that one and I don't know if Eastern Interior
17 did. I don't think it did. Eastern Interior didn't
18 change household member, did it? I was going to ask a
19 question from Fish & Game. I see Gloria has her hand up.
20 Gloria, would you come up so we can ask you. Are
21 subsistence permits in the Copper Basin, are they given
22 to a household or are they given to individuals in the
23 household? Gloria, do you know the answer to that one?
24

25 MS. STICKWAN: One per household.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You get one per
28 household. Okay. I was wondering about that.

29
30 MS. STICKWAN: I just want to state that
31 in times of shortage we should put in here that customary
32 trade would stop. I also think it's very important that
33 we have some kind of recordkeeping or permitting system
34 for our area. It's needed, I think.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You don't think it's
37 very important?

38
39 MS. STICKWAN: I think it's very
40 important that we have some kind of permitting or some
41 kind of recordkeeping.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Would it be possible to
44 combine that right with your subsistence permit? Have a
45 space on your subsistence permit where you record fish
46 that you sold? That would be a lot less.....

47
48 MS. STICKWAN: That would be less
49 paperwork for us.

50
00227
1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That would be less
2 paperwork and less bookkeeping because you already have
3 to have the permit anyhow.

4
5 MS. STICKWAN: Yes.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And I don't know if
8 other areas in the state have to have that, but I think
9 on the Copper River and I know down in Prince William
10 Sound you have to get a permit for your subsistence catch
11 to begin with, so there could be a place on that. That
12 would be more acceptable to record fish that were sold
13 right on the permit that you've got.

14
15 MS. STICKWAN: Yes. That would be less
16 paperwork.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fred.

19
20 MR. ELVSAAS: The issue of shortages is
21 real difficult because, in our area, when we have
22 shortages, other people have lots of fish. There's a big
23 difference between east and west sides of Cook Inlet.
24 Defining shortages, I think in terms of shortages you

25 just aren't going to catch as many. I have very good
26 days fishing when others aren't even fishing. I don't
27 think we should get bogged down in shortages. If you
28 have a collapse like the Yukon River has been, the whole
29 area gets shut down. But when we look at what we're
30 doing here in our region, I don't think we should include
31 shortages yet unless it becomes a major problem. And
32 that's one of the things. I don't think we can solve all
33 issues today. Some of them have to crop up down the road
34 and be addressed at that point. Thank you.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fred.

37

38 MR. JOHN: I just want to say my personal
39 feeling about this whole thing. I kind of wish it would
40 stall for another 20 years. (Laughing) I know the
41 Federal bureaucracy wants rules and regulation and
42 they're very in our life. Right now I'm speaking from my
43 home area, Metasta, and some of the village I know in our
44 area. Trade and barter up there is going good. We feed
45 our family in Fairbanks and sometimes we come back with
46 chicken. Sometimes they donate a little money to us for
47 gas to come back. The Northway area -- I'm just speaking
48 in general, or Tetlin area, they've got no steambath
49 rocks, so sometimes we go to the park, get our steambath
50 rock, which is those, what do you call them, rock from
00228

1 volcano. We take them up there and sometimes we trade
2 and sometimes they just give us money. We don't have no
3 set value on money on that.

4

5 Like fishing, we don't buy fresh fish,
6 you know, we just give it away or give it to people that
7 want it in Fairbanks or up in Northway area where they
8 don't have no salmon. Our fish wheel, sometimes we rent
9 it out. We don't know if it's legal or not, you know,
10 but we rent it out because fish wheel costs money to
11 build and a lot of hard work and everything to put it in.
12 We have somebody come down and they donate us money for
13 use of the fish wheel.

14

15 Another thing is selling of salmon strip.
16 We know where to go in Fairbanks. Rampart, good salmon
17 strip and Galena, you know, and we buy it from them.
18 It's hard work drying it and smoking it and everything.
19 That's hard work and it's pretty expensive, but we like
20 the taste of it and everything, so we buy it sometimes
21 off the street, sometime at AFN.

22

23 To me, things are okay right now.
24 Putting in regulation and everything, to me, it's going
25 to start corruption, going to start a lot of stuff, the
26 \$1,000 and everything. Like if we give something away,
27 sometimes they feel obligated to give us money for it,
28 like persons in Fairbanks and everything, or give us some
29 food and it's been done, it's being done in the villages.

30

31

32 To me, it's going good. That's just my
33 thoughts. I know we need some regulation probably
34 someplace, too. I'd really like to say I'm not going to

35 stall it or anything. If it needs to be done, it has to
36 be done. You know, I see enough reason to do it. I'll
37 go with it, you know. I don't know about the other area
38 if they're having problems with these things. To me, in
39 my area, we don't have a problem. That's what I want to
40 say. I'm speaking strictly from the northern part of
41 AHTNA.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pete, correct me if I'm
44 wrong, but that's the same issue we heard time and time
45 again in our deliberations on this, was the fear that by
46 setting regulations will set precedent and encourage
47 business and destroy subsistence. That was what I read
48 time and time again.

49

50 MR. JOHN: You just said what I wanted to
00229

1 say. It will probably destroy the value of cultural
2 relationship and subsistence area and it's going to
3 probably hurt more than what it's doing right now. Right
4 now I don't see anything wrong with it.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pete.

7

8 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chairman, I think Mr.
9 John articulated very well on what we've been wrestling
10 with. We're trying to adopt Federal regulations to
11 protect what you just discussed. At the same time, there
12 are abuses going on. The U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
13 said there's abuse occurring on subsistence sales. So we
14 look at that and we recognize that by drawing attention
15 and develop regulations, just like Ralph articulated, may
16 invite further abuse, so it's a really delicate line and
17 that's what we've been wrestling with. We want to
18 protect what's currently going on and keep that going,
19 but at the same time prevents these abuses that may
20 escalate. Mr. Chair.

21

22 MR. JOHN: Back in the '30s when the
23 first Federal Game Warden came in and told my dad he only
24 could hunt 30 days out of the year, you know, which he
25 did hunt all the time to provide for the family. He
26 didn't have any other way of making money. That kind of
27 hurt.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.

30

31 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, through the Chair.
32 Could you describe what abuses you're most concerned
33 about that are occurring, either by area or what kind of
34 enterprises? That would be helpful to me.

35

36 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair, Mr. Churchill.
37 As the task force met, we had enforcement personnel sit
38 on the committee and I guess that would be the driving
39 factor that initially got us to the table, was the
40 unenforceability of the regulations. What the
41 enforcement people told us that there is abuses going on
42 that they have documented, but that's as far as they
43 would go. They didn't have any specifics. They said the
44 regulation is unenforceable and, consequently, couldn't

45 make the cases. That's as far as the information we had
46 and no more specifics.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.

49

50 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, through the Chair.
00230

1 Did they have any specific recommendations as to what
2 might make them enforceable? Is this language the result
3 of that input?

4

5 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair, Mr. Churchill.

6 The enforcement personnel that were in our task force,
7 once we started discussing a cap, a \$1 cap, that's
8 something that's enforceable, but not by itself. As Mr.
9 Boss articulated very well, in order to enforce it, there
10 has to be some type of reporting requirement, either a
11 permit or we call it a reporting requirement on the task
12 force.

13

14 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you very much.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fred.

17

18 MR. ELVSAAS: After hearing Fred's
19 testimony and the issue of the abuses, right now I have a
20 little bit of a problem understanding what abuses there
21 are. If somebody from enforcement says there's abuses,
22 we've got to make a law. We're talking about
23 subsistence. Subsistence is a way of life. Life evolves
24 and things happen. So we're looking at exchanges for
25 cash and barter and trade for other good. I'm just
26 wondering if we aren't bogging ourselves down here by
27 even addressing the subject. Here we're going to make
28 more rules.

29

30 My initial thinking, and at the last
31 meeting too, I support what we did. But, on the other
32 hand, I don't want to support it if it's going to stop
33 people from having the ability to barter, trade and sell
34 these goods for other things. I fully understand what
35 Fred said. It's kind of bothersome to think that we may
36 be changing a whole way of life just because we're
37 sitting here making proposals to the Board and the Board
38 looks to us for guidance.

39

40 I just have heartburn over the idea that
41 -- I don't want to change the subsistence lifestyle of
42 anybody. I think that's one of the best things in
43 Alaska, that people can go out and subsistence and use
44 the resources and so forth. When it comes to the
45 fishing, I don't want to see subsistence fish in the
46 commercial market either, but is that really something
47 for us or is that something for the State to worry about.
48 The State is the one that regulates commercial fisheries.
49 I just throw that out because I don't want to stop
50 anything in the subsistence lifestyle. With that, I'll
00231

1 shut up and listen to some more.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fred, I'd like to answer

4 something on that. Rules will be made. The Board will
5 address this issue. They will make a rule. The question
6 is, do we want to have input into making those rules or
7 do we want them to make those decisions in a vacuum. We
8 aren't going to make any rules here. What we're going to
9 try to do is we're going to try to give them an
10 indication of how we, as a council, from Southcentral
11 view the least disruptive way that we can do this or the
12 most protective way that we can do this. They will make
13 a rule and they're going to make a rule whether we say
14 something or whether we don't because they're forced into
15 a position to do that. I feel that this is our
16 opportunity, this is a forum that we have and this is our
17 opportunity to put some input into those rules or we're
18 going to get rules that fit someplace else and don't fit
19 us or we're going to get rules that don't take into
20 account how we feel about these things. Mr. Churchill.
21

22 MR. CHURCHILL: At least from reading all
23 the material, that's certainly the intent I get, is not
24 to restrict unnecessarily or inhibit a subsistence
25 lifestyle, it's to protect it from those that either
26 don't understand it and because of where they live may
27 have access to it. It really is meant to support and
28 protect it, not restrict it. I mean that's certainly the
29 intent I get from reading all the information we've had
30 so far.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: In response to that, the
33 task force, that was one of the things that we kept
34 wrestling with, is how do we allow what's going on now
35 and not encourage something that could destroy what's
36 going on now. It was basically a question of how do you
37 protect what's currently taking place. Not protecting
38 the abuses, but protecting what's currently taking place
39 in the subsistence community without creating something
40 that could destroy that or allowing abuses by those that
41 aren't part of it to destroy it in another way. Fred,
42 you were going to say something?

43
44 MR. ELVSAAS: In view of what you just
45 said, I have to agree, we do need to have input into
46 this. If the Board is going to address it and make some
47 decisions, then it's proper that we do so. But, again, I
48 don't want to do anything that is restricting ongoing
49 subsistence lifestyle. With that, I guess I have to
50 review our previous action as the correct action. Thank
00232
1 you.

2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.
4

5 MR. CHURCHILL: Just a follow-up. I
6 remember a meeting I was in in Bethel when the western
7 Arctic herd was being discussed and there was, at that
8 point, a real market in the sale of antlers and the
9 feedback we got from the individual advisory committees
10 and councils, they were terrified of the public
11 perception that, in fact, these people who were taking
12 caribou to feed their families and their villages, that
13 the perception of the public would be they were taking

14 them merely for resale and I know they were terrified of
15 that. They felt the consequences of that and the
16 repercussions of that could have a dramatic effect on
17 their ability to hunt and to harvest. So I kind of read
18 a strain of that in here, too. That real concern with
19 perception as a part of this.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Susan.

22

23 MS. WELLS: This whole issue is specific
24 to salmon. You've talked about abuses going on and I'm
25 wondering if in the use of the term subsistence caught
26 fish may be, I don't know, confused with personal use
27 caught fish or sport caught fish within the state. I
28 have experienced and I have witnessed abuses of personal
29 use caught fish and sport caught fish. In summer in
30 Kenai, it's very common to go down to -- I mean you can
31 see in the airport the boxes and boxes, the pounds of
32 fish leaving our state with tourists.

33

34 I worked with a guide for a very brief
35 time, my only time, and grappled with the issue of his
36 wanton waste. I mean he could clean fish faster than me,
37 but he left a good 25 to 50 percent of the fish on the
38 backbone and bellies on the beach. That's a crime. And
39 then also, every time he came in with a group, he cleaned
40 the fish and put it in the refrigerator, his allocation
41 started over for that day. So he could go back out and
42 get twice as much or sometimes three times as much,
43 depending on how many clients he took out.

44

45 Differentiating between the different
46 types of fish that are being abused is important to me.
47 Then, as a subsistence user, not being blamed for abuses
48 that my group may or may not have committed. That's a
49 very concern of mine. But I do agree that there has been
50 abuse of this resource, but I don't know that I can agree

00233

1 that it is the subsistence user that is abusing them. As
2 we are talking and I am new on this Council, when we go
3 forward with this, it must be to protect the right of the
4 subsistence use as ANILCA allows.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Susan. That
7 was one of the things that was brought up, especially
8 when we were dealing with Southcentral, is that there can
9 be a difference between abuses by subsistence users and
10 abuses by people who have access to subsistence use
11 because of the fact we're a very mobile population. In
12 Southcentral, there's road access. State law recognizes
13 everybody in the state is a subsistence user or has
14 subsistence access, so you can have problems with
15 subsistence users or you can have problems with people
16 who have access to subsistence use.

17

18 We're hoping, and that was one of the
19 things that kept coming up, was that the subsistence
20 community has to govern themselves to a certain extent.
21 There should be internal community pressures that keep a
22 true subsistence user from violating the idea of the law
23 instead of the letter of the law, but even that's not

24 always the case because individuals are individuals and
25 anybody can choose to do the maximum amount of illegal
26 activity that they want to do. In a subsistence
27 community, you do have social pressure that contains some
28 of that. Bob.

29

30 MR. CHURCHILL: This might present a real
31 opportunity for maybe the advisory council and the
32 advisory committees to work together on some issues
33 through our area because I do know from my involvement in
34 the advisory committees the amount of tonnage of fish
35 that's taken out of the state.

36

37 I have a hard time -- I ran into two
38 families in campers or motorhomes that will cost more
39 than my house and they were telling me they had literally
40 hundreds of cases of salmon they were taking back to the
41 Lower 48. I don't know how big their family was, but
42 they couldn't have possibly fed all that salmon -- you
43 know it's for resale and that might be a real productive
44 area for us to explore with the advisory committees to
45 see if we could put something in place that would limit
46 the poundage, and not unnecessarily, but limit the
47 poundage taken out of the state by folks because the
48 impact of that on the resource can be huge and hurt all
49 Alaskans, so that might be an area that would be real
50 fruitful for discussion and a cooperative effort.

00234

1 MS. WELLS: I know we're getting off the
2 task at hand here, but I have been in Arizona at a flea
3 market and seen Alaska caught fish in jars and it wasn't
4 pink salmon either and I can tell. I think it is a crime
5 against the people, all users of the state. As a
6 personal use fisher on the Kenai, witnessing canning not
7 far from the beach, on the bank, outside of motorhomes.
8 You might not believe this and I'm not one that wants to
9 cause trouble, but I will report that anymore. I mean I
10 have a responsibility to our area and to the local
11 fishers of our area. Anyway, back on task.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Susan, while we're off
14 task, but it is part of the task, I'm going to say
15 something and this is my own, personal feeling. Number
16 one, until we, as individuals, get to the point that we
17 are willing to report those kind of abuses, nothing can
18 be done about them. The day that the subsistence
19 community gets behind some of the proposals that have
20 been presented to the Board of Fish to limit the amount
21 of fish that a non-resident can take out of the state,
22 the day that happens and we all have access to -- I have
23 submitted a proposal that way, so I know how much support
24 you get. But the day they get inundated with proposals
25 from the subsistence community to limit non-residents
26 taking fish out of the state to a daily bag limit or a
27 possession bag limit instead of -- I've been at the
28 airport like you, too. I've seen a man go out with 11
29 boxes of silver salmon fillets from Cordova. He was
30 there for a two-week trip. There's no legal way he could
31 take 11 boxes of silver salmon fillets, but he was with a
32 fly-out outfitter and I know that every time that fly-out
33 outfitter came in, his fish probably went to the

34 processor and got processed and frozen and they didn't
35 consider them part of the limit.

36

37 The subsistence community is going to
38 have to submit proposals through the proper avenue, which
39 is the Alaska Board of Fish, to get that changed and it's
40 not going to take an individual, it's going to take
41 multiple individuals from multiple sources. Bob.

42

43 MR. CHURCHILL: This may not be the time
44 to do it, but I'd certainly be more than willing to
45 participate in an effort to work with the advisory
46 committees. I think that would be really powerful if we
47 had all of the affected or the majority of the affected
48 advisory committees working with the advisory council and
49 saying we all and those that we represent feel this is a
50 real need. I've had the same frustration you have
00235

1 bringing this forward. People turn a deaf ear to it. It
2 might present a real opportunity for us to all work
3 together in a cooperative effort.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Now that we've
6 addressed that. We weren't really off the subject
7 because we were addressing the issue that was brought up
8 about abuse and that the abuse is not confined to
9 subsistence. Maybe even subsistence takes some of the
10 credit for the abuse that comes from other areas. Let's
11 get back and take a look at what we have on the table
12 right now so we get done today.

13

14 MR. JOHN: That's one of the problems we
15 should write to the Federal Board.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's a good one to put
18 on our annual report to the Board, our concern with that.
19 I think that's excellent, Fred. What we have on the
20 table right now is we have our original proposal. We've
21 looked at some of the changes other places made. I'm
22 going to run through those changes once. If nobody wants
23 to offer an amendment, I think that we should stay with
24 our discussion unless somebody offers an amendment on
25 these issues that I bring up. If they don't, we'll send
26 forward what we have.

27

28 One of the things that came up, household
29 member or household. Do we want to leave it as household
30 member or do we want to offer an amendment consistent
31 with some other RAC's to change it to household? Do we
32 have any thoughts on it? Okay. At this point in time,
33 we don't have any thoughts on it, so let's go on.

34

35 The only other thing that I can see was
36 the value. We left the value of \$1,000. One of the
37 suggestions that Gloria had today was that the value
38 might be somewhere between 200 and 1,000. It's up to us
39 to decide whether we want to leave it the way it is or
40 change it. If I don't hear anything, we're going to
41 leave it the way it is.

42

43 MR. CHURCHILL: Again, just a thought,

44 but might it not give the Board another tool to consider?
45 I mean I don't have any disagreement with what the
46 advisory council did, but it might give them a real
47 useful tool to consider if we included that. Certainly
48 in our minutes if not in our suggestion on what they do
49 on these. I was really impressed. I thought that was a
50 good idea.

00236

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Susan.

2

3 MR. WELLS: Clarification on this range.
4 Is this range so that when it goes back to each area then
5 they can set something? Because the bottom line, you
6 could have zero to 1,000.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Or maybe what we're
9 saying is that we would be satisfied in our area with
10 anything in that range. That's what I would look at it
11 to be. In other words, I think the Board is going to
12 come up with -- my personal opinion is the Board is going
13 to come up with a number. What Gloria was suggesting is
14 that, and my way of looking at it, was that we would be
15 satisfied for a number that fit within this range. In
16 other words, the bottom line would be 200, the top line
17 would be 1,000. The one thing that we have stressed that
18 we've heard time and time again, we don't want to set it
19 high enough to attract attention. Yet, at the same time,
20 we want to allow it to happen. If you want to change it
21 to a range or you want to leave it at 1,000, I'm leaving
22 that up to the Council. Yes, Pete.

23

24 MR. PROBASCO: Just a clarification so
25 the Council doesn't get confused. Remember, A-11 is
26 rural to rural. There is no cap. So A-12, which you're
27 discussing, is rural to others, non-federally-qualified
28 users. Mr. Chair.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Pete. Fred.

31

32 MR. JOHN: Do we have any sunset clause
33 on this?

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You can't say a sunset
36 clause. This can be reconsidered every year. All it
37 takes is a proposal to be put forward and that puts it
38 back on the table.

39

40 MR. JOHN: Okay. That's all I wanted to
41 know.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fred.

44

45 MR. ELVSAAS: Well, if you leave the
46 \$1,000 as is, maybe the Board, in its deliberations,
47 looking at some that want 400, like Bristol Bay, they may
48 do that range, but, like you say, if they come up with a
49 number, I think our position that you have to utilize at
50 least half of the fish yourself, within your own family,
00237

1 when you sell, if you sell any, you can't sell more than

2 half, that \$1,000 is not a bad number. Just think back

3 to yesterday. We wrestled with \$10,000 gall bladders and
4 didn't get very far. I think that the number as pegged
5 is good enough for our recommendation.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I agree with Fred that
8 it's good enough for our recommendation. I think what
9 Gloria was wanting to indicate was that we would be
10 willing to have any number in that range so that we're
11 not saying that we demand \$1,000, that we're willing to
12 accept a range, but I don't think we need to change it.
13 If the rest of the Council doesn't want to, we can leave
14 it the way it is. If somebody wants to offer an
15 amendment, we're open to it.

16

17 MS. WELLS: The other thing that she
18 mentioned, too, was the recordkeeping and I don't know if
19 this is where we need to put that on. I really think
20 that recordkeeping could be simple. Sometimes our
21 bureaucracy doesn't make it simple, but adding it to the
22 permitting process on the form, you know, personal use,
23 you write down every fish and the type you get, it's easy
24 enough. If it's recommended that way, maybe that's the
25 process that they might use so it is easy for the
26 subsistence user.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I was going to suggest
29 that as an amendment and we'd tack that on the end. To
30 simplify it, that all recordkeeping will be kept on the
31 permit form that you have and then they can decide what
32 has to be written on it, but it will be kept on that same
33 one form. I was going to suggest that, but thank you for
34 suggesting it. Maybe we can think of how to word it and
35 maybe we can put it on as an amendment when we get to the
36 end of this.

37

38 Okay. We want to stick with our 50
39 percent, right?

40

41 MR. ELVSAAS: Oh, yes.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, do we want to go
44 like Eastern Interior and say that the fish that are sold
45 end up being sold for personal or family consumption so
46 they don't enter the marketplace in any way? Does
47 anybody have any feelings on that?

48

49 MR. ELVSAAS: Do we want to get our
50 recommendation too early? That could be a problem.

00238

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I don't think it can be
2 because all these are is recommendations at this point in
3 time. Basically, what we would be doing by doing that is
4 we would be supporting Eastern Interior and we're saying
5 that, yeah, we concur that that's a good idea or that's
6 not a good idea. If we don't concur with it, basically
7 we're letting them stand by themselves and the Board is
8 going to look at theirs and say, hey, that's a good idea
9 or that's not a good idea. If we concur with it, then it
10 says we're saying that's a good idea just like they are.

11

12

13 Again, what I'm doing is I'm going
14 through the changes that other councils recommended and
15 just seeing if we want to support any of those or if we
16 want to leave ours the way it stood. So, I'm leaving it
17 at that. If somebody wants to add that as an amendment,
18 we can add it as an amendment. Otherwise, we can leave
19 it the way it is.

20

21 MR. ELVSAAS: I support the concept. I
22 just don't want to get bogged down in a lengthy
23 recommendation, you know. If it's that simple.....

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's as simple as it
26 is.

27

28 MR. ELVSAAS: Do you need a motion to
29 that effect?

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We need a motion to that
32 effect and I can find the wording.

33

34 MS. WELLS: We have a motion to support
35 to take this forward.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We have a motion to
38 support to take this forward. What we would need is an
39 amendment to support Eastern Interior's recommendation
40 that sale to others be used for personal or family
41 consumption of the individual who purchases the fish.

42

43 MR. CHURCHILL: So moved.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved.

46

47 MS. WELLS: We have a motion on the table
48 right now.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So we're making an
00239

1 amendment.

2

3 MS. WELLS: So, if we're going to support
4 it, it's so simple here. It's very definitive to be used
5 for personal family consumption of the individual who
6 purchases the fish.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So we add that as an
9 amendment to ours. We have a motion on the table. Do we
10 have a second for the amendment?

11

12 MS. WELLS: Second.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So seconded. Do we need
15 any further discussion on that?

16

17 MR. ELVSAAS: Do we have to have an
18 amendment right now? We just add it on and then vote for
19 the whole thing.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We can't because we have
22 a motion on the table. The motion is as it's written.

23 So we have to add this as an amendment. The easiest way
24 to do this is to go through this, add amendments to the
25 motion that we have on the table and then vote on the
26 motion as amended.

27

28 MR. JOHN: Question.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
31 called.

32

33 MR. PROBASCO: Point of clarification.

34 You're focusing on A-12, the Eastern Interior, and you
35 focused your attention on the bold last sentence only?

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We focused it on as I
38 just read it, which is the bold last sentence. It is to
39 be used for personal or family consumption of the
40 individual who purchases the fish. The question has been
41 called. All in favor signify by saying aye.

42

43 IN UNISON: Aye.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
46 saying nay.

47

48 (No opposing votes)

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. So
00240

1 that's an amendment that's added to our original one.

2 Okay. That pretty well takes us through -- oh, except

3 for the recordkeeping. Susan.

4

5 MS. WELLS: I'm thinking of adding a
6 brief statement about requiring a permitting process or
7 requiring.....

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Requiring that all
10 recordkeeping be kept on the permitting process.

11

12 MS. WELLS: A permitting requirement --
13 no, I don't have the words.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We have a permitting
16 process in place.

17

18 MS. WELLS: Okay. Requiring the
19 recordkeeping be limited to the permit. No.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: To the recordkeeping
22 required.....

23

24 MR. CHURCHILL: Are we saying that we
25 want the recordkeeping contained on the permit?

26

27 MS. WELLS: Contained is a good word.

28 Yes.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Contained in the
31 permitting process. Does that sound reasonable, Pete?

32

33 MS. WELLS: No. What we're saying is we
34 want it on the permit.
35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. On the permit.
37 That all recordkeeping be required to be on the permit.
38 One thing we could say is no additional recordkeeping,
39 but that all recordkeeping will be part of the permit.
40
41 MR. ELVSAAS: Possibly what you want to
42 say is that the permit shall include a form for
43 recordkeeping.
44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's even better yet.
46 I like that. Do you want to make that as a motion?
47
48 MR. ELVSAAS: No. I'm making that as
49 part of Susan's motion.
50
00241
1 MS. WELLS: So Susan's motion is to.....
2
3 MR. ELVSAAS: The permit will include the
4 form for recordkeeping.
5
6 MS. WELLS: Will include the
7 recordkeeping.
8
9 MR. ELVSAAS: But you want it to be the
10 form, see, the form for recordkeeping.
11
12 MS. WELLS: Got it. Like he said. I
13 move.
14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have a second?
16
17 MR. CHURCHILL: Second.
18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
20 seconded. Any discussion?
21
22 MR. ELVSAAS: Question.
23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pete.
25
26 MR. PROBASCO: Just for clarification for
27 the record, so you're saying recordkeeping for the intent
28 of documenting customary trade.
29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Uh-huh. Will be
31 included with the permit or included on the permit.
32
33 MR. ELVSAAS: The form.
34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
36 called. All in favor signify by saying aye.
37
38 IN UNISON: Aye.
39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
41 saying nay.
42

43 (No opposing votes)

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. Now,
46 the only other thing that I saw in here would be on
47 number 13 where Eastern Interior included other
48 businesses than the Alaska statute, but I personally
49 don't think that's necessary if we have that provision in
50 12 which says to others must be used for personal or
00242

1 family consumption. I think we don't have to add
2 anything else to it. Is there any other amendments
3 anybody would like to offer? No other amendments. Any
4 further discussion. Ida has her hand up and we always
5 give everybody an opportunity to say something.

6

7 MS. HILDEBRAND: Mr. Chairman, Ida
8 Hildebrand, BIA Staff Committee member. While I'm in
9 total agreement with however you conduct your business,
10 I'm concerned that some of your concerns that were raised
11 during your discussion which aren't a part of your
12 motion, you can also forward to the Board as concerns of
13 this Council, that the Board would be apprised of your
14 concerns.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We should probably
17 forward those in our annual report, right?

18

19 MS. HILDEBRAND: You could do it either
20 as just a statement to the Board regarding customary
21 trade with your recommendations. These are other
22 concerns, we didn't make recommendation, but we believe
23 you should be apprised of and you can, in addition, put
24 it in your annual report.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. No further
27 discussion? Question is in order.

28

29 MS. WELLS: Question.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
32 called. All in favor of our motion as amended -- do I
33 need to read the whole thing? Pete.

34

35 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair, I'll try and
36 Ann can correct me. A-11, your Council has recommended
37 you leave as you passed in the fall meeting. A-12,
38 you're amending it to stick with your 50 percent
39 requirement, your \$1,000 annual sales, as long as it's
40 used for personal or family consumption of the individual
41 as stated in the bold paragraph under Eastern Regional
42 Advisory Council, and that you're also putting a putting
43 that the permit will include recordkeeping provisions for
44 tracking customary trade.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Ann.

47

48 MS. WILKINSON: I would just add one
49 other thing to that. The second amendment I've included
50 keeping recordkeeping of sale under paragraph 12 just in
00243

1 case there's anybody confused.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So that it's
4 limited to that so it's not on paragraph 11.

5

6 MS. WILKINSON: Right.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Good. With
9 that.....

10

11 MR. CHURCHILL: Question.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
14 called. All in favor signify by saying aye.

15

16 IN UNISON: Aye.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
19 saying nay.

20

21 (No opposing votes)

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think that unless the
24 Chairman says he's abstaining, he's concurring with the
25 majority, right? If I don't say I'm abstaining, I'm
26 concurring with the majority, but I don't have to say
27 anything. That way I don't have to vote unless there's a
28 tie. Okay. It is 12:00 noon. We have agency reports,
29 new business, draft annual report, commercial
30 sportfishing guides. We have a small plate for this
31 afternoon. We definitely can't take care of it by
32 skipping lunch. My original suggestion was going to be
33 that we went to 1:00 and finish, but this took longer
34 than I thought. So, if it's the wish of the rest of the
35 Council, should we take an hour and a half for lunch,
36 come back and finish this up this afternoon? Is there
37 anybody here that has to leave that won't be available
38 for this afternoon that has something important to give
39 that they can't just hand in to Ann and have her read to
40 us? Okay. Seeing that, we are going to adjourn until
41 1:30.

42

43 (Off record - 12:00 p.m.)

44

45 (On record - 1:30 p.m.)

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We'll call the spring
48 session of the 2002 Southcentral Regional Subsistence
49 Advisory Council back in session. We are currently on
50 the review draft for the annual report on 2001. Let's
51 turn to Tab G. Okay. We have in front of us the 2001
00244

1 annual report. Some of the things that were brought up
2 was a stipend and that was also carried forward by the
3 Council chairs. That also was rejected by the powers
4 that be. Predation has been brought up again this
5 meeting. We've got it on as an ongoing concern. We
6 could leave it on our annual report as an ongoing concern
7 if that's the wish of the rest of the Council. Bob.

8

9 MR. CHURCHILL: Just for the record, I
10 think Mr. Ewan testified that that was a concern in his
11 area pretty clearly and to the point.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. And the next
14 thing that was on the letter here was the Cook Inlet
15 fisheries. I think they have started the process, but I
16 don't think we've gone very far on it yet. We have
17 actually set up a subsistence priority for Cook Inlet on
18 Federal land. Do we need to include anything on the Cook
19 Inlet fisheries in our annual report? Ann.

20

21 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman. This is
22 the draft that I wrote up after the fall meeting. It was
23 written almost directly after that fall meeting. So,
24 yes, there has been work begun on this. You will hear
25 about it later in the staff reports. If you want to add
26 something to this paragraph or change it, we could do it
27 after that as well.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's what I was
30 basically -- I didn't mean to delete it. I meant does
31 anybody want to add anything to it. Susan.

32

33 MS. WELLS: Is this the report that we
34 want to add our concerns about the abuse?

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes. And we could
37 figure out where we would like to put that into this
38 report if we'd like. These were things that were brought
39 up at our fall meeting that Ann wrote up this draft for
40 us. As you can see, it covers some of the things that
41 took place in Cook Inlet.

42

43 The other thing we have is the Copper
44 River Subsistence Fisheries Evaluation 2000 and the
45 traditional knowledge project that's going on there. And
46 the process of recommendations for residency for Cantwell
47 members in the Denali National Park. This is the first
48 time this residency requirement has been brought up. It
49 was brought up at the request of the folks that were up
50 there. We've passed this forward to the Board because we
00245

1 thought it was important. We didn't have a proposal to
2 this effect. This was a suggestion. Does anybody have
3 anything they want to add to that? Again, we defined
4 that we weren't setting a precedent, that this was a
5 particular case-by-case study where conditions were
6 unique.

7 MR. CHURCHILL: Just some
8 information for my own use. It appears from that that
9 there's a problem with relatively new folks in that area
10 engaging in traditional activities and maybe to the
11 detriment of the total resource. Is that kind of the
12 background?

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Basically it was. I'll
14 let Gilbert kind of explain it. It was the fast growth
15 of Cantwell and an awful lot of it is government, if I
16 remember right. Isn't it?

17

18 MR. DEMENTI: The SRC met and we
19 discussed this and the population has over doubled since
20 this program started using the Denali Park as a

21 subsistence area for Cantwell resident and we figured
22 this would be part of the way we could control or the
23 Park Service could control the use of the resource there
24 because there's a very limited amount of Park land that
25 we could use for the amount of people that's there.

26

27 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you very much.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Any other things
30 that we wanted to add to this? One of the concerns that
31 we expressed was the large volume take by non-resident
32 and alien sport fishermen, the large volume of fish that
33 goes out of the state and the impact that that makes on
34 the resources for subsistence fishermen. Anybody have
35 any particular way that they would like that worded or
36 should we let Ann come up with a draft on that? Mr.
37 Churchill.

38

39 MR. CHURCHILL: I guess I'd offer if you
40 wanted. I'd be happy to work with Ann. As I understand
41 the process, the letter comes back to the RAC members for
42 review and I'd be happy to do that.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: As the secretary, that
45 would be appropriate. Are there any other issues that we
46 would like to include in this? Ann.

47

48 MS. WILKINSON: Just one thing. Would
49 you like to have that paragraph about resident and alien
50 sportfishers listed separately from Cook Inlet fisheries?
00246

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, definitely, because
2 it impacts the whole state.

3

4 MS. WILKINSON: Okay. Thank you.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What we could do is we
7 could say that that impacts Southcentral and most of the
8 rest of the state. We heard it from up north when they
9 were talking about sheefish and things like that. Now,
10 any other things that anybody can think of to add to our
11 annual report? Hearing none.

12

13 MR. ELVSAAS: I'm trying to think if we
14 didn't save something else to put in, but I don't recall
15 at this time.

16

17 MS. WELLS: The one thing, and I don't
18 know if it was -- I think we addressed it when we had our
19 motion, but the recordkeeping business I think we
20 addressed that, but that was something that was talked
21 about.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fred.

24

25 MR. JOHN: Didn't we say something about
26 the rules and regulations we're going to make on
27 customary trade that we want to protect it, not uproot
28 all the tradition and the knowledge and everything.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That we would like them

31 to keep in mind that the reason it's there is to protect
32 and preserve current practices now and into the future
33 rather than to regulate practices out of existence. Bob.
34

35 MR. CHURCHILL: As I remember the
36 discussion, it was both practices and the resource.
37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. That would go
39 good right after the concern on the large take going out
40 of the state because that's part of an impact on a
41 resource, too. Well, if I don't hear anything else, I'm
42 going to instruct Ann to prepare a draft with those in
43 there and we'll go from there. Okay. Do we need a
44 motion on this? I don't think so.
45

46 With that, we're going on to commercial
47 sportfishing guides. Report on the permitting and
48 recordkeeping processes for operations in Federal waters
49 and the procedure for changing these processes. Who is
50 going to be making that presentation? I'll give you guys
00247

1 the opportunity to start where and when you'd like.

2

3 MR. HOLBROOK: My name is Ken Holbrook
4 with the Chugach National Forest. As I understand the
5 issue here, you've asked us how we would keep records of
6 sport harvest under guided trips.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, I was under the
9 impression that what had come up was the fact that it had
10 been expressed as a concern from a lot of the councils of
11 the growth of sportfishing on Federal waters, like the
12 Gulkana, all over the state and that the Federal
13 government was looking into a way to keep track of what
14 was taking place on Federal waters, keep track of the
15 growth and guiding operations and the impact on
16 fisheries. Did we have this on the agenda for us to do
17 something with? I thought this was a report. Ann.

18

19 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman, this was
20 part of last year's annual report and the Council, at
21 that time, did express a concern about how -- well, the
22 recordkeeping system of the different agencies in the
23 different Federal waters and whether permittees were
24 required to record their catches and just how that system
25 worked and the Council also wanted to know whether or not
26 they may have any involvement in changing that system.
27 This was, like I said, included in the annual report and
28 then the Staff Committee response and the Board response.
29 The Board response was to have the Staff Committee
30 instruct their people to present something to the
31 Council.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It looks like maybe it
34 fell through the cracks, huh?

35

36 MR. HOLBROOK: Well, I'm prepared to
37 respond to what Ann asked me to.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do you have a
40 presentation or an update?

41

42 MR. HOLBROOK: Mostly just to give you a
43 briefing on it and answer any of your questions.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Good.

46

47 MR. HOLBROOK: Typically, throughout the
48 forest, whether it be the Tongass or the Chugach, we
49 receive applications for outfitter guiding. In most
50 cases, we have already set user day limits for specific
00248

1 areas, whether it be the Setuk River or Prince William
2 Sound or whatever. So, at that time, if we have openings
3 available, user days available, we will issue permits
4 after doing public involvement.

5

6 We do not, under sportfish -- because all
7 these operators are under sportfish regulations. For
8 harvest, we do not actually have them keep track of
9 harvest by their clients. That is done through the
10 annual statewide sportfish survey. That's the question I
11 have been asked before by Ann is how we would go about
12 changing that to have us keep track. Right now, through
13 policy and procedure, we don't have any way to do that
14 because it is duplication of effort and it's under State
15 regulations.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If I remember right from
18 our discussion, the problem is it's not duplication
19 effort because the State doesn't do that. I mean they
20 don't do it. They have no method of tracking other than
21 end of season. Because I sat in on the board meeting
22 where we discussed that and basically the guides and
23 outfitters said it was too much trouble to keep track,
24 they were too busy to keep track, they had no means to
25 keep track. So we discussed this with the Federal with
26 the idea that a lot of this takes place on Federal land,
27 on Federal waters, and they have to have permits to
28 operate on those Federal waters, so there would be an
29 opportunity, and it was also expressed as a concern up
30 north, to keep track of the growth in the fisheries and
31 the take from those fisheries so we could see how over
32 time things change.

33

34 We're making all these fishery assessment
35 programs right now, like in Yukon Charlie, Wrangell-St.
36 Elias and the Denali and all of those and we thought this
37 would probably be a good tool that could be worked into
38 the permitting process where somehow or another an
39 account would have to be kept so we could see whether or
40 not -- and this was a concern that was expressed all
41 across the subsistence community, including discussions
42 with other people -- whether or not there would be a way
43 to keep track of what was being taken and the growth in
44 what was being taken, because a lot of these fisheries
45 are growing rapidly. One of the concerns is on the
46 Gulgana, which is kind of stabilized, but up north they
47 have concerns with them growing rapidly. I had kind of
48 gotten the impression that it was possible that they
49 could tack this on to the Federal permit and they were
50 going to look into what would have to be done to do that

00249

1 so that we would have a procedure to go ahead and suggest
2 that something like this be put in place, but maybe I'm
3 wrong.

4

5 MR. HOLBROOK: I'm not sure that it can't
6 be done, Mr. Chairman. It's just that at this point our
7 permittees don't have that option without some direction
8 and change in policy from above.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. At this point in
11 time, there is no recordkeeping of take or increase in
12 take or size dropping or anything like that under the
13 Federal system either.

14

15 MR. HOLBROOK: Not in the National
16 Forest. I can't speak to the refuges, but I don't think
17 they do that either. We monitor and control user days on
18 Federal lands and waters. A good deal of this issue, as
19 I'm aware of in Prince William Sound, is related to
20 places like Billy's Hole where the fishing is taking
21 place in the ocean, which we don't permit and have no
22 jurisdiction over at this point.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

25

26 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, through the Chair.
27 I'm just kind of curious about where this data is going
28 to go or what we're going to use it for. Do you track
29 the individual fish runs and populations in the parks
30 closely enough that you'd be able to make an informed
31 call as to the health of the runs? Is that what we're
32 trying to do with this information. If you could talk a
33 little bit about how we measure those populations in and
34 of themselves.

35

36 MR. HOLBROOK: Mr. Chair, at this point,
37 Fish & Game does all escapement monitoring in Prince
38 William Sound. We assist on some systems and there are
39 times when it is closed for conservation, but we don't
40 track harvest of individual fish, we track only the user
41 days.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: On the Forest Service in
44 Prince William Sound.

45

46 MR. HOLBROOK: On the Forest Service in
47 Alaska, yes.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I don't think currently
50 any of it is tracked anywhere, but I do know that the
00250

1 Federal Subsistence Board or Council or Management and
2 the National Park Service are trying to get a handle on
3 the status of fish in their waters all over the state.

4 That's basically what your project is, isn't it, to get a
5 handle of what's there at this point in time?

6

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We haven't tackled
8 anything tied to harvest of specific species.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No. You're just trying
11 to identify stock and population levels and things like
12 this, aren't you? And it was the concern of the Council
13 that possibly something could be done in this permitting
14 process to gain additional information because what we
15 look at is down the road. These things are impacting
16 subsistence users and the growth of them impacts it and
17 the drop in size impacts it. If you don't start doing it
18 and you don't get a baseline, this information isn't any
19 good if you haven't got a length of history behind it.
20

21 So that was what the concern was, what
22 would we have to do if it's not in place now to get
23 something in place so that part of the Federal permitting
24 system would keep track of harvest. You know, not just
25 the size, the quantity of the harvest, but the size of
26 the fish involved so that we could say that this run up
27 on Yukon Charlie, for example, when the fishery had 18
28 guides on it in 1999 and 2003 the average run size of the
29 grayling was 15 inches and after 10 years of fishery the
30 average grayling size is 13 inches. We see what happened
31 on the Chena River where basically the grayling
32 population with pressure plummeted to the point where
33 they had to close the thing down to bring grayling back,
34 so now the Chena River is back to having a good size
35 grayling back in it again. So that's what we were
36 interested in, what do we have to do if it's not in
37 place, and obviously it's not, to get something in place.
38

39 MR. HOLBROOK: Mr. Chair. I think the
40 first step would be to put this in your annual report.
41 Since the directors of the Federal lands are the Board,
42 and I'm sure they're aware of this, it's been discussed
43 before, but that would be a place to start. I don't know
44 that any of the individual unit managers can change these
45 policies. It would have to come from the State directors
46 or even above that.
47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think it was in our
49 annual report and we requested the information on it. I
50 guess that's what we expected to get was information as
00251

1 to what's in place and what we can do.

2

3 MR. HOLBROOK: Mr. Chair, there's nothing
4 in place and our system at this point is not conducive to
5 that. I would point out also that there are a number of
6 harvest situations occurring. The outfitter guided
7 portion. The outfitter situation is another one that we
8 don't really deal with in the National Forest. An
9 outfitter, say an air charter, drops off 20 people at one
10 site and that's not a guided situation and that's not
11 through us at all.
12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, it is. The
14 outfitter doesn't have to get a permit to drop people off
15 or anything like that then?
16

17 MR. HOLBROOK: The air charter operators?
18 No.
19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That is exactly what
21 we've seen happen in Prince William Sound, with places
22 like Shelter Bay. It's going on with Hole In the Wall,
23 it's going on with the ice cave where the outfitters are
24 dropping people off and, basically, in a 10-year time
25 period, they took Shelter Bay from a good run to nothing.
26

27 MR. HOLBROOK: That's correct.
28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So that was the concern,
30 how do we get something in place that if a commercial
31 operation is going to take place on Federal land, that
32 there be some recordkeeping and reporting to go along
33 with it. What do we have to do? Obviously, you said the
34 first step is to take it to the Board. Maybe we need to
35 make a proposal to the Board. Were you going to make a
36 comment?
37

38 MR. GERHARD: Mr. Chairman, my name is
39 Bob Gerhard. I work for the National Park Service, Staff
40 Committee in Anchorage. I can only speak for the
41 National Park Service, which has a slightly different
42 system. Most of the commercial activities in National
43 Park lands occur under an incidental business permit, an
44 IBP, and that's similar to a business license. When
45 people get those permits, they indicate what kind of
46 activity that they plan to conduct on the park lands.
47

48 Thinking that the concern was for the
49 Prince William Sound area, we looked at Denali just as a
50 small portion and Wrangell-St. Elias National Park, and
00252

1 we looked for either sportfishing or river trips as what
2 guide services said they were going to do. None of the
3 incidental business permits in Denali listed water
4 activities. For Wrangell-St. Elias, there are four
5 incidental business permits that list sportfishing and 19
6 permits that list river trips. At the present time, none
7 of those permits are required to report harvest of fish.
8 Our concessions office says that is possible right now
9 actually. Apparently Katmai National Park, on a few key
10 streams requires the permittees to record their fish
11 harvest.
12

13 So, it is possible and the mechanism is
14 to get a request. It could either go in an annual report
15 to the Federal Board, it could be directly to the
16 National Park Service. I think probably the most
17 effective way would be talking with each individual park
18 manager and indicating the interest in collecting that
19 information. Even if there are particular streams and
20 indicating those. The answer is it is possible, it just
21 has to be conveyed to the Park Superintendent and to the
22 Concessions Office if that request is made.
23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Would that request have
25 to come from the Board or could that request come
26 straight from councils?
27

28 MR. GERHARD: As I said, it could be
29 conveyed in a number of ways. It would not have to go

30 through the Board. It could go directly as a
31 communication from individuals or the Council to the Park
32 Superintendent saying we request that this be done.
33 There's advantages in going both ways. If you want it on
34 a more regional basis or even statewide, probably going
35 through the Board might be a good mechanism. If it's
36 particular areas that are of concern, it may be going
37 directly to the land manager for that area.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I guess what we were
40 talking about was the fact that most commercial
41 activities or all commercial activities on Federal land
42 have to have a permit or there's a permitting going on
43 for most or all commercial activities on Federal land and
44 here was the opportunity to get a handle on something.
45 When we met as Chairs, this was expressed, too, that this
46 is a chance to get a handle on something ahead of time
47 and to collect data relatively easy to show either an
48 increase in use or a change in resource or something like
49 that. I guess you've answered my question. Basically
50 none of that is being done right now.

00253

1 MR. GERHARD: Not on National Park
2 permits, that's correct.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Or on National Forest.
5 That leaves BLM and a couple of the small ones. So those
6 are opportunities that we have in the future then to come
7 up with an idea as a Council of how we'd like to approach
8 it and ask them to do it. I mean we're paying all this
9 money out to collect all this other stock status
10 information and things like that, we've got these
11 resource management projects that we're going through.
12 It would seem that here you have a situation where you're
13 already issuing a permit. Part of the requirement of
14 getting that permit would be to keep records.

15

16 Now, we ran into the same problem when we
17 dealt with the Board of Fish because they have to get
18 permits through the Board -- they have to have commercial
19 licenses through the Board of Fish and a saltwater
20 charter operator has to keep records, but all of the
21 freshwater operators who operate on the streams in the
22 Interior don't have to keep records because it's too much
23 trouble. The Board didn't pass it. But we have the
24 opportunity as a Federal Board to at least monitor what's
25 going on on our Federal lands. I saw another hand up
26 back there.

27

28 MARK: I just wanted to mention about the
29 log book we just did on the State Park.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But the log book applies
32 to saltwater only.

33

34 MARK: Right. But there's a place in
35 there (indiscernible) are incidental and salmon and stuff
36 like that.

37

38 MS. WILKINSON: When people comment like
39 that, it's very difficult to get it on the record, so it

40 would be better if they came up to a microphone.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'll have him come up
43 and say it.

44

45 MS. SHARP: Mr. Chair. Debbie Sharp,
46 Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve. On the
47 surface, it would look like there would be a lot of
48 commercially-led sportfishing in the park and you'd think
49 in 13 million acres and many, many large rivers and
50 streams we would have a lot, but the truth of it is, is
00254

1 that most of what comes down from the Wrangell Mountains
2 and is relatively road accessible is glacial and it's not
3 road accessible and then the areas that are road
4 accessible are outside of the National Park Service.

5

6 What it comes right down to is we really
7 don't have much of an opportunity for commercially-led
8 sportfishing because of the geography of the park. There
9 is some up the Tana River. We know who does that. One
10 way to go about this would be to ask for the park to
11 request voluntary compliance on this initially. It's all
12 we can do to get good IBP data that will give us adequate
13 data for park management; who goes where, how many people
14 and what they're doing. I certainly support you in this
15 effort to get more data. I just want you to realize that
16 even in a very big park, in this particular case, there
17 just isn't a lot of opportunity for fishing.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: How about the wild and
20 scenic rivers, do they come under the Park Service?

21

22 MS. SHARP: We don't have any wild and
23 scenic rivers in Wrangell.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Or Gulkana?

26

27 MS. SHARP: That's not ours. That's BLM.

28

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's BLM?

31

32 MS. SHARP: Right. I'm just speaking for
33 the piece of land that I'm asked to manage.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Under our Federal
36 agencies, there are quite a few important watersheds and
37 streams all over the state that the data could -- if the
38 State doesn't do it, if the Feds did it at least on their
39 land, we could have a -- I don't know if you'd call it a
40 guideline. What do you call it when you build a base so
41 that.....

42

43 MS. SHARP: Baseline data.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:so you can see
46 whether things are going up or going down?

47

48 MS. SHARP: Baseline data so you can
49 monitor changes.

50

00255

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that would be the
2 idea, that you'd be monitoring changes over time. The
3 longer you wait to put something in place, the less basic
4 your plane is. I mean the more the plane has been
5 changed before you start collecting your data, the less
6 valid plane you have to start from. So that's, in my way
7 of thinking, if there's a chance to do something like
8 this, the sooner it's done, the more close to normal your
9 plane is going to be. If you wait until you've got 25
10 guides operating on a river and you start your data from
11 there, you don't have a real indicator for a starting
12 place, especially if they've operated for five years.

13
14 So, anyhow, we can go ahead if we want as
15 a Council and submit something to the Board and request
16 them to do this or we can do it to individual land
17 management agencies or we can just continue to express
18 our concern in the annual report and hope that that
19 concern is expressed often enough that somebody does
20 something about it.

21
22 MR. HOLBROOK: Mr. Chair, there's
23 probably some way we can do this in the Forest Service,
24 but I would express some concern that most of this
25 fishing that's occurring is outside of our control. It's
26 either saltwater oriented or it's charter companies, air
27 charter companies doing drop-offs, which we don't control
28 and we have no way to do that. I know from 25 years of
29 observation in Prince William Sound that that's where the
30 fish have gone in most of those isolated system is
31 through the air charter companies.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But the fact that we
34 don't do it doesn't mean that we can't do it. Back in
35 '84 when I first started chartering, I took deer hunters
36 out and I dropped them on Forest Service land for them to
37 go deer hunting. At that time, you didn't need any kind
38 of license. Then we had to get a transporter license.
39 Now, if you get a transporter's license and you take deer
40 hunters out there, which I don't do anymore, but if you
41 take them out there, you, as a transporter, have to keep
42 track of how many deer you transport. It was one way to
43 get a handle on what kind of effect transporters had on
44 the take of deer in Prince William Sound.

45
46 Now, the fact that we currently don't
47 require air charter operators operating in Federal waters
48 or Federal land to keep track of what they haul is true,
49 but that doesn't mean if we wanted the information we
50 couldn't put something in place to do that.

00256

1 MR. HOLBROOK: Mr. Chair. We have been
2 aware for years and this issue has come to our attention.
3 I know George Koval and many others have continually
4 brought this to our attention that some of the charters
5 are bringing in -- you know, you've got an Otter working
6 around the area, going to Marten, dropping 22 people at a
7 time and it's severely impacting the fishery, but we have
8 been unable, even with our attempts, to get this under

9 control.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I realize that. And
12 that's one of the things that I've thought about and one
13 of the reasons that I brought it up. The impact on some
14 of our cutthroat streams in Prince William Sound has been
15 devastating. You can't drop the same people off at the
16 same cutthroat stream day after day and expect there to
17 be any fish left there. You can't take people to a
18 lagoon like Shelter Bay and take plane load after plane
19 load and helicopter load after helicopter load and fly
20 them all out with fish and then wonder when you've got
21 four fish for escapement at the end of the season why
22 four years later you don't have any silvers.

23

24 If a handle was being kept on what was
25 being taken, this kind of line would show and maybe we
26 could stop it in time before it gets to the point where
27 it's a disaster, and that's what I'm calling for. If
28 there's a possibility that it can be done, the sooner we
29 start collecting that kind of data, the better baseline
30 we get to see the changes that take place. I thank you.
31 You have answered my question because basically there is
32 nothing in place anyplace to collect that baseline.

33

34 MR. HOLBROOK: Mr. Chairman, that's
35 correct. I don't believe that's available or being done
36 on any of the Federal lands at this point.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Yes.

39

40 MR. HALL: I have a presentation. We are
41 collecting some of that data.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, you are? Good.
44 Then, with the rest of the Council's permission, I would
45 also like to request that we include that same issue on
46 our annual report that it's still a concern. Ann.

47

48 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman, do you want
49 it expressed simply as a continuing concern or are you
50 going to ask them for some sort of action?

00257

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think we should ask
2 them for some sort of action. I don't know what specific
3 action to ask them for, but I think we should ask them to
4 consider it and evaluate it. Mr. Churchill.

5

6 MR. CHURCHILL: And maybe as just an
7 example, I do know there's a pretty fair monitoring
8 program going in the Marten River and a number of other
9 systems. As an indicator to support your concern, I've
10 seen some numbers on hooking mortality with bait on
11 cutthroat and it's close to 50 percent. If you take
12 cutthroat with bait, 50 percent of those fish are going
13 to die whether you boink them on the head or not, so it's
14 pretty huge.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do you want to share
17 something with us right now?

18

19 MR. HALL: Mr. Chairman, my name is Jim
20 Hall. I'm the Deputy Refuge Manager at the Kenai
21 National Wildlife Refuge, which is kind of different from
22 most other Federal land in Alaska. We've been a refuge
23 since 1941. The boundaries were changed and modified
24 through ANILCA. The question that was asked was
25 procedure for changing the processes for permitting
26 guides and recordkeeping processes. The Kenai has a 60-
27 year history of permitting guides on the refuge, but it's
28 really complicated on the Kenai River because of multiple
29 ownership. I wanted the Board to understand the issues
30 involved with the Kenai River and to understand the
31 history a little bit and to acknowledge the complications
32 and then come to a conclusion.

33
34 The Kenai River. To show you where
35 Federal ownership is of the Kenai River, this is our
36 eastern boundary with the Chugach National Forest. The
37 Kenai River flows into Skilak Lake and then out of Skilak
38 Lake and out of Federal ownership into private State and
39 Borough ownership and then flows down and then comes back
40 to Federal ownership at Moose Range Meadows and then back
41 out of Federal ownership out to Cook Inlet at Kenai.
42 This is about Mile 25.1 to Mile 28.1, so it's only a
43 three mile section right here, and then the river comes
44 back into Federal ownership at Mile 45.5. The Kasilof
45 River doesn't come into Federal ownership until Hong Kong
46 bend, just north of Tustamena Lake. Everything south of
47 that is State jurisdiction.

48
49 The river guides using refuge.
50 Currently, we regulate guides through three different
00258
1 processes and three different areas. The guides using
2 the upper river, guides using the upper middle river and
3 then guides using the lower river and operating under the
4 Kenai River special management area permit, which is
5 issued by the Kenai River Center. This is a short clip
6 showing the Russian River Ferry, which the Russian River
7 area is probably the most popular public fishing area in
8 the state of Alaska. The ferry last year transported
9 33,000 people across the river to the confluence of the
10 Russian River.

11
12 The upper Kenai River, for all purposes,
13 includes from the confluence of the Russian River
14 downstream to Skilak Lake and the Russian River is
15 probably the most popular fishing area in Alaska.
16 Approximately 50,000 anglers are believed to use this
17 area every year for fishing from not only Anchorage but
18 all over the world.

19
20 Management of the upper Kenai River is
21 done through a series of things, including our
22 comprehensive conservation plan, compatibility
23 determinations, area specific management determinations.
24 In the upper river case, environmental assessment.
25 Influence of the cooperative State regulations because
26 the KRSMA overlays the refuge waters as well. Then Title
27 50, Code of Federal Regulations, which spells out how the
28 competitive guide process is done on national wildlife

29 refuges.

30

31 The current status of the upper Kenai
32 River guides is, in 2001, we limited the number guides to
33 20 fishing guides and 21 touring permits or sightseeing,
34 raft trips, et cetera, and they were awarded through a
35 competitive process, which is a five-year permit. Every
36 five years it's another competitive process. I've given
37 each of you an application for both the upper river
38 guides and the upper middle river guides, which is two
39 separate processes.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: When you say
42 competitive, is that financially competitive?

43

44 MR. HALL: No, it's not. The packet I
45 gave you lists the criteria for the competitive process.
46 It's length of guide service, any violations, things of
47 that nature, lack of turning in information on a timely
48 basis. Fishing and touring guides are limited to 10
49 starts per week and no more than two starts per day on
50 the upper river.

00259

1 Skilak Lake and the upper middle river is
2 regulated through a different process because it's a
3 different type of user. The upper river guides are
4 primarily after silvers and rainbows and Dolly Varden.
5 The upper middle river are after sockeye, king salmon,
6 cohos, et cetera, so it's a different type of user than
7 we get on the upper river. This is that area from Skilak
8 Lake Campground, downstream to river milepost 45.5, where
9 the river flows out of Federal jurisdiction back into
10 State jurisdiction. Last year, a total of 136 refuge
11 permits were issued for both sportfishing and other
12 consumptive activities. This includes air taxi operators
13 that fly people in to remote lakes on the refuge, river
14 guides and guides using the upper Kasilof River section
15 of the refuge, so this 136 isn't just for the Kenai
16 River.

17

18 Almost all of the permit holders for this
19 section of the river also possess a KRSMA permit because
20 there's nowhere for them to take out when they hit the
21 refuge boundary, so they're going into KRSMA
22 jurisdiction.

23

24 The management of the upper middle Kenai
25 River is done through conservation plans, compatibility
26 determinations, area specific management determinations
27 and the influence of the cooperative State regulations
28 and the predominance of the middle river is State
29 regulated, everything below river post 45.5. These are
30 the permit stickers that we give the different guides on
31 the refuge, which they put on their boat and identifies
32 them for having a permit for that calendar year.

33

34 The lower river, there's only a three-
35 mile section of river in Federal jurisdiction, which is
36 at the Moose Range Meadows, which was a conveyance to the
37 Salamatof Native Corporation and it was developed into a
38 residential neighborhood, but the service retained two

39 public use easements in the negotiations for the
40 development of this area, which is where the public can
41 access the river from. This is the first Federal land
42 available for subsistence purposes moving upstream on the
43 Kenai River and it's from milepost 25.1 to 28.1.
44

45 In the Moose Range Meadow section in the
46 lower river, the refuge honors the KRSMA permits since
47 only a small section of the refuge is involved. Last
48 year there were 374 permits issued by KRSMA. The average
49 KRSMA holding guide has very little to no percentage of
50 use on the Federal lands in the waters in the lower
00260

1 river. The management of the lower river is done through
2 the same processes as before and the predominance of the
3 lower river is again State regulated.

4

5 KRSMA guide statistics from '82 through
6 2001 were very interesting and I thought the Board would
7 like to see some of these. In 1982, there were 217
8 guides using the Kenai River for both fishing and non-
9 fishing activities. In 1992, that number had risen to
10 275 and in 2001 there were 374 permits issued by KRSMA
11 and the breakdown of these permits represents
12 approximately 90 percent fishing and 10 percent non-
13 fishing or tour-type boats.

14

15 So, to conclude all this, the refuge
16 permits are valid for both sections of the Kenai and
17 upper Kasilof River, depending on the applicant. The
18 average KRSMA permit holding guide has little to no
19 percentage of use in Federal lands and waters and
20 management of the permits is influenced by cooperative
21 State management with KRSMA.

22

23 How to change the process, which was the
24 original question, is a very complicated question when it
25 involves the Kenai River. Under our permitting process,
26 we require the guides to not only keep up with the number
27 of clients that they serve and other information as well
28 and that's all included in the packets that I gave you.
29 This is just a little video clip of the Russian River.
30 And I hope that answers some of the Board's questions
31 that they had.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So the information as to
34 recordkeeping on fish is in the permit application.

35

36 MR. HALL: We don't collect information
37 on the number of fish because of the designation of the
38 KRSMA over the entire Kenai watershed, the State process
39 -- and I had to fill one out last year. They ask you did
40 you have a guide, how many fish did you catch using a
41 guide, how many fish did you catch total, where did you
42 catch these fish. It's a pretty involved process. So
43 rather than duplicate the State's effort on that, we just
44 allow them to collect that information for us.

45

46 MS. WELLS: Before you leave that picture,
47 if you look at the bank of the river there and the other
48 one was even more descriptive of what's happening, not in

49 just that three-mile area, but the banks of the river
50 have been tremendously impacted by this particular
00261

1 fishery.

2

3 MR. HALL: We just finished in this
4 section of the river that you're looking at last year
5 some extensive stream bank stabilization. Also there at
6 the ferry. All of that was stabilized this past year.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any
9 questions? Thank you much. Thanks for the presentation.
10 Okay. I think we said if the rest of the Council
11 concurred that we would continue to have this on our
12 annual report as a concern, the need to collect baseline
13 information. Any other further comments from the
14 audience on this subject?

15

16 The comment that Mark made before, just
17 in case it wasn't carried through was that the logbook is
18 already required for saltwater guides, so there is a
19 recordkeeping for the guides that are operating in Prince
20 William Sound on saltwater. It's on our freshwater
21 system that we don't have anything. Susan.

22

23 MS. WELLS: The National Wildlife Refuge
24 has an example so that any other agency wouldn't have to
25 reinvent the wheel. So, as we put this in our report,
26 I'm hoping that we're asking for an implementation of
27 baseline data monitoring. I'm assuming that there would
28 be a permitting process for any user of Federal lands.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: There is no permitting
31 process for an individual on Federal lands.

32

33 MS. WELLS: So commercially then.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, it's commercial
36 enterprises. I mean you can go on Federal land and go
37 hunting or fishing and you don't have to file for a
38 permit to go do it, but if you are operating a business
39 on it.....

40

41 MS. WELLS: You must.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:you must. I'm
44 almost positive you must on all of them, but I'm not
45 perfectly positive on that. I think your way of putting
46 it, an implementation of a program to collect that
47 baseline data as part of the permitting process is a good
48 way to put it. I mean here is an opportunity for very
49 little additional cost to get some data that is not going
50 to be available 10 years down the road.

00262

1 With that, let's go on with our agency
2 reports if nobody has anything further to say on this
3 one. The first agency is the Office of Subsistence
4 Management, Cook Inlet subsistence fisheries update.

5

6 MS. PETRIVELLI: Mr. Chairman, my name is
7 Pat Petrivelli and I'm the anthropologist for the

8 Southcentral team. I think you all have the handout that
9 describes the Cook Inlet fisheries scoping project. I'm
10 going to talk about two parts, just the study and then
11 just the current season.

12
13 The study was part of an 809 agreement
14 that we had with the State and with that agreement it was
15 just unofficially put into place last Friday. Well, we
16 finished our process kind of unofficially, just to get
17 all the steps in place to fund the study. But we are
18 undertaking the study with the State Division of
19 Subsistence and it's a two-part phase where we go through
20 doing the investigation plan and then through this spring
21 and some initial studies on defining the scope of exactly
22 how we'll go about gathering this information because
23 it's so complicated with the C&T not being made yet and
24 looking at the use and with the uses restricted for the
25 last 60 years. But then we hope to undertake intensive
26 surveys next fall and then the steps would fall into
27 place. But I'll be meeting with Jim Paul the end of this
28 month and we'll have more concrete dates. And then the
29 next part -- because our subsistence fishing regulations
30 became effective March 1st. I can let Gary talk about
31 that.

32
33 MR. SONNEVIL: Mr. Chair, my name is Gary
34 Sonnevill. I'm the project leader of the Kenai Fishery
35 Resource Office and also the designated in-season federal
36 fisheries subsistence manager for Cook Inlet. Just to
37 let you know, the season began on March 1 -- at least
38 that's the starting date. We have in place permits right
39 now for any qualified rural residents that might want to
40 acquire those. We're setting up the process by which
41 they can acquire them at my office, the Kenai Refuge,
42 Alaska Maritime Refuge out of Homer and the Forrest
43 Service offices that are in the Cook Inlet area. We're
44 preparing an information sheet. We've had some initial
45 meetings with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and
46 we'll be preparing a news release. So that's where we're
47 at right now and we're prepared and set up to initiate
48 this first subsistence fishery.

49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, just as a comment
00263

1 on that one there, Susan, in regard to your writing
2 subsistence on your sport fishing license, this would be
3 the permit that you would get for use on Federal land.
4 Because you still have to use sport fishing methods and
5 means for this year, right?

6
7 MR. SONNEVIL: That's correct. And I
8 failed to bring a copy of our permit but on the back of
9 the permit we do have columns for the individuals to
10 record every fish that they harvest by species, so.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Susan.

13
14 MS. WELLS: My discussion earlier, off
15 record, happened to be with regards to the State
16 permitting of -- getting a license. And as a personal
17 use fish/game eater/consumer, I resent having to buy a

18 sport fishing license. And so my idea was or my thought
19 is to -- on the State license, actually having a place
20 where I can chose to distinguish who I am. If I am a
21 sport fisherman and that's why I'm getting my license to
22 take fish and game, I can chose to distinguish sport use.
23 If I am a personal use person, the fish or game that I
24 take from the resource is going to go home and be eaten.
25 I can chose to use personal use to distinguish that on
26 that license. Because as a user, I am often counted in
27 the numbers that give the sport users the numbers for the
28 allocation. And so I understand this is a different
29 permit and -- it's a different use permit that what I'm
30 talking about -- earlier.

31

32 MR. SONNEVIL: Yes, this is a Federal
33 subsistence permit. It's available for all qualified
34 rural residents in Alaska to participate in this Federal
35 subsistence fishery in Cook Inlet.

36

37 MS. WELLS: I just wanted that -- what I
38 was talking about as far as the licensing and the
39 classification, I guess, as --me as a user. And that has
40 to do with the State fishery?

41

42 MR. SONNEVIL: Yes, that's correct. Just
43 as you probably know, I too am a personal use fisher on
44 the Kenai.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fred.

47

48 MR. ELVSAAS: Thank you. As I
49 understand, you just said you could do the subsistence
50 fishery under the State guidelines? State bag limits and
00264

1 methods and means?

2

3 MR. SONNEVIL: Yes, it's the sport -- the
4 Federal Subsistence Board adopted the sport fishing
5 regulations.

6

7 MR. ELVSAAS: But what happens with the
8 traditional fishing then? The people that use nets and
9 so forth?

10

11 MR. SONNEVIL: Well, at this point, nets
12 aren't allowed in fresh water so it's strictly following
13 the seasons, the gear type.....

14

15 MR. ELVSAAS: Oh, this is just fresh
16 water?

17

18 MR. SONNEVIL: This is just fresh water.

19

20 MR. ELVSAAS: Oh, I'm sorry.

21

22 MR. SONNEVIL: That's all right.

23

24 MR. ELVSAAS: I thought you said Federal
25 waters.

26

27 MR. SONNEVIL: Well, what we're saying is

28 Federal fresh waters at this point.

29

30 MR. ELVSAAS: Okay. Okay, thank you.

31 Because there's a lot of Federal water in Cook Inlet.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay, any questions?

34 Thank you. Federal/State coordination.

35

36 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair, I promise to

37 make this quick and bring you up to speed on the

38 Federal/State coordination. You'll find a couple

39 briefing papers under Tab H, page one. And following

40 that there's a briefing on the regulatory coordination.

41 Mainly for some of our new Council members, I'd just like

42 to make some bullets on this Federal/State coordination

43 to help you understand the process that the Federal

44 agencies, along with the State of Alaska, are going

45 through in managing, or co-managing if you will, our

46 fishery resources. Our subsistence fishery resources.

47 The interim Federal/State memorandum of agreement -- and

48 you'll hear this term a lot -- the MOA, was agreed to at

49 April of 2000 by the Commissioner of Fish and Game, the

50 Chair of the Alaska Board of Fisheries, Chair of the

00265

1 Alaska Board of Game and the regional directors from the

2 five Federal agencies and Mr. Mitch Demientieff, our

3 chair for our Federal subsistence board.

4

5 The purpose of the MOA is to establish

6 guidelines for coordination between the Federal agencies

7 and ADF&G in managing subsistence use of fish and

8 wildlife resources on Federal public lands in Alaska. An

9 MOA working group consisting of representatives on the

10 Federal side and ADF&G have been assigned the task to

11 develop protocols which describe how the agencies will

12 work together to accomplish their common goals. I serve

13 as one of the co-chairs on the Federal side and Marianne

14 See, who's in the audience here, serves for the

15 Department of Fish and Game as the other co-chair.

16 Currently we are in the process of working on six

17 protocols. And developing these protocols are fairly

18 tedious and time consuming and I'll admit that there are

19 other protocols that will need to be developed but these

20 are the six that we're currently working on. And I'll

21 give you status reports on those.

22

23 The subsistence management information

24 sharing protocol, which essentially describes how Federal

25 agencies in the state of Alaska will exchange and share

26 data. That final draft has been completed and it will be

27 going forward for signatories by the MOA signatories.

28 The Yukon River drainage subsistence fishery management

29 plan which describes how we will manage and work together

30 in-season for the Yukon River, that also has been

31 completed and it's ready for signatories. If Council

32 members would like copies of the Yukon, I would encourage

33 you to take a look at that because I feel that that

34 possibly will be used as a template in the future for

35 developing protocols for other rivers as we move along.

36

37 The regulatory coordination protocol,

38 which is one that will directly effect regional councils,
39 is a fairly time consuming process. We are working on
40 the protocol. We have two regional council members that
41 serve on this protocol developing committee. That's Bill
42 Thomas from Southeast and John Hansen from, I believe
43 it's Emmonak on the Yukon. And we anticipate, barring no
44 problems, to have this completed in late 2003. Three
45 other protocols that we're working on that have scheduled
46 later dates are fisheries regulatory management planning
47 -- in other words, how do we as agencies in the state
48 work together in either developing new fishery management
49 plans or changing some of the existing management plans.
50
00266

1 Statewide in-season subsistence fisheries
2 management is a protocol that was probably looking at how
3 we will manage fisheries statewide. It may be similar to
4 what you see in the Yukon. And then subsistence use
5 amounts, in other words, how do we describe and define
6 the amounts subsistence users need. Mr. Chair and
7 Council members are an important part of the development
8 of protocols. As I stated, we do have Council members
9 that sit and assist in developing these protocols however
10 we encourage more involvement and it's strictly
11 volunteer. If any of you would like to see any of these
12 protocols or future protocols that you'd like to be
13 involved -- either contact myself or Ann and she will
14 direct you to the proper person to talk to. And Mr.
15 Chair, that concludes my presentation.
16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Pete?
18 Thank you. That's about as brief as I've ever heard you.
19 No, Pete that's -- okay, statewide rural determination
20 methodology.
21

22 MS. MCCLENAHAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
23 I'm Pat McClenahan, Office of Subsistence Management.
24 The leadership team has asked me to come here today and
25 provide you with an informal report on the statewide
26 rural determination methodology contract. This at Tab H,
27 pages five and six. A method for determining whether a
28 community is rural or non-rural was developed at that
29 beginning of the Federal subsistence management program
30 and was used to make the initial rural and non-rural
31 determinations in 1991. Some concerns about the Board
32 approved method were expressed at the beginning and have
33 been raised after that. The latest was the
34 reconsideration in 2001 of the 2000 Kenai Peninsula rural
35 determination. All rural and non-rural determinations
36 are to be reviewed by the Board every 10 years.
37

38 The next 10 year statewide review is
39 approaching. The Board wanted to evaluate the concerns
40 raised about the methods currently being used. For that
41 reason the Board directed the Office of Subsistence
42 Management to contract an independent third party to do
43 an evaluation. In September 2001 the Office of
44 Subsistence Management awarded a competitively bid
45 contract to the University of Alaska Anchorage, the
46 Institute of Social and Economic Research, which we refer
47 to as ISER. The contract is scheduled to be completed in

48 June 2002. ISER will provide a method of determining
49 rural and non-rural status for Alaska communities to the
50 Federal Subsistence Board. The contract is going forward
00267

1 as planned. The first report, a comprehensive letter to
2 review, has been completed and two focus group meetings
3 were held in January. We anticipate a public review of
4 two methods for rural/non-rural determination that ISER
5 is developing. The review is planned during the
6 regularly scheduled fall 2002 Subsistence Regional
7 Advisory Council meetings.

8
9 Two Council representatives, Dan O'Hara
10 and Gerald Nicholai, will participate in the Board
11 deliberations then the Board reviews and makes a decision
12 about any revisions of the rural determination methods.
13 A Board decision is expected in late 2002. Once the
14 Board has decided on a rural/non-rural determinations
15 method, this method, the 2000 census data and other data
16 will be used for a new statewide rural/non-rural
17 determination, which is expected in 2003. Mr. Chairman,
18 that concludes my report.

19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. So things
21 are proceeding according to schedule then?

22
23 MS. MCCLLENAHAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions?

26
27 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, if you could -- are
28 most of the folks that are working with ISER here in
29 Alaska or is that being done outside? Do you know?

30
31 MS. MCCLLENAHAN: Mr. Chairman, Mr.
32 Churchill. As far as I know, everyone is here within
33 Alaska. I have not been part of the committee or the
34 meetings. Ann Wilkinson, I think, has been to a briefing
35 and so she can chirp up if she disagrees with me. But I
36 believe that they're all residents of Alaska.

37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

39
40 MR. CHURCHILL: Is this primarily an
41 economic based model or can you speak to that?

42
43 MS. MCCLLENAHAN: I can't speak to that
44 because I'm not privy to the contract or the methodology
45 but maybe Ann can speak to that.

46
47 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Can you Ann? Or if you
50 can't, that's fine too.

00268
1 MS. WILKINSON: I can get for you some of
2 the reports and documents, if you would like to read
3 them, that they have put out so far. They're very
4 sketchy, not finalized, but they are public information.
5 So if you would like to see those, I could get it for
6 you.

7

8 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, I would. And just
9 a point of clarification, is this effort that Vic Fischer
10 is heading up?

11

12 MS. PETROVELLI: Robert Wolf and Vic
13 Fischer are the project leaders for the contract. And
14 our former methodology had five various characteristics
15 and the new methodology is supposed to be different. So
16 I mean, so community characteristics that include a mix
17 of hunt, subsistence harvesting, economic infrastructure
18 and others. And so it will -- they're developing
19 something that would look at various characteristics of
20 rural/non-rural.

21

22 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you very much, Pat.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And if you need the
25 information you can get it. Any other questions from
26 anybody else? Okay, let's go -- let's take a break.
27 Five minutes.

28

29 (Off record)

30

31 (On record)

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We'll call this
34 meeting back in session. At this point in time we're
35 going to the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program.
36 Doug. Doug told me he can't quite be the (indiscernible
37 - microphone off)

38

39 MR. MCBRIDE: I can always try, Mr.
40 Chairman, but I don't think I can accomplish it. Mr.
41 Chairman, members of the Council, my name is Doug
42 McBride. I'm with the Office of Subsistence Management
43 and Fishery Information Services, a section of that shop.
44 And I'll be covering all four items under Section D, 14D.
45 And to do that, I put several handouts in front of you
46 earlier today and there are three things. There's a
47 single white page that's called the Partners Fisheries
48 Monitoring Program. Then there's a small green pamphlet
49 called the Winter Performance Report to the Southcentral
50 Regional Advisory Council. And then I have the only
00269

1 white copy but there's also a -- what you have is a blue
2 report that's called the Fisheries Resource Monitoring
3 Program 2004 Strategic Planning. And all three of these
4 documents are also on the back table.

5

6 Mr. Chairman, all of these -- all four
7 items here are pieces of the Fishery Resource Monitoring
8 Program and I think the best way to go through this is to
9 first of all give a very, very brief overview of the
10 Fishery Resource Monitoring Program and then go into all
11 the component pieces of it. So to get the overview, I'm
12 going to refer you to your green document. And if you
13 will open it to the second page, page two, what you'll
14 find is a bar graph that looks like this. And I also
15 want to say, Mr. Chairman, before I start, everything I'm
16 giving you right now is advisory only. There's no action

17 required by the Council right now but there will be
18 action at the upcoming meeting in the fall and we thought
19 it would be useful to go through some of this right now.
20

21 This bar graph on page two basically
22 follows the money of the Fishery Resource Monitoring
23 Program. And we've been through this before but I'll
24 just briefly restate it. The Fishery Resource Monitoring
25 Program is the assessment side, if you will, of the
26 Federal Subsistence Program. It's the money that the
27 Federal government invests to collect information
28 necessary for Federal subsistence fisheries management.
29 And to do that, the Federal government invests
30 approximately seven million dollars annually and funds
31 studies to do things like monitor fish stocks, to monitor
32 subsistence fisheries and to collect traditional,
33 ecological knowledge -- are the three major categories of
34 information. So what this bar graph is, is a brief
35 summary of how the money has been spent and is projected
36 to be spent through the year 2004. So what you've got
37 are the years on the horizontal axis, starting with the
38 year 2000 and then on the vertical axis -- and that's
39 mislabeled -- those are actually hundreds of thousands of
40 dollars. So each figure on there, the thousand is
41 actually a million dollars, two million, three million up
42 to about 10 million at the top of the graph.

43 And so what has happened in the Fishery
44 Resource Monitoring Program, it started in year 2000 with
45 a relatively small investment of a little over two
46 million dollars -- and again, this is on a statewide
47 basis, this is not just Southcentral -- but those black
48 bars are the first installment of the Fishery Resource
49 Monitoring Program. If you'll remember, we fund projects
50 up to three years in duration, so that's why you'll see
00270

1 each individual color coding on this bar will go out to
2 three years. So in the first year, we spent
3 approximately a little over two million dollars and then
4 those black bars follow the subsequent years of those
5 projects. So in this year, this year we're in right now,
6 2002, is the final year of any projects that were started
7 in the year 2000. Okay, then a little over a year ago,
8 in February of last year, we had that large meeting where
9 all the regional councils came into Anchorage and we
10 talked completely about the Fishery Resource Monitoring
11 Program. And so if you go to the year 2001, the largest
12 bar on there, that gray bar there, that was the little
13 over seven million dollars that initiated the 2001
14 program. We went through those proposals last year and
15 so those projects were actually started in 2001 this last
16 year. And then you can see that gray bar track it out.
17 So in 2002 we'll be in the second year of that program
18 and then in 2003 we'll be in the third and final year of
19 that investment.

20
21 And those are probably some of the -- are
22 definitely the more well known projects I think you're
23 familiar with. For instance the Chinook abundance
24 estimate that's being run by the Native village of Eyak.
25 That's one of those projects. There's a low river test
26 program on the Copper River. There's several harvest

27 monitoring TEK projects. There's some steelhead
28 projects. And I'll get into those in a minute but those
29 are the programs that we did a year ago. So that's all
30 ongoing stuff. The final piece of the ongoing programs,
31 just at the last Federal Board meeting in December, they
32 made the funding decision for new program starts in 2002.
33 So if you go to the 2002 and you go to the third bar out,
34 that light gray bar, that's a fairly small bar, statewide
35 we have a little over two million dollars. And those
36 were programs that were -- that will start this coming
37 year. And again, those track out over three years.

38
39 I think the other part right now in the
40 overview that bears mentioning -- if you go to the year
41 2002 and you go to the very top part, there's a striped
42 bar that represents about a million dollars. That's the
43 Partners for Fisheries Program and that's one of the
44 segments I'm going to talk about here. That's a program
45 where we're going to fund up to 10 positions statewide.
46 Those are a combination of fishery biologists and social
47 scientists. Those are not going to be government
48 employees. Those are positions that we put out in the
49 rural organizations around the state that will represent
50 broad geographic regions of the state that will be used

00271
1 to basically help implement this program. And so, Mr.
2 Chairman, right now what I'm -- I'm going to stop at
3 various points in my presentation. That's a brief
4 overview of where we've been so far on the Fishery
5 Resource Monitoring Program. I'll stop and ask if
6 there's any questions about the overview and then I'm
7 going to get into all the component pieces.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Questions? I think you
10 did a good job on the that part.

11
12 MR. MCBRIDE: Okay, thank you. Okay, the
13 first piece I'm going to talk about is the Partners for
14 Fisheries Program. So that's this one page summary that
15 I handed you. And unfortunately I don't have a lot of
16 new and startling information to tell you about this.
17 Again, this is a program that's going to hire up to 10
18 positions around the state. A combination of fisheries
19 biologists and social scientists. There has been a
20 pretty intense selection process that has gone on. We
21 put out a call for proposals for these positions; we
22 received them. There's been a committee within the
23 Office of Subsistence Management but also with
24 representatives from other Federal agencies. They've
25 gone through a selection process and they're basically
26 going to announce -- what they've said is about mid-
27 March. So basically in the next two weeks the
28 announcement will go out to those proposers or applicants
29 that were successful. And the intent of that program is
30 to have positions -- certainly to make that announcement
31 in the next two weeks and hopefully have those positions
32 on by the beginning of the summer. Now that's going to
33 be a pretty aggressive schedule and a lot of that will
34 depend on how the hiring goes once the cooperative
35 agreements are actually drawn up and implemented. But
36 that's the intent of the program. So, Mr. Chairman,

37 that's the summary that I have for you on the Partners
38 for Fisheries Program. Are there any questions about
39 that?

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Questions? No
42 questions. We have a real quiet bunch right now.

43

44 MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. That's great. Okay,
45 the next piece that I'm going to talk about, going back
46 to the agenda, is the status of the 2000 and the 2001
47 programs. And that information is contained in this
48 green document with the graph that we've been looking at.
49 So on page two what you've got is the bar chart that
50 shows the money statewide. If you go to the facing page,
00272

1 page three, that's a table of all the programs that have
2 implemented so far in the Cook Inlet Gulf of Alaska
3 region. So it's the region that this Council covers.
4 And what I tried to do in this table, there's a lot of
5 information there, but what I tried to do was to group
6 the projects by the subject matter. So if you look at
7 that table, the first heading that you see under project
8 title is Copper River salmon. And clearly the major
9 emphasis of the Fishery Resource Monitoring Program in
10 this area so far has been on Copper River salmon. And
11 you'll see a whole bunch of projects there that have been
12 implemented. If you go to the next column you'll see the
13 investigators so you can see who's actually running those
14 projects. And then the far right is the financial
15 information. So you can see by year how much money is
16 being spent on those programs. So we've got a major
17 emphasis on Copper River salmon.

18

19 The next grouping of projects is again
20 about the Copper River, it's just not about salmon. It's
21 Copper River steelhead and non-salmon projects. So we've
22 got two projects about steelhead. We also have a couple
23 of non-salmon, primarily mapping projects that are going
24 on. There are a couple of projects that are taking place
25 in Prince William Sound -- that's the next category down.
26 And then finally, there have been a couple of projects
27 implemented in Cook Inlet. By next year the program that
28 Pat Petrivelli talked to you about, the harvest use study
29 for Cook Inlet, that will be pulled into the Fishery
30 Resource Monitoring Program. So in FY-03 you'll start
31 seeing that and then we'll be summarizing the results of
32 that program once it comes on-line and takes form.

33

34 As far as the status of these programs,
35 again, this green document is a very brief summary of
36 what's going on in those projects. There's really not a
37 lot of new information from when I reported to you on
38 this -- at your fall meeting. I think in general the
39 program is going fairly well. Most of the programs are
40 being implemented as we originally planned them and
41 discussed them. Some are not but that's to be expected.
42 I think some of the highlights of the program so far,
43 again, most of our program is taking place in the Copper
44 River. We've been very pleased with the progress that's
45 been made on some of the -- really on most of the
46 projects. We've got a weir going in Tanada Creek, which

47 is in the upper part of the Copper River, estimating the
48 number of salmon going into that system. We've got some
49 very large projects estimating Chinook abundance in the
50 Cooper River. Also developing a low river test fish
00273

1 program in the Copper River, primarily using sonar.
2 There are some harvest monitoring and TEK projects that
3 are going on. One of them was discussed today, that was
4 Project 40, the Copper River subsistence salmon fishery
5 evaluation. That was conducted -- the principle
6 investigator for that was Bill Simeone, with the Alaska
7 Department of Fish and Game, Subsistence Division. He
8 gave you a presentation on that at your fall meeting. In
9 fact, they've submitted a report for that project that's
10 currently under review.

11
12 As you move down into the Copper River
13 steelhead and non-salmon, the steelhead projects are
14 going very well and pretty much as planned. There's a
15 stock status project looking at the spawning populations
16 in the Gulkana and Hanageda (ph) Rivers. There's also a
17 harvest monitoring program that's being conducted by
18 Copper River Native Association, doing some very specific
19 and detailed harvest monitoring in the fishwheel fishery
20 looking for steelhead in that fishery. There are a
21 couple of mapping projects that are being conducted in
22 the Copper River. Those are two of the ones that are not
23 really going as planned. They're a little more difficult
24 than what we originally thought and we're working with
25 the investigators and I expect that they will be
26 successfully completed. But those two have not gone
27 exactly according to plan.

28
29 For this upcoming year in the Copper
30 River, there's going to be several projects that are
31 going to be started this year. Probably the biggest one
32 is a radio tagging add-on to that Copper River Chinook
33 program. And we think that's going to add a lot of value
34 to that program. There's also a eulachon or a hooligan
35 program that's going to be started in the Copper River.
36 And also another mapping project, that's that increasing
37 GIS capabilities in the upper Copper River and that's
38 another Copper River Native Association project that
39 they're the primary investigator on.

40
41 The programs in Prince William Sound are
42 pretty much coming to conclusion and the Cook Inlet
43 programs have come to conclusion. And again, all those
44 seem to be successfully going as planned. So Mr.
45 Chairman, again, I'm going to stop -- I'm trying to be as
46 Probasco brief as I can here. But that's again a very
47 brief thumbnail sketch of where we are with the projects
48 that we've implemented today. And I'll pause and ask for
49 any questions.

50
00274

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Did you say that one of
2 the projects didn't get implemented that we okayed? Did
3 I understand that correctly or did I understand that
4 wrong?

5

6 MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, all the
7 programs that have been approved so far either have or
8 will be implemented. There's really only one project
9 that was completely not implemented but it's actually
10 starting about now. That's Project 01-217, that's a
11 harvest monitoring TEK project. It's called a workshop
12 to build capacity among Copper River groups. That's a
13 Copper River Native Association program. They're going
14 to be holding a series of workshops throughout the Copper
15 River. And that one was designed to start right about
16 this time of year. And if you'll remember back a year
17 ago -- the fellow board actually makes the final -- you
18 know, they are the final approving body of this program.
19 And the meeting where they did that was on February 28th.
20 And this program is designed to have workshop starting in
21 early March and there was simply no way we were going to
22 get the money turned around that fast. At any rate, what
23 we did with them is we said, look, do that in 2002
24 instead of 2001. So that program will be implemented
25 this year.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: This year. Okay, any
28 questions for Doug on the programs? Thank you on that,
29 Doug.

30
31 MR. MCBRIDE: Okay, the next piece of
32 this that I'm going to talk about -- if you go back to
33 this bar chart, we've got a call for proposals that is
34 out and we've received proposals now for program starts
35 in 2003. So if you look under the year -- or look at the
36 2003 year -- and it's the very top bar, sort of the cross
37 hatch bar. You'll see a small area, it's about a little
38 over a million dollars. We're going to do some new
39 program starts for 2003. We had a call for proposals
40 that went out in November. The deadline for that was
41 February 15th. We've received about 56 proposals
42 statewide. About three and a half million dollars worth
43 of proposals statewide. Those proposals will be reviewed
44 by the FIS staff and OSM and then further review by the
45 inter-agency technical review committee. And portion of
46 those proposals will be forwarded for development of an
47 investigation plan. So what we have are really brief,
48 two page proposals and what we're going to ask for is a
49 complete investigation plan or an operational plan. You
50 know, how the program is really going to work and what
00275

1 it's really going to cost and all the details of it.

2
3 Those investigation plans will be due
4 back to our office about midsummer. Those will get
5 review, again go back to the TRC and we will come back to
6 you at your fall meeting with a draft Fishery Resource
7 Monitoring Program for 2003. So when we meet again for
8 the fall, one of your action items will be to make
9 recommendations on our recommendations for programs to
10 fund in 2003. But remember, just looking at this, it's a
11 pretty amount of money. Statewide it's going to be about
12 one and a half million dollars. In Southcentral that's
13 going to translate into, I don't know, 300,000 something
14 -- on that order. So it's a pretty modest amount of
15 money compared to what we've been dealing with. So again

16 I'll pause and ask if there are any questions on that.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions? Keep
19 going.

20

21 MR. MCBRIDE: Okay. The final piece is
22 really looking into the future. And again, if you'll go
23 back to this bar chart and you go out to the very last
24 bar in 2004, what you'll see is a fairly large area here
25 and it's got 4.9 million dollars written in it. And the
26 way this program has been designed, most of the project
27 commitments, most of the funding commitments for the
28 ongoing program that we've been talking about for the
29 last 10 minutes, will be done in 2004. Now there will be
30 a couple of small pieces that have been committed. The
31 Partners for Fisheries Program, there will be that
32 ongoing commitment. That's the diagonal bar in 2004.
33 And then that small gray area at the bottom. Those are
34 program commitments from 2002 and 2003 starts. But most
35 of the money will be freed up from the previous program
36 commitments. It's going to be on the order of five
37 million, 4.9 -- five millions dollars.

38

39 And so what we're working at and what I
40 really -- I think probably the most important thing that
41 I want to discuss with you today is, in looking towards
42 the future, we feel very strongly -- and a lot of this is
43 based on Council input from you and other councils --
44 looking forward to how do we effectively spend our money
45 into the future. Strategic planning -- you know,
46 whatever you want to call it but in 2004 we're going to
47 free up most of the money that we have committed so far.
48 We will have had about three or four years worth of
49 history on the program. And so what we're looking at is
50 trying to develop framework for making some smart
00276

1 decisions on how we spend our money for the Fishery
2 Resource Monitoring Program projects off into the future.

3

4

5 And so the blue document that I gave you
6 is a draft framework, if you will, for what our current
7 thinking is on how we're going to try to assemble our
8 thoughts, if you will, for trying to decide what's
9 important versus what is less important for future
10 funding decisions. And if you turn to page three of that
11 blue document, there's a heading there call future
12 issues. And it just briefly explains what I just did.
13 That again, we've got a fair amount of money coming free
14 again. We've got the opportunity to set in motion the
15 future direction of this program. And the way we thought
16 it would best to think about how to prioritize what we
17 think is important or not was to ask a series of
18 questions. And that's what those four bullets are on
19 that page. And those are the questions that we've kind
20 of asked ourselves so far. And what I'm going to do for
21 the next couple of minutes, Mr. Chairman, is just kind of
22 go through those questions, what our current thinking is
23 on those questions. And our intent is to come back to
24 you in the fall with an updated version of this analysis
25 coupled with the 2002 project performance, you know, what

26 happens this summer with our projects. And then looking
27 on into the future for program recommendations in 2003
28 and then how we structure our thoughts for 2004. That's
29 what we'll be coming back with in the fall.

30

31 So I'm just going to very briefly go
32 through our thinking on these questions. And those
33 questions are first, how will the project selections
34 today address the Council's issues and information needs?
35 Second, which issues and information needs likely require
36 some annual collection of long term data sets? I won't
37 read the rest of them, I'll go through those. But
38 starting with the first question, every regional council
39 back in the year 2000 came up with a set of issues and
40 information needs. In fact, they're in your Council book
41 as they've existed. And really with very few exceptions,
42 those issues and information needs have not changed much
43 since they were first pulled together by the Councils
44 back in 1999 and 2000. So one of the things we thought
45 would be real useful is to look at the project selections
46 that we've done so far and compare those back to your
47 issues and information needs and see, well, are we on
48 target or are we not.

49

50 So if you flip the page and look at pages
00277

1 four and five of that blue document, what you'll find
2 there is for each area in the Cook Inlet Gulf of Alaska
3 region, it's a summary of the projects that we've funded
4 so far and where they fit into your issues and
5 information needs. So if you look on page four, Cook
6 Inlet kind of stands off by itself because you identified
7 a lot of issues and information needs for Cook Inlet,
8 particularly for the Kenai River. But as Pat explained,
9 all that's really been put on hold until we do this Cook
10 Inlet harvest monitoring use study. So that is the
11 current issue and information need for Cook Inlet that's
12 underway. And that's going to take two to four years to
13 complete. So that kind of really completes the Cook
14 Inlet story for at least the next couple of years.

15

16 Most of the projects clearly are falling
17 in the Copper River. And if you look at the issues and
18 information needs that you identified, there's basically
19 the Cook Inlet and there was the Copper River. So the
20 weight of the program has really fallen on the Copper
21 River and that seems to be very much on target with the
22 issues and information needs that you identified. There
23 were no issues and information needs identified for
24 Prince William Sound. A couple of projects have been
25 funded there but it's a very minor part of the program
26 and again, that seems in keeping. In conclusion, in
27 answering that question, it at least appears to us that
28 if you just look at the projects as they've been funded
29 and where they fall with the issues and information
30 needs, they fall squarely on top of the issues and
31 information needs identified by this Council. And if you
32 look for any missing pieces, there's really only a couple
33 of minor missing pieces we can find.

34

35 One of your issues, that you had raised

36 had to deal with Copper River burbot. We've never funded
37 a study on Copper River burbot. There were also a couple
38 of issues and information needs that really fall outside
39 of our program. For instance, there were questions about
40 hatchery fish and there were some questions really about
41 coastal ecology. And again, those kind of fall outside
42 of the mandate of the Fishery Resource Monitoring
43 Program. So if you look at those issues and information
44 needs that clearly fall within our mandate, with the
45 exception of Copper River burbot, we think we've got
46 really good coverage. And given that those issues and
47 information needs have not changed much over a three year
48 time frame, we feel fairly confident that the project
49 selection to date seems to be on target. And we're not
50 seeing a lot of burning new issues coming up because
00278

1 we're not seeing changes in the issues and information
2 needs. So Mr. Chairman, I'm going to pause there again.
3 That's our current thinking on that first question. Kind
4 of looking at your issues and information needs and
5 trying to do what we would call a gap analysis. Are we
6 missing anything that's been identified? And again, I'll
7 pause.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Does anybody see any --
10 Susan.

11
12 MS. WELLS: I might not quite be up to
13 speed on all this but I'm just wondering if the issue we
14 brought up earlier about the data, monitoring the.....

15
16 MR. MCBRIDE: Sport fish in fresh water.

17
18 MS. WELLS: Well, yeah, that one. If
19 that was a potential project.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug, correct me if I'm
22 wrong but.....

23
24 MS. WELLS: Baseline data monitoring,
25 yeah.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:that probably
28 wouldn't come under this because these are projects that
29 we are -- resource monitoring and TEK projects that we're
30 setting up in conjunction with other entities like the
31 State, like the Native village of Eyak and that it's an
32 opportunity to learn and grow together on, on issues that
33 are important. Where there, we have the agency in place
34 and almost have the process in place where that could be,
35 you know, fairly easily collected without setting up a
36 project like this and spending additional money.
37 Besides, the money would go straight to an agency and if
38 I remember right, that's out -- these are projects that
39 are done in conjunction with somebody else. Aren't they,
40 Doug? Or are some of them direct -- there are some
41 direct Fish and Wildlife Service here.

42
43 MR. MCBRIDE: Right.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And there are some

46 National Park Service projects too.

47

48 MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, you're
49 correct. Our enlisted investigators is a who's who of
50 organizations throughout Alaska. I mean, it's the
00279

1 Federal agencies, Alaska Department of Fish and Game and
2 rural organizations in this area. The major ones would
3 be Native village of Eyak, Copper River Native
4 Association, Chugach Regional Research Corporation. I
5 mean, it's all of those entities, basically, are who
6 we're funding. I think on the question of the sport fish
7 guiding, I mean, in the discussion you just had, what you
8 had up here were the land managers of the Federal
9 conservation units. And this would really fall more
10 under their purview and jurisdiction than under the
11 purview and jurisdiction of subsistence management per
12 se. I mean what you're talking about is reporting of
13 sport fishing guides. You're not talking about reporting
14 of subsistence fishers and things like that. So at least
15 my initial take on it is that would kind of fall outside
16 of the immediate realm of this program.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
19 Doug? Okay.

20

21 MR. MCBRIDE: The next question we ask
22 then is, okay we've looked at the issues and information
23 needs, we've looked at just the projects we've selected
24 so far and how they fall in there but really the next
25 question is, are there issues and information needs that
26 likely require annual collection of long term data sets.
27 Now if you remember how this program is structured, we've
28 made three year funding commitments for any individual
29 project. But, I mean, we've got to ask the question, are
30 some of these issues and information needs, do they go
31 beyond three years. And the short answer to that, at
32 least from our perspective and I think from yours too, is
33 yes, there are some major ones that go beyond three
34 years. So if you to the bottom of page five and
35 basically through page six, that's our answer, if you
36 will, at least our current thinking to that question.
37 And the way we're looking at that, there's really kind of
38 two categories of projects that we see -- or actually
39 three categories of projects that really are going to
40 require some long term commitments.

41

42 The first one, which is summarized at the
43 bottom of page five, are some of the stock status and
44 trends projects. Any or at least some of the projects
45 that are trying to do things like estimate abundance,
46 determine an escapement goal, manage for an escapement
47 goal -- very likely that's going to go well beyond a
48 three year funding commitment. The best example I can
49 give you is estimating King Salmon abundance on the
50 Copper River. We've only got one year under our belt,
00280

1 it was a rousing success. Assuming that remains
2 successful on and into the future, I would have a hard
3 time imagining this program walking away from that kind
4 of information. And there's other projects that fall

5 into that category also but there's clearly going to be
6 some stock status and trends projects. Probably some
7 substantial ones that are going to require some long term
8 funding commitments.

9
10 The other categories of information
11 really had to do with subsistence harvest monitoring or
12 harvest assessment. The Fishery Resource Monitoring
13 Program funded a very broad based look at how best to
14 conduct subsistence harvest monitoring. And we've
15 reported on that somewhat to you in the past. There's
16 been some offshoots of that program. We've held a series
17 of regional workshops looking at how subsistence harvest
18 monitoring is conducted. In fact, the last time I was in
19 this hotel was on 9/11 and Fred was here with me and we
20 held the workshop here for Prince William Sound and lower
21 Cook Inlet. And what we were looking at that day, in
22 addition to the other things that were going on
23 nationally, but what we were looking at specifically here
24 was how subsistence harvest monitoring is conducted in
25 lower Cook Inlet and Prince William Sound. And luckily
26 in this region, most of the program is funded outside of
27 this program. I mean, it's permit system, it's mostly
28 funded by the State. So financially there won't be a big
29 obligation however there will be some funding
30 recommendations, I think, that will come out of that
31 process that we think ought to receive a lot of
32 consideration from our process in terms of funding.

33
34 The other recommendation that came out of
35 that statewide harvest monitoring work group is in
36 addition to just the, you know, rote, repetitive annual
37 estimation of subsistence harvest, another key ingredient
38 to getting credible subsistence harvest is to at least
39 periodically go in and do much more intensive, what they
40 call baseline surveys. This is going to get us into the
41 realm of traditional knowledge. You know, intensive
42 survey -- community based type surveys. So the other
43 category of information the we think is going to go well
44 beyond a three year funding commitment is some kind of a
45 strategic look to periodically go visit all the
46 communities on an intensive baseline survey type basis.

47
48 And what we're specifically looking for
49 is harvest assessment information. There's a lot of
50 categories, if you will, of traditional knowledge and a
00281

1 lot of the information is collected through those
2 baseline surveys. But we're talking about is that
3 information that directly applies to harvest assessment.
4 So again, you know, looking at that question, are there
5 funding commitments that go beyond three years, the short
6 answer is yes, we strongly feel that's the case. We
7 suspect you do also. And so as we look on into the
8 future, we're going to be looking at projects that do
9 baseline harvest assessment, subsistence harvest
10 assessment and then long term stock status type projects
11 for stocks of fish, like Copper River king salmon that
12 are very important to subsistence fisheries. Again, Mr.
13 Chairman, I'll pause and ask if there's any questions.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If nobody else has a
16 question, I do, Doug. When we come on some of these long
17 term projects and basically they were funded for three
18 years, so that would give us like a reassessment every
19 three years. Every three years these projects would have
20 to come back up for funding, wouldn't they?

21

22 MR. MCBRIDE: Absolutely.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And so we could reassess
25 both the need and whether or not they're doing the job.
26 Now if you have a long term project like that, maybe it's
27 underneath some agency or some organization that's doing
28 it, when it comes up for re-funding, will other agencies
29 or organizations be able to bid on that project? And
30 let's say we have a stock assessment program that's
31 currently done by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game
32 in conjunction with the Fish and Wildlife Service but the
33 local community of Gulkana or Gulkona figures that they
34 can do it. Can they put a competitive bid in to do that
35 same project?

36

37 MR. MCBRIDE: I think the answer to all
38 those questions is yes. We have a competitive bidding
39 process. It's not necessarily just the lowest bidder. I
40 mean we look.....

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If the job can be done
43 by somebody else, somebody else can put an -- I guess
44 you'd call it a (indiscernible). But they can put a
45 contract in to bid on doing the same job that somebody
46 else is currently doing. Because at the end of three
47 years that project is done. It either has to be re-bid
48 or somebody else has to bid it out also.

49

50 MR. MCBRIDE: Right. And along those
00282

1 lines, Mr. Chairman, by design, we're trying to the
2 extent possible to make some of these programs change who
3 does them. For instance, an important aspect of our
4 program is what we call capacity building. What we're
5 trying to do is to get rural residents, rural
6 organizations to build their capacity to meaningfully
7 participate in resource management. So by design, some
8 of these programs will shift in that direction. I don't
9 have any good examples in Southcentral where there's been
10 a shift for an ongoing program but the other area I cover
11 is Southeast. And some of the projects down there, the
12 agencies have sat down with the rural organizations and
13 they're coming to common agreement where they're actually
14 shifting responsibilities and shifting budgets to
15 increase the responsibility of the rural organizations
16 and lessen the responsibility of the Federal and State
17 agencies. So by design, some of that is going to happen.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That and the three year
20 review process would make it very available to do that,
21 too.

22

23 MR. MCBRIDE: Absolutely. And also, when
24 we do a program commitment for three years, we're -- I

25 mean, internally we're reviewing these annually. There
26 have been some examples, not in this region, where
27 projects -- I mean, there have been performance issues
28 and for various reasons the projects didn't go forward as
29 planned. And so even though a commitment was made to do
30 a project for three years, if it's not happening then we
31 reassess and pull the money back in and go to the next
32 best thing basically.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay, any other
35 questions?

36

37 MR. MCBRIDE: There's one final question,
38 I'll try to be mercifully brief on this. The third
39 question that we ask is, are there other funding sources
40 that we can tap into to try to leverage the fishery
41 resource monitoring funds? And what we're not focused on
42 here are just the normal operating budgets, if you will
43 -- the State and Federal agencies. But what we were
44 specifically trying to do is look at other programs that
45 are also open competitive type programs. And that at
46 least to some degree overlap with the subject of
47 subsistence management. In Southcentral region there
48 really are two such programs that we've already undergone
49 discussions with the people that are implementing those
50 programs. One is the Gulf Ecosystem Monitoring program,
00283

1 the GEM program. It's sort of the -- it's the EVOS
2 program, what's come out of the restoration work. We
3 think there are going to be some opportunities there to
4 coordinate efforts with them and either joint fund some
5 projects that we're interested in and they're interested
6 in or have them cover certain areas that maybe fall
7 somewhat out of our mandate so we can kind of jigsaw the
8 two programs together. But at any rate, the whole idea
9 is to try to coordinate efforts.

10

11 The other program is within the Forest
12 Service. They have the National Wildlife Fisheries
13 appropriation. And actually in Southeast, we've already
14 had some examples where we've either joint funded a
15 program or they picked up funding for a program that we
16 basically ran out of funding for out of this program. So
17 those are two examples where we're trying to leverage our
18 funds to get more bang for the buck. So with that, Mr.
19 Chairman, I'm going to conclude my presentation. Again,
20 the whole idea of this is trying to look forward to the
21 future and one of the things we feel real strongly about
22 is the Council really needs to focus on a planning effort
23 for 2004 because that's going to be the opportunity to
24 kind of set -- you know, revamp the program for the
25 foreseeable future.

26

27 Thank you.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anybody have any
30 questions for Doug before we allow him to leave? You're
31 done, Doug. Thank you. Okay. We have Bill Knauer,
32 Council member ballots.

33

34 MR. KNAUER: Good afternoon, Mr.

35 Chairman, Council members. My name is Bill Knauer and
36 this briefing is for informational purposes only and does
37 not require any action upon your part. Recently there
38 was a letter that was received from the Deputy Secretary
39 of the Interior, Mr. Steven Griles, concerning membership
40 balance on the regional councils. You have all been
41 provided a copy of this. Mr. Griles requested that we
42 review our procedures for recommending Council members to
43 insure that we are complying with the Federal Advisory
44 Committee Act, also known as FACA, regarding membership
45 ballots and representation of all effected user groups.
46 That is, subsistence, sport, commercial, urban, rural,
47 Native and non-Native. Nationwide there is an ongoing
48 review of all FACA committees and membership balance. We
49 realize that the letter from Mr. Griles may have raised
50 some concerns with you however we want to reassure you
00284

1 that we welcome this opportunity to review these
2 administrative procedures and processes for member
3 appointments.

4
5 As the Chair, Mr. Dementieff, indicated
6 in his transmittal letter to you, we believe that we do
7 have a solid record and that we are complying with both
8 the spirit and the intent of ANILCA and FACA. The Board
9 Chair has appointed a committee of Board members or their
10 designees to undertake a review of the nominations
11 process, including the selection process. The guiding
12 principles that he has set for this membership balance
13 committee include keeping subsistence management and the
14 goals of ANILCA, Title VIII, as the primary focus in our
15 procedures to assure membership balance on the councils
16 in accordance with FACA. To promote selection of Council
17 members among those who will work constructively to
18 uphold the ANILCA Title VIII mandate. And lastly to
19 recognize that there are several interests that are
20 directly effected by the Federal Subsistence Management
21 Program and that these interests should be provided an
22 opportunity to be directly involved in the subsistence
23 management process. That committee will provide
24 recommendations back to the full board and after review
25 by the Board, recommendations will be forwarded to Deputy
26 Secretary Griles. It's the Board's intent to keep the
27 councils informed as this review process proceeds. Mr.
28 Chairman, that concludes my briefing and I'd be more than
29 happy to answer any questions.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have any
32 questions? I think most of us have read most of that, so
33 thanks, Bill.

34
35 MR. KNAUER: Thank you.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay, National Park
38 Service. Oops -- Taylor.

39
40 MR. BRELSFORD: I wonder if I could have
41 just a second on this previous topic?

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

44

45 MR. BRELSFORD: Thank you. I would like
46 to add a bit of update on the Board committee that is
47 working on regional council balance and membership. This
48 is a concern that several of you with the longer time of
49 service on the Southcentral Regional Council will
50 recognize over the years. The Board's committee involve
00285

1 several Board members and several key Staffers. We've
2 met several times -- four times in the last month. So it
3 is a fairly fast track matter. One item that I'd like to
4 -- two items -- I'd like to mention to you and see if you
5 have any input that might be put forward at the current
6 time. One of those has to do with alternates on regional
7 councils. There's some discussion about insuring that
8 all 10 of the regional councils have alternates to have
9 full membership or full participation at every Council
10 meeting. If you have concerns about that, I think this
11 would be good for us to know at the present time.

12
13 And the second item I'd like to mention
14 to you is the question of the size of regional councils.
15 There are a couple of councils that serve very diverse
16 and complex regions that would include the Southeast
17 Regional Council, the Southcentral Regional Council and
18 the Eastern Interior Regional Council. The Southeast
19 Regional Council has 13 members, the Eastern Interior has
20 nine and then the Southcentral Council has seven. So one
21 of the things that is being discussed is the prospect
22 that those councils, because of the diversity of the
23 regions they serve, require larger membership. And I
24 believe, in the case of Southcentral, that's really right
25 at the head of the list of potential changes. So if you
26 have any thoughts about that -- pro, con, sideways -- I
27 think early input would be helpful to the Board's
28 committee. And let me simply stop with that and invite
29 any comments that you might have.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Does anybody have any
32 comments on need for either alternatives or increased
33 size for the Council for Southcentral. I'll make one
34 comment, Taylor. I know in the past that we haven't been
35 very supportive of alternatives [sic] because we've
36 rather have people that stay up to speed. Not
37 alternatives but alternates.

38
39 MR. ELVSAAS: Alternates.
40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, alternates. It's
42 late in the day, Fred. Because we'd rather have people
43 that are up to speed and are full members rather than
44 alternates. I know that's been a comment that's been
45 done by this council in the past. With that, I'll leave
46 it up to the rest of them on size. Fred.

47
48 MR. ELVSAAS: Yeah, I agree with your
49 comments on alternates. Sometimes it's beneficial; other
50 times it's not. But in regards to size, you know, we do
00286

1 cover a large, diverse region. On the other hand, the
2 way I view the committee is the goal is to make sure
3 ANILCA is working. I sit here as a subsistence user, I

4 also have a sport fishing permit. I also am a commercial
5 fisherman. You know, so we are diverse people ourselves.
6 Do we want to make this advisory committee advisory to
7 everything? Because when you look at it there's many,
8 many fish and game advisory committees that's in the
9 region also. And I believe they have a place within our
10 agenda to address issues. So I think we cover all the
11 bases when you look at it in that light. In regards to
12 the fisheries, to game, to birds. I feel pretty
13 comfortable with the structure and the manner that we're
14 working. I don't see any problem other than the fact
15 that we have one member who hasn't shown up for quite
16 some time. But nonetheless, in my mind, we're a pretty
17 well rounded broad based council. We come from all
18 corners of the Southcentral region and as such I think
19 we've got it pretty well covered.

20 Thanks.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Fred. Bob.

23

24 MR. CHURCHILL: You know, Fred's comment,
25 having taken a look at the structure and how it was
26 designed. Maybe this really argues for a closer working
27 relationship between the State advisory committees and
28 the Regional Advisory Council. We can draw on their
29 strength and they can certainly draw on ours. And it
30 would seem there's -- we already discussed three or four
31 objectives that certainly seem to be of common interest.
32 That maybe we could accentuate that and not really have
33 to do anything at any new or different but just better
34 utilize what we have to work with.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Taylor, can I make a
37 comment on it? Sometimes size doesn't add diversity.
38 Size can add cumbersomeness. However, we are a large
39 area and it probably wouldn't hurt to have a couple more
40 individuals or some more individuals from across the
41 area. But I would rather see diverse individuals who
42 have knowledge in lots of different fields rather than
43 diverse interest groups with single focuses looking at
44 this being a way to look out for their interests. I'd
45 rather have people who have knowledge in lots of
46 different areas so that they can take those different
47 areas into it and do exactly what we have to do as a
48 council, which is interact all these different ideas.
49 And many of the individuals on this council have to
50 interact those ideas in their own life because they are

00287

1 diverse individuals. They take part in many of the
2 different activities that make up the use of the game and
3 fishery sources in our area. So that's kind of the way I
4 would look at it. I would look that too large could be
5 cumbersome but possibly the need for a couple of more
6 people because our area is bigger. But again, I would
7 rather see us look for diverse individuals who have a
8 broad knowledge and a broad background instead of
9 individuals who are here to represent -- this is to
10 represent this group, this is to represent this group
11 type person.

12

13 MR. BRELSFORD: Let me say those are

14 actually very helpful comments and I thank you for that.
15 I'm not sure any of us can predict where this is going to
16 land in the next month or two. I didn't want any of it
17 to be a surprise and so to the extent that these
18 discussions are underway, I wanted to make you aware of
19 that. But these are actually very thoughtful points and
20 I should expect nothing less from the Southcentral
21 Regional Council. One final item, Bob had mentioned the
22 value of strengthening relationship with the local
23 advisory committees and Pete may have skimmed across this
24 in his effort to be brief but that actually is a specific
25 discussion item in the State/Federal working group. The
26 regulatory coordination protocol. So I think we've
27 actually got a team focused on that and in a year's time
28 I think we'll have some problematic tools to achieve that
29 end. So thank you.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.

32

33 MR. CHURCHILL: To the Chair, we have
34 Sherry Wright here, who's the Southcentral coordinator
35 for the advisory committees and maybe she would have a
36 comment.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Sherry.

39

40 MS. WRIGHT: The only one suggestion I
41 would have is looking at the different areas. The only
42 one that I don't really see is Matanuska Valley, if you
43 were considering adding a seat so I just wanted to make
44 that suggestion.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Okay, with
47 that, we go on to the National Park Service. Why is it
48 Denali National Park always has the prettiest brochures
49 to hand out. Everybody else comes in plain blue paper or
50 white and gray and we get nice multicolored ones.

00288

1 MR. TWITCHELL: Chair, Council members.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's a tough room to
4 play, isn't it?

5

6 MR. TWITCHELL: It is. It is. Chair,
7 Council members. My name is Hollis Twitchell, I'm with
8 Denali National Park, Cultural Subsistence Resource
9 Manager. Considering the long days that you put in, I'm
10 going to be pretty brief. I don't have any issue that
11 requires specific action on behalf of the Council. So
12 this will be just informational. For a couple of the new
13 members not familiar with your experience with park units
14 and commissions or not -- so I'll just briefly say that
15 we have a local advisory subsistence commission. It's
16 made up of nine members. Three are appointed by the
17 Governor of Alaska, three by the Secretary of the
18 Interior and three by Regional Advisory Councils.
19 Although Denali has three regional advisory areas
20 overlapping Denali boundaries -- the Eastern, Western and
21 Southcentral -- the Denali Subsistence Resource
22 Commission requested that their charter be changed to
23 have two members appointed to our commission from

24 Southcentral Regional Advisory Council. And the
25 reasoning was for that was because Cantwell is one of the
26 larger communities that are involved in Denali and they
27 have a lot more issues regarding resources and user
28 conflicts and a variety of things. And so they felt
29 representation should be distributed that way. The other
30 appointees are covering the northern region fairly well
31 with State and Secretary of Interior appointees. So we
32 actually have a pretty good representation. Gilbert
33 Dementi and Vernon Carlson are appointed by this Council
34 to our commission. And they're both in good standing.
35 Their reappointments will come up in '03. So they're in
36 good shape.

37
38 The second point was -- if you have any
39 questions, just interrupt me at any time. The second
40 point, the Denali SRC met February 22nd, primarily to
41 respond to Federal proposals in the book but secondarily
42 to take up their own hunting plan proposal regarding the
43 community of Cantwell, which was advanced to the councils
44 and the public through this last year. To summarize
45 their activities, they receive comments from Eastern
46 Interior, Western Interior and Southcentral Regional
47 Advisory Councils. All of those Councils were in support
48 of their proposal. In addition, they received comments
49 from the local fish and game advisory committee in
50 Cantwell, which unanimously supported the proposal for
00289

1 Cantwell. The Cantwell Native Tribal Council also sent a
2 letter of support for the proposal as well as the Copper
3 River Native Association. The comments that came back
4 either neutral or unsupportive of the proposal came from
5 the Sierra Club. They questioned whether there was a
6 significant concentration of subsistence users in
7 Cantwell and, if not, that the Cantwell resident zone be
8 deleted and that the park go to an individual permits
9 system in place of the resident zone.

10
11 The Middle Nenana Fish and Game Advisory
12 Committee met and discussed the Cantwell proposal. They
13 came up with sort of a split response and vote. Three of
14 the members abstained to vote on the initiative. One of
15 them voted in favor and three opposed -- correction, four
16 opposed. And most of the comments from those that
17 opposed said that they would like to support the Cantwell
18 resident zone but they had reservations about the one
19 moose per household as well as two caribou per hunter
20 provisions in the Federal regulations and thought that
21 maybe there should be some conservation on behalf of
22 subsistence users harvest before there was a restriction
23 put on subsistence users moving into the community. So
24 they were sort of a mixed vote there.

25
26 The State of Alaska said that they would
27 not support that proposal. They raised issues about
28 durational requirements for eligibility for subsistence
29 users in Alaska and also raised questions about 804. If
30 there was a need to allocate, why not go through the 804
31 process of ANILCA rather than establish a three year
32 residency. The commission took into consideration those
33 comments and they decided that they would go ahead and

34 advance their proposal as they had submitted it. At this
35 point, since it's an agency specific proposal for a
36 change in regulation, it will now be advanced to the
37 Governor and to the Secretary of the Interior for their
38 comments and responses to that. So that's where that
39 action is at this point.

40

41 I'll move on to my final point if there
42 isn't any other questions. And the last one is the user
43 guide that I handed out. Again, the history on this is
44 the commission has been pretty aggressive in addressing
45 the park that we do a number of things. One, make
46 subsistence use a little more understandable to our local
47 users and as such, when they looked at the complexity of
48 NPS regulations and the Federal program, they requested
49 that the park put together something that's a little
50 briefer than the regulations themselves to help people
00290

1 understand the subsistence programs at Denali. This is
2 an updated version. The first version came out a couple
3 of years ago and it was pretty dated so we just advanced
4 this one to them this last meeting, which is a more
5 current version. They also have been pretty instrumental
6 in getting the park to do a lot more to get information
7 out to visitors themselves in terms of subsistence use
8 and cultural use at Denali. And I think at the last
9 meeting or so I brought around the subsistence visitor's
10 brochure that we make available to visitors and people
11 coming into the park area. With that, I'll close and
12 answer any questions that you may have regarding Denali.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anybody else have any
15 questions? I could probably ask you mine afterwards but
16 I was just kind of interested in the discharge of
17 firearms in the Kantishna prohibited from September 1
18 through 15, just that little time period. Is that
19 because that's the start of the moose season but there's
20 still tourists there and you just don't expect anything
21 to be discharged before September 1?

22

23 MR. TWITCHELL: That's pretty much
24 correct. The lodges that operate in Kantishna -- and
25 there's four of them and they have a pretty high capacity
26 of use all through the summer, up until about the 12th of
27 September and at that point all the lodges are closed.
28 The moose season on the north side is open September 1st
29 through September 30th. So this closure, which is only
30 along the road corridor where these lodges are located,
31 is in place just for those first 15 days until the
32 visitors are out of the area. And at that point, the
33 whole unit is opened up to the rest of the hunt.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, I was just
36 wondering because it says operational firearms may be
37 carried in the ANILCA park and additions. That would
38 mean that they would also be able to be carried in there
39 prior to September 1st, if I understand that correctly.

40

41 MR. TWITCHELL: That's correct.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So a firearm could be

44 discharged for the purpose of taking a grouse from August
45 1st to September 1st but it's just mostly because -- it
46 was just mostly put in there because of the conflict with
47 the moose hunting and high powered rifles while the
48 visitors were there, wasn't it?

49

50 MR. TWITCHELL: That's correct.

00291

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And it was the minimum
2 amount of restriction that could be taking place.

3

4 MR. TWITCHELL: We went through quite an
5 evolved process in coming to this, involving the Regional
6 Councils, the commission and ultimately the Federal
7 Subsistence Board. And as such, we took the lead from
8 the Board which directed the agency to deal with this.
9 And working with the SRC came about to that compromise
10 and that's how that particular closure evolved.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I appreciate the fact
13 that it was the minimal that had to be done instead of
14 saying, you know, no firearms could be discharged from
15 September 31st to the following September 1st, you know,
16 or something like that. Because there are visitors there
17 at other times in the year.

18

19 MR. TWITCHELL: But recognizing that that
20 was the biggest part of the problem, to just target that
21 area as the minimal that could be done. I think that was
22 very good. Mr. Churchill.

23

24 MR. CHURCHILL: To follow-up, I am
25 assuming based on the dates and the times, it was
26 primarily a safety rather than a public relations safety
27 concern that drove this.

28

29 MR. TWITCHELL: That is correct. Thank
30 you.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Bureau of
33 Land Management, trails and -- oops, we got another
34 National Park Service. Okay. Did you bring a nice
35 pretty picture, too?

36

37 MR. VEACH: I didn't. We don't have
38 quite the budget. Mr. Chairman, Regional Council
39 members, my name is Eric Veach, I'm a Fisheries Biologist
40 for Wrangell-St. Elias National Park. And in the
41 interest of being brief this afternoon, all I want to go
42 over with you is just our plans for the management of the
43 Federal fishery and the Chitina subdistrict this coming
44 season. As I'm sure you know, we have a new Federal
45 season in the Chitina subdistrict. Federal users will
46 now have the option to use dipnets and they can alternate
47 between dipnets, fish wheels or rod and reel. And they
48 can fish in both the Chitina subdistrict and the
49 Glennallen subdistrict this summer. The limits will be
50 the same as they've been in the past for the Glennallen

00292

1 subdistrict. It will just now be a combined limit
2 between the Glennallen and Chitina subdistrict, if a

3 household chooses to fish in both subdistricts. So that
4 would be up to 200 salmon for a household of one and up
5 to 500 salmon for a household of two or more. If a
6 household chooses to fish in both subdistricts, they need
7 to obtain separate permits. We'll have a Federal permit
8 for the Glennallen subdistrict and also for the Chitina
9 subdistrict. And they'll need to carry both those --
10 have both those permits in their possession while they're
11 either fishing or transporting subsistence caught fish.

12
13 Let's see, basically I wanted to mention
14 to you that you can get permits at our headquarters
15 office in Copper Center and also the Slana ranger
16 station. Kind of the next thing I wanted to move on to
17 after the permits is that we intend to manage the fishery
18 in the Chitina subdistrict through periodic openings,
19 which is how it's traditionally been managed in the past
20 by the State. And so for at least this first year, what
21 we intend to do is to open and close -- really it will
22 just be periodic openings. I don't even like to use the
23 word closures. We'll have periodic openings that -- in
24 cooperation with the State. And technically the Federal
25 season in the Chitina subdistrict opens May 15th. But we
26 intend to do this year is to issue a special action that
27 will close the season May 15th and then we'll open it at
28 the same time the State opens their subsistence fishery
29 in the Chitina subdistrict. Typically that's been at
30 some time between June 1st and June 11th.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So what you're saying is
33 both fisheries will be open at the same time, right?

34
35 MR. VEACH: Exactly. So the fisheries
36 will both be open at the same time. And because we're
37 really not -- like I said, it's sort of, is the glass
38 half full or half empty and I guess we're kind of taking
39 the half full approach here. These are periodic
40 openings, not closures. And so because of that we don't
41 -- there won't be any need to say, restrict the sport
42 fishery in the Copper River in the Chitina subdistrict
43 during that time because these restrictions really aren't
44 based on a specific conservation concern or a shortage
45 among Federally qualified subsistence users. This is
46 just a way to manage the fishery to provide for fish
47 upstream for spawning escapement and also to provide for
48 the subsistence fisheries upstream in both the Glennallen
49 subdistrict and the Batzulnetas area fishery.

50
00293

1 One thing I kind of wanted to remind
2 everyone is also that it was Proposal 21, the results of
3 the Board's decision on Proposal 21. Folks that are
4 fishing under a Federal permit this year will need to
5 remove the ventral fin. In the past, regulations have
6 been the same as the State, that you remove the,
7 basically, the lobes of the tail. This year if you're
8 fishing under a Federal permit, your only option is to
9 remove the ventral or oriental fin instead. So that's
10 just something the folks will need to be aware of if
11 they're fishing under a Federal permit.

12

13 Another thing that I want to mention too,
14 in the past the State has entered into an access
15 arrangement with Ahtna and Chitina Corporations. The
16 Federal Board decided not to do that. There's some
17 jurisdiction issues that they're really not able to enter
18 into that type of an access agreement. And the users
19 will need to be aware, and this is something that we're
20 going to state on the permit, that the Federal permit
21 doesn't provide any trespass right or right to access
22 across private lands. That's really about all I have to
23 say about management of the Chitina dipnet fishery -- or,
24 I'm sorry, the Federal fishery in the Chitina subdistrict
25 this summer. Do you have any questions for me?
26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, one question.
28 Could an individual hold a Federal subsistence permit in
29 the Chitina district and also hold a State subsistence
30 fishery permit for the Chitina district?
31

32 MR. VEACH: There really isn't anything
33 to stop a person from doing that but you need to be aware
34 of the fact that those limits are not additive. You
35 would still be restricted to a maximum of 500 fish in the
36 entire upper Copper River district, which is both the
37 Chitina subdistrict and the Glennallen subdistrict. One
38 thing that I want to mention too, we're definitely
39 encouraging folks that are Federally qualified to go
40 ahead and get a Federal permit. It gives them more
41 options to fish. It gives them a lot more flexibility in
42 the fishery. The other thing that will help us do is it
43 will help us get kind of a clearer picture of just how
44 much Federal participation there is and we can use that
45 information in the future to determine if we need to
46 continue to manage through these periodic openings or
47 not. You know, we really don't have a good handle at
48 this point or a good idea of how much use we're going to
49 see by Federally qualified users in the Chitina
50 subdistrict this summer.

00294

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I was thinking of the
2 State permit also. If the State enters into an agreement
3 with Chitina, that would be one way for a Federal permit
4 holder to have paid his trespass fees so that he could
5 fish down in that section underneath the -- you know,
6 because he would have shared in the cost of the trespass
7 fee with Chitina and Ahtna if he held a State permit.
8 And that would be because if the Federal permit makes no
9 provision for paying for that trespass fee and the State
10 permit does, Ahtna and Chitina could say there will be no
11 trespass by Federal permit holders. But if a person had
12 both fees paid, he would have paid his trespass fee.
13

14 MR. VEACH: That question might actually
15 be better directed at my ADF&G counterpart when he makes
16 his report a little bit later here.
17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any other
19 questions? Fred.
20

21 MR. ELVSAAS: Well, in regards to the
22 trespass fee, if you had a Federal permit, can you make

23 your own arrangements for access?

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, I'm sure you could.

26 I can't say that for sure but....

27

28 MR. ELVSAAS: Well what I'm thinking is

29 the corporations aren't shutting everybody out if they

30 don't have a State permit, are they?

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I can't answer that

33 question either. I don't know if they've made that

34 decision yet.

35

36 MR. ELVSAAS: That could be a way....

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

39

40 MR. ELVSAAS:to get your own

41 access.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Many of the people that

44 have Federal subsistence fees also have -- Federal

45 subsistence permits also have kinship ties or are Ahtna

46 members and so there's possibly that there would just be

47 trophy involved.

48

49 MR. JOHN: Joe Hart is here. Maybe he

50 could answer some questions.

00295

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, is Joe here?

2

3 MR. JOHN: Joe Hart.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

6

7 MR. JOHN: From the land department.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, I didn't see him

10 back there.

11

12 MR. HART: Thank you. Currently the

13 Chitina Native Corporation hasn't addressed how they're

14 going to deal with this issue in regards to both the

15 State fishery and the Federal fishery. We have a meeting

16 scheduled for Monday where we're going to talk about a

17 proposal that's going to be submitted to the Board of

18 Fish and there has been a letter written to the Governor

19 of Alaska from Chitina Native Corporation addressing the

20 issue. There's a large concern of a survey that was

21 conducted on the right-of-way that's down there and

22 public access that happens to the river. The State of

23 Alaska is determined that about 60 percent of that right-

24 of-way reaches the edge of the river and are saying that

25 there might not be a need for them to charge the

26 dipnetters an access fee. So -- but that's not a 60

27 percent section that's all in one conjoining area. There

28 are intermittent breaks in there that are private

29 property. And so the stance that the Corporation is

30 basically taking is that if you're going to invite people

31 to come to our backyard, some type of compensation or

32 protection needs to be put in place. And at this point,

33 we're not hearing from either the Federal or the State
34 agencies that they're going to make those provisions this
35 next year. So we're still discussing what we're going to
36 do.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Joe, can I ask you a
39 question?

40

41 MR. HART: Sure.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Isn't it also in
44 contention whether or not the State actually has that
45 right-of-way that extends to the river? I was under the
46 impression that there's still contention as to over how
47 wide the right-of-way is.

48

49 MR. HART: And State court has determined
50 that's a 300 foot right-of-way.

00296

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The State court has
2 determined that?

3

4 MR. HART: Yes. It's never gone to a
5 Federal court though. It's a railroad right-of-way.
6 Initially it was a hundred feet wide. Just recently back
7 in, I believe it was in, around '92, '93. There was a
8 court decision that said that it's a State highway
9 vehicle traffic, therefore it's a 300 foot right-of-way
10 and that's what they assert, the State of Alaska does.
11 And that's what the recent survey has gone down and shown
12 where the portions of that 300 foot right-of-way from the
13 centerline of the road that's currently there reaches the
14 edge of the river or extends into the river. But there
15 are portions where, like at -- I can't think of the --
16 the Escalida (ph) Creek, that portion there does not
17 extend to the river but that's a high use area. A lot of
18 people go right there to do their camping, their fishing,
19 processing their fish and so on. There's a stream that
20 comes down and they use that for cleaning their salmon
21 and so on. And that area does not reach the river but
22 still the Fish and Game and now the Park Service Federal
23 Subsistence is going to invite people to come there and
24 trample across our land to reach the river. And they're
25 not going to do anything to prevent that from happening.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Are they measuring their
28 right-of-way from the current road or from the original
29 road site?

30

31 MR. HART: From the original railroad
32 bed.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

35

36 MR. HART: And that has, I believe, a
37 documented right-of-way.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now does that extend
40 over the whole railroad from Cordova to McCarthy?

41

42 MR. HART: Yes, it does. Well, no it

43 does not. From what I understand, they're saying that up
44 to Chitina where the Edgerton Road comes in, from there
45 down to Cordova is 300 feet. From Chitina to McCarthy,
46 there are portions of that that are still only 100 feet
47 wide. And we're discussing that in the McCarthy round
48 table meetings that have been going on.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any
00297

1 questions? Thank you for that information. From that
2 standpoint, like I was saying, if they do end up having
3 funding through the State, it would seem to me to behoove
4 Federal subsistence permit holders to get a State permit
5 just so they can share in the trespass fee, just to do
6 their share. Okay. With that, we're going to go on to
7 Bureau of Land Management, trails and easements. I don't
8 think it's covering the kind we were just talking about
9 but.

10

11 MR. BRELSFORD: Thank you Mr. Chairman.
12 We don't actually have any additional information to
13 provide to you at this point. This was a concern raised
14 by the Southcentral Council in the annual report and
15 directly in conversation with the Board, spring, a year
16 ago. There was a reply letter prepared by the lands
17 people in the State office and that was conveyed, I'm not
18 quite sure how many months ago, but it's been quite a
19 while. So that letter referred to some ongoing public
20 meetings and discussions with the Ahtna Corporation and
21 others in the Copper River Basin and I don't have any
22 updated information about the status of easements or
23 joint efforts at easement management. So if you would
24 like additional information on it I would need to get the
25 right people to the meeting for you at a later time. I
26 wasn't aware that this was on the agenda and so I didn't
27 prepare anything significant for you.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Taylor, I think mostly
30 what we'd like to be is we'd like to be kept updated with
31 current status or any actions that are taking place on it
32 so that if in the future something is happening in this
33 area that we could a report on it at our meetings. I
34 mean, if there's nothing going on that needs to be
35 reported, that's probably okay but if the status changes
36 or if there's been some action taken on easements, let's
37 say up in Unit 13 with ATVs or something on that order,
38 we definitely as a Council would like to be kept apprised
39 of what's going on.

40

41 MR. BRELSFORD: Thanks. Let me take the
42 responsibility to treat this as an ongoing agenda
43 item.....

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right.

46

47 MR. BRELSFORD:so that K.J.
48 Mishovik, the specialist in Glennallen, who works with
49 this question, would provide us whatever current status
50 is the case at each meeting and that way you'd have an
00298

1 ongoing awareness of developments.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Does that
4 sound agreeable to the rest of the Council? Because
5 that's basically what we're looking for, was just the
6 information.

7

8 MR. HOLBROOK: Mr. Chairman, Ken Holbrook
9 with the Forest Service. We have developed a Copper
10 River landowners and users committee dealing with the use
11 of the river and with the easements. And we have had a
12 number of meetings and the next one is scheduled for
13 April 1st. It includes all of the landowners including
14 the corporations up river and down river. And it is at
15 the sportsman's show this next month. We have
16 presentations, seminars to present where access is along
17 the river, how you go about getting permits. We have
18 committed to consolidating the permitting. In the past
19 it's been, I think, nine permits for people to use the
20 river and get all the way down. That's going to be
21 turned into just two permits, hopefully by the end of the
22 year. And we can include the Council on the mailing list
23 to keep you updated on that.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, I think that
26 would be appreciated. Fred.

27

28 MR. ELVSAAS: It seems to me at the --
29 when we were at the Copper Center meeting, we were asked
30 and apprised of and shown a video of four-wheeler damage
31 to the lands and so forth where they were going off the
32 easements and so forth. And what -- the easement was
33 actually damaged to the point where they had to go off
34 the easement, as I recall, to get around one soft spot.
35 And has anything happened on that?

36

37 MR. HOLBROOK: Mr. Chairman, yes. We
38 have -- that video has been circulated widely in attempts
39 to resolve that kind of issue, not only here but across
40 the state because this issue does exist everywhere across
41 the state with 17B easements. We are in the process of
42 marking and delineating and providing educational
43 materials. We have signed the Copper River with where
44 easements -- both sight and trail easements are and the
45 rules by which you must use them. Plus we're
46 incorporating and getting all of the outfitters who are
47 using the river to help us police the situation. It is a
48 very difficult situation and we are working on it. And I
49 think we're doing a pretty good job in Southcentral by
50 getting this working group together.

00299

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And this is from the top
2 of the river to the bottom, pretty much?

3

4 MR. HOLBROOK: Pretty much, yes.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

7

8 MR. HOLBROOK: I think there's probably
9 seven or eight landowners plus outfitter guides plus
10 interested public. And like I said, at the Sportsman's
11 Show, we will have booths and seminars to presentations

12 on where and how and how to go about using the easements
13 and where they are.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any
16 questions? Thank you muchly.

17

18 MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman, I had one
19 other small item to mention for you in regard to the BLM
20 in Glennallen and that has to do with the proposal to
21 establish a count tower on the Gulkana River this year.
22 It would be actually managed by ADF&G and Tom may be
23 ready to tell you a little bit more about he specifics.
24 But since that is on a wild and scenic river managed by
25 the BLM, an environmental review is required and there is
26 actually an environmental assessment document in EA that
27 came out last week. It is currently under public review
28 through the end of March. So if any of the members would
29 be particularly interested in a chance to review that,
30 Kari Rogers, our coworker in Glennallen is here. She was
31 the author of that document. We could take names and
32 make sure that she would have a copy in order to review
33 it. It's not a particularly environmentally significant
34 undertaking but there is some controversy about it, I
35 want to mention to you. And I think the end result is
36 that we have supported the value of a stock assessment
37 project on the Gulkana River and that's the finding in
38 the environmental assessment. I wanted you to be aware
39 of it and if you have interest, we'll make additional
40 documentation available to you.

41

42 Okay, thank you.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I know that when I was
45 reading up on it I noticed that it almost looked like it
46 was stopped by the controversy but it just had to go
47 through the right steps then.

48

49 MR. BRELSFORD: Right, I think that's
50 exactly the perspective to take here. That there is a
00300

1 specific procedure for reviewing potential environmental
2 impacts and possible alternatives and mitigation and so
3 on. Once those procedures are fulfilled then we think it
4 -- we have concluded at this point that it is a project
5 that adds value to resource management and it consistent
6 with the purposes of the wild and scenic river and could
7 proceed. So Ralph, you've actually already had a copy of
8 the EA.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I had a copy of the
11 objections to it. I haven't had a copy of the assessment
12 on it.

13

14 MR. BRELSFORD: So maybe a copy of the EA
15 for you and for Bob would be the conclusion here. And
16 for Ann. It makes great evening reading, I want to
17 encourage everybody.

18

19 Okay, thank you.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's a foldout map from

22 the top of Tangle Lakes down to the Copper River. Okay,
23 with that we go on to the Alaska Department of Fish and
24 Game.

25

26 MR. TAUBE: Mr. Chairman, my name is Tom
27 Taube, I'm the Alaska Department of Fish and Game,
28 Fisheries Management Biologist out of the Glennallen
29 office responsible for the sport and subsistence
30 fisheries in the upper Copper River. And today I had
31 pretty much planned just to summarize the harvest numbers
32 from the 2001 fisheries in the Glennallen and Chitina
33 subdistricts. And from some of the previous discussion,
34 I guess there will be some other topics that I'll address
35 any questions you have regarding that. In the Glennallen
36 subdistrict in 2001, we issued 1,240 permits. This was
37 the second highest number of permits that had been issued
38 for the Glennallen subdistrict. Thirty-five percent of
39 these permits were from communities -- issued to people
40 from communities that would have been Federally
41 qualified. Of these permits -- and this is with 90
42 percent of the permits returned so this is just reported
43 harvest, the actual estimated harvest will probably be
44 slightly higher than this.

45 But for sockeye, there was approximately
46 78,000 sockeye harvested; 3,300 Chinook and 1,000 coho
47 for a total of 83,000. Of this, approximately 36,000 was
48 harvested from communities that would fall under Federal
49 qualification. For the Chitina subdistrict, 9,462
50 permits were issued. This was the third largest number
00301

1 of permits that we had issued for that subdistrict.
2 About one percent of these were issued to residents of
3 Federally qualified communities. The reported harvest
4 was about 90 percent of the permits turned in. It was
5 120,000 sockeye; 3,000 Chinook; 2,500 coho for a total of
6 125,000. And this was the fifth highest harvest for the
7 Chitina subdistrict. And for 2002, the forecast for the
8 Copper River is a total return of 1.6 million sockeye
9 with a range of 800,000 to 2.6 million. 49,000 king is
10 the forecast and 302,000 coho with a range of 86,000 to
11 500,000. And I guess I'll take any questions you have at
12 this time regarding this or any other topics that have
13 been covered here earlier.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anybody have any
16 questions? Bob.

17

18 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, and I'm sorry, I
19 didn't get the first number of permits you mentioned.
20 Was it 1340?

21

22 MR. TAUBE: It was 1240 from my own
23 subdistrict.

24

25 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And then if I understood
28 right, about 35 percent of the permits and 36 percent of
29 the fish was taken by Federally qualified subsistence
30 users and -- am I correct on that?

31

32 MR. TAUBE: Thirty-five percent of the
33 permits and actually 43 percent of the harvest. It was
34 36,000 salmon total. And for the Chitina subdistrict it
35 was one percent of the permits and one percent of the
36 harvest.

37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, so out of the
39 total harvest though, if you took the total harvest of
40 200,000 fish.....

41
42 MR. TAUBE: 37,000 would have been
43 harvested by Federally qualified users.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So that's approximately
46 -- that's approximately 20 percent.

47
48 MR. TAUBE: Right.

49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Somewhere in that
00302
1 neighborhood. A little less than 20. About 18 percent
2 of the fish were harvested by Federally qualified
3 subsistence users.

4
5 MR. TAUBE: That's correct.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fred.

8
9 MR. ELVSAAS: The projection of 1.6
10 million, is that about average for the Copper?

11
12 MR. TAUBE: In recent years, it's about
13 average. For say, the last five years it's about
14 average. The king is actually slightly lower than
15 recent. But the king forecast is based upon just average
16 harvests due to some information we haven't been able to
17 get on age composition of the harvest. The forecast for
18 king salmon is just based upon the average commercial
19 harvest. And so it's actually the forecast -- that's
20 forecasted commercial harvest of 49,000 kings. For
21 sockeye it was 1.6 million was the total return. So that
22 would be harvest and escapement all combined in there.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fred.

25
26 MR. ELVSAAS: It seems to me we discussed
27 at one point that there was some inaccuracies in the king
28 counting system before. Wasn't there something Eyak was
29 going to work on, on the fish wheel to try to refine the
30 king counting a little better?

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Eyak is working on it
33 and that's what the counting towers that he was talking
34 about previously on the Gulkana will be to address also.
35 We haven't had -- we've only had one year that we had a
36 weir there and the rest of it has always been on -- was
37 it only one year we had a weir there?

38
39 MR. TAUBE: That's correct, yeah. In the
40 Gulkana we had one year in 1996 where a weir was in
41 operation and that just provided an escapement for the

42 Gulkana. What the Department had been doing the last
43 three years -- has been doing a radio telemetry study
44 that has produced an estimate of escapement for the upper
45 Copper River, based upon we have marked the fish below
46 the Chitina subdistrict. And then based upon the harvest
47 of these fish that we marked in the Chitina subdistrict
48 where they get harvested in the Chitina subdistrict,
49 we're able to produce an estimate of harvest along with
50 distribution of a percentage of spawners in each of the
00303

1 spawning tributaries. And that will be continuing on
2 this year. And in 1999 the Board of Fisheries
3 established an escapement goal for king salmon of 28 to
4 55,000. And from the three years of information we have,
5 we've been right at the low end of that escapement for
6 king salmon. Previous to that we used aerial survey and
7 the seas. Where we have nine survey streams which are
8 flowing during the peak of the run and we get an index
9 for each stream and we use that to try to manage the
10 fisheries.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions?
13 We're gone or are you done?

14
15 MR. TAUBE: I'm done unless there's more,
16 I guess, regarding the access fee. Right now, for the
17 Chitina subdistrict, the fee is in State regulation, the
18 \$25 fee. And for there not to be a fee, the State
19 legislature would have to remove that from the books.
20 There is no agreement between Ahtna and Chitina at this
21 time for any of that fee to be paid to them for access.
22 The Federal Board's decision in December kind of put the
23 State in the awkward position where we've got Federal
24 users that don't have to pay a fee and State users that
25 do. So from the State perspective, we've got two classes
26 of users down there. And so from that, we're actually
27 looking at not collecting the fee.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Wouldn't they have to
30 collect the fee but not pay it, I mean, if it's in.....

31
32 MR. TAUBE: If it's in regulation.
33 Right. But the Legislature still can act before the
34 fishing season starts and remove that.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Go ahead.

37
38 MS. SEE: My name is Marianne See, I'm
39 the Assistant Director of the Division of Subsistence and
40 I appreciate the opportunity to address the Council this
41 afternoon. The Cook Inlet Project was already mentioned
42 by our colleagues at Fish and Wildlife Service so I'll
43 focus my remarks today on an information item only for
44 you. This is on the budget for the Fish and Game
45 Department which was passed out of house finance
46 subcommittee last night. And in that closeout they
47 directed a cut of general funds which would eliminate all
48 the general funds currently going to the Division of
49 Subsistence. This is commonly referred to as zeroing out
50 an agency element. In this case, an entire division.

00304

1 As I'm sure you know, the Subsistence
2 Division is charged -- it's actually the only State
3 agency charged with researching subsistence uses and
4 providing expertise to decision makers that implements
5 the State's subsistence law. And that law, of course,
6 provides for subsistence as the priority use for Fish and
7 Wildlife. The next step for this is this budget by the
8 subcommittee goes to the full House Budget Committee.
9 And there are also going to be public hearings. Now
10 those considerations are done for all departments at this
11 stage. So Fish and Game and all the other departments
12 will be under consideration by the House Budget
13 Committee. And the public hearing next week is also for
14 all departments. So we wanted you to be aware of that
15 information and if you have any questions, I'll try to
16 answer them for you.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I have only one
19 question. If this goes through then basically there will
20 be no Division of Subsistence for the Alaska Department
21 of Fish and Game.

22
23 MS. SEE: It is difficult to imagine that
24 there could be a division. There could be some elements
25 left of the work that we currently do because we do in
26 fact get Federal funding but the core funding for the
27 division is State general fund.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And isn't most Federal
30 funding, matching funding?

31
32 MS. SEE: Some is, it's a mix.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Mr. Churchill.

35
36 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, have you talked to
37 Mary about this yet? Pete?

38
39 MS. SEE: She's well aware of it, yes.

40
41 MR. CHURCHILL: Well, I'm sure she's
42 aware of it but does she have anything to share with us
43 or that you might share on her behalf with us that would
44 allow us to either act or have some input on this?

45
46 MS. SEE: Well, as I mentioned, the next
47 step for all department budgets is the evaluation that's
48 done in the House Budget -- the full committee. Of the
49 chairs of that committee are Eldon Mulder and Bill
50 Williams. And typically the public -- any member of the
00305

1 public may offer comments to that committee or any other
2 committee through a public opinion message. And of
3 course the public hearing is next week as well. So those
4 are the methods by which the public normally would offer
5 any kind of comments to a budget committee.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

8
9 MR. CHURCHILL: I guess this is directed
10 to you as the Chair. Is this something that would be

11 appropriate for you as the Chair to speak on behalf of
12 the Advisory Council at that time?

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If so directed or we
15 could even direct the Secretary to do that, too.

16

17 (Laughter)

18

19 MR. CHURCHILL: Whoever that may be.
20 Being still in training, I'd be hesitant to speak on
21 behalf but.....

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We could direct the
24 Secretary to compose a letter -- if that's the wish of
25 the Council to object as Alaska residents to object to
26 the cutting of the fund for the Subsistence Division.

27

28 MS. WELLS: I would think it would be
29 appropriate to do that. As she stated that -- isn't
30 there a priority for use of fish and game within our
31 constitution?

32

33 MS. SEE: It's State law. The priority
34 is State law.

35

36 MS. WELLS: And so to remove funding for
37 this, the State's breaking their own law or -- aren't our
38 legislators stepping on their own law? So I would think
39 it would be appropriate because we are -- our whole point
40 is to look out for the subsistence users whether they're
41 Federal or State if they're residents of this state. So
42 I would encourage the Secretary to write that letter for
43 you to sign.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I would delegate my
46 authority to have him sign it himself.

47

48 MR. CHURCHILL: It sounds like in the
49 first out of the foxhole. I guess rather than put it in
50 terms of -- I doubt that by the State withdrawing funding
00306

1 there's any legal issues whatsoever but I think this
2 could probably be stated in the positive. I know working
3 with the Subsistence Division in a number of other
4 capacities the real positives for all Alaskans and maybe
5 in that light is what the tone of the letter could be.
6 And if it's so directed, I'd be happy to draft a letter
7 like that for you signature and sign it for you or for my
8 signature. But I think it would carry a great deal more
9 weight with your signature block and I'm sure between all
10 the communication tools we have, you could review it
11 thoroughly before it actually went.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, see that's the
14 problem, Bob. I have no fax. I have no Internet.

15

16 MR. CHURCHILL: Do you have a telephone?

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I have a telephone.

19

20 MR. CHURCHILL: Bingo.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I can review it if
23 you'll -- if you want to, you know, signed in proxy.
24 That would be fine with me. Yes, I'd be happy to do it
25 that way. So if that's the direction that the Council
26 would like to give, I concur with Bob on one thing, it's
27 not illegal for them to withdraw funding; it's illegal
28 for them not to operate under subsistence priority. They
29 can say they can operate under subsistence priority even
30 without having funding any research or anything like
31 that. So I agree with Bob that it should be not a -- for
32 lack of a better way of putting it -- not a complaining
33 letter but just to state how important this is to all
34 residents in the state of Alaska. And to increasing
35 communication instead of decreasing it. But I'm sure
36 that you're capable of writing the letter and I'll be
37 happy to review it. Allow you to sign it.

38

39 MR. CHURCHILL: Nobody's been able to
40 read my signature for 54 years.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If I had my stamp I
43 would give it to you and you could just stamp it.

44

45 MR. CHURCHILL: Stay out of the subject
46 of stamps.

47

48 (Laughter)

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay, with that,
00307

1 anything more for the Fish and Game?

2

3 MS. SEE: No, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for the
6 Fish and Game? No. Okay, let's go to the Forest
7 Service.

8

9 MR. ZEMKE: My name is Steve Zemke, I'm
10 the Subsistence Coordinator for the Chugach National
11 Forest and given the late hour that this I'll try to make
12 this very brief. What I've handed out is basically a
13 2001 subsistence report for the Chugach and it basically
14 focuses on wildlife management populations and harvests.
15 And the fisheries portion of it was basically discussed
16 during the fall meeting in 2001. For those of the
17 Council members who are new, though you probably already
18 know this, the Chugach National Forest encompasses
19 primarily most of Unit 6 and Unit 7 with a very small
20 portion in the southern part of Unit 14. And the forest
21 is divided into three ranger districts. There's the
22 Cordova ranger district out of Cordova; the Seward ranger
23 district out of Seward and then there's the Glacier
24 ranger district, which is Girdwood. We currently have
25 not that many specific or special subsistence harvest
26 seasons.

27

28 Primarily there are the mountain goat
29 subsistence seasons in Unit 6, which the Council has
30 acted on previously in several different times. And then

31 there's the moose hunt on Copper River Delta and then
32 there's also a moose hunt in King's Bay. Those are the
33 primary actions that the Regional Council has been
34 involved with. Currently in Units C and D there's and
35 customary and traditional use determination for rural
36 residents of C and D, which are Cordova, Tatitlek and
37 Chenega. And they have special, specific harvests for
38 mountain goat and moose. And getting back to the
39 mountain goats in the 2001/2002 season, there's actually
40 a harvest quota of 17 goats established for Unit 6D. And
41 of that quota, there was actually only seven permits
42 issued to rural residents out of the area. And there was
43 only one reported goat harvested. The mountain goat
44 population surveys for those areas that the hunts occur
45 in, right now all the goat populations are pretty much
46 stable or increasing except for Units 249 and register
47 goat Units 252, which are kind of around the Valdez Arm
48 area. And if you want more specific information on those
49 specific units, you can look in the back end of the
50 document and there's long term histories of the goat
00308

1 population trends. And then some harvest information.

2

3 The other major subsistence harvest hunt
4 the forest manages right now is currently the cow moose
5 harvest in the Cordova area in Unit 6C. I think it was
6 probably previously reported, there were about 600
7 Cordova residents applied for these permits. There was
8 five cow permits issued and then all five of those
9 permits were fulfilled and they were successful hunts.
10 And then the Cordova ranger district also has been
11 involved with a cooperative deer management pellet group
12 survey work in Prince William Sound. Though there is
13 currently no specific subsistence season in that area,
14 it's a major subsistence land mammal opportunity. And
15 right now it looks like the deer populations within
16 Prince William Sound are significantly up. There were 16
17 percent increase last year and with this winter, it looks
18 like there's probably even better survival. So there
19 probably isn't any long term problem with that.

20

21 The other special harvest season that's
22 been established is the King's Bay moose harvest, which
23 is a special harvest for the residents of Chenega and
24 Tatitlek where they've been allocated a permit of one
25 bull only for each one of those two communities. This
26 past year there was no permit was issued as there was no
27 request and there's no information about either harvest
28 or whether -- there was no documented use of the area.
29 And that, in 2001, there was actually a special action
30 that closed that season due to the survey data from the
31 previous winter. I think the Council was informed of
32 that. The season was closed, primarily biological
33 concern reasons. This year, January 2002, the Alaska
34 Department of Fish and Game through cooperative work with
35 the Forest Service did an aerial survey and with
36 excellent counting conditions and they counted a total of
37 12 moose in the area. And it consisted of one calf,
38 seven adult females and four adult bulls. And it's
39 presently felt that since there has been very little
40 harvest pressure on those animals that there probably

41 won't be a request for special action. It's -- currently
42 the season is scheduled and it will go on from there.

43

44 And then on the Seward ranger district,
45 really there hasn't been any specific season and bag
46 established for any subsistence harvest except for those
47 regulations that are in the book that mirror the State
48 regulations that are currently there. If there's any
49 questions I'd be more than willing to answer them. Also,
50 if you have specific questions about lower Copper River
00309

1 Delta or Prince William Sound, Milo Burcham, this Cordova
2 ranger district subsistence biologist is here to answer
3 those also.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

6

7 MR. CHURCHILL: Do you see predation as
8 an issue? I was just thinking of the moose numbers and
9 their decline from last year. I think we saw figures of
10 360 down to an estimate of closer to 340. Any thoughts
11 on why the decline? I mean the weather didn't seem to be
12 a factor and habitat doesn't seem to be.

13

14 MR. ZEMKE: Mr. Chair, I think it was
15 already reported with the radio collar study that appears
16 that there may be more predation going on than previously
17 estimated. But that long term goals of that study would
18 be able to establish that. Yeah, if you look at the data
19 last year, the population growth seemed to have leveled
20 out even though the condition factor of the animals was
21 excellent. So predation could be one of those factors
22 and it's certainly going to be looked at.

23

24 MR. CHURCHILL: What do you think the
25 primary predator is or predators?

26

27 MR. ZEMKE: I'm not an expert in that but
28 it was reported that it looks -- it could be brown bear.
29 Could be the major predator.

30

31 MR. CHURCHILL: Does that fit with your
32 knowledge? Do you think that's pretty consistent?

33

34 MR. ZEMKE: Like I say, I'm not the --
35 I'm a fisheries biologist, so I try to stay out of those
36 -- but if -- I say, as reported earlier. I think that's
37 what they were looking at, as brown bear could be the
38 major predator although there could be other ones out as
39 they look long term.

40

41 MR. CHURCHILL: When I fish I try to stay
42 away from brown bear, too.

43

44 MR. BURCHAM: And I could just say
45 something on that real quickly. Again, Milo Burcham at
46 the Cordova ranger district. Just because the number is
47 lower this year, 341, than it was the year before that,
48 367 or something -- I think 367, it shouldn't be
49 interpreted as a decline. There's a lot of slop around
50 counts and there's confidence intervals on either side of

00310

1 them and I see that as fairly stable and not a drastic
2 decline. You're certainly not going to count the exact
3 same numbers from year to year, so. Tending toward
4 stable.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any other
7 questions? Thank you.

8
9 MR. ZEMKE: Thank you very much.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What we'll have to do
12 sometime is put you at the start of the -- we'll have to
13 reverse the order. Poor Forest Service always ends up
14 down at the end.

15
16 MS. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, I just made a
17 note to myself to recycle these things so next time
18 whoever was last will go first and everybody else will
19 drop down one.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay, thank you. And
22 lastly, RurALCAP.

23
24 MR. SAM: Mr. Chair, thank you for giving
25 me the opportunity to testify here today. As of
26 yesterday, I would have been here yesterday but we're
27 working on this whole budget thing with the State and the
28 subsistence issue and, you know, through the
29 representatives and senators. And obviously did not get
30 anywhere with -- you know, common sense says we should
31 protect subsistence but well, like I said, common sense
32 says that but I guess there's a lack of it. Mr. Chair, I
33 just want to touch on a few things that we're working on
34 at RurRAL CAP. And one of the issues that, through our
35 subsistence committee at RurRAL CAP that came up is
36 working more closely with the RAC advisory committees,
37 the State advisory committees. It seems like we're
38 always being reactive to things though. We'd like to be
39 more proactive. And this is my first meeting here with
40 you guys. I know some of you guys on this committee
41 here. And, you know, for RurRAL CAP we want to be --
42 we're a statewide organization and I think we should be
43 more involved in what happens in terms of subsistence
44 issues throughout the state. So one of the things we're
45 working on right now is a statewide Alaska Native
46 wildlife summit. That was supposed to be kicked off in
47 April but the funding sources that we've applied for,
48 we're still waiting for confirmation of those funds. And
49 so we moved it to August.

50
00311

1 And we're planning on inviting a lot of
2 agencies and, you know, from what I hear today of the
3 agencies and their support for subsistence people's ways
4 of life, I think it's important that if we're all going
5 to be working together that we all get on the same page
6 here. For Alaska's benefit at the most, for the people
7 of Alaska. And I don't just mean Native people, I mean
8 all the people of Alaska. If we're going to be, you know
9 -- one of the things that we've been working real hard on

10 is this whole conflict of the urban rural divide. Where
11 is the source of this division in the state of Alaska. I
12 think everybody has a pretty good idea of where it's
13 located. But I think as people of the state of Alaska,
14 we have a lot to offer. I will be attending the Western
15 Interior Regional Advisory Council.

16
17 There are some proposals there that I
18 started on when I was with another organization. The
19 selling of bear parts. In the interior, we strongly
20 oppose that when they propose it to the State Board of
21 Game. It was solemnly defeated. And I know there's one
22 with the Federal Subsistence Board. You know, I don't
23 know if you're familiar with Denakanaga (ph) but it's the
24 Elders committee up in the interior. They strongly
25 oppose the selling of bear parts. And the customary
26 trade thing, you know, was kind of involved in that with
27 Pete Probasco when they were doing their committee
28 meetings here in Anchorage and voice a lot of concerns
29 about the process of it. The inclusion of other Native
30 organizations that at the time we felt should have been
31 included in the process. Because well, RurRALCAP, Tanana
32 Chiefs, AVCP -- they represent a lot of people. I think
33 it would have done a lot of good if they included these
34 large Native organizations.

35
36 And Mr. Churchill brought up the
37 predation problem. That's still going on in the
38 Interior. I'm in contact with some villages in the
39 Interior where dogs are being eaten still yet today. The
40 village of Allakaket, there's -- Allakaket is by the
41 river and then New Allakaket is up on the hill. The kids
42 that live here and by the river, in the morning in the
43 dark have to run through town to get to school. And it's
44 kind of like a game for them, they can hear the wolves
45 and while they are running through town they are barking
46 and howling up there in the hills. And the local
47 hunters, they go back and forth during school hours, kind
48 of like patrolling the roads where the kids go to school.
49 So that's, you know, there's definitely still a problem
50 with predation out there -- or not predation but predator
00312

1 control and the lack of it. And, you know, I don't want
2 to take up too much of your time but I just wanted to
3 meet some of you guys and let you know that we're out
4 there and probably be working more closely with you guys.
5 And if there's any questions, I'll be happy to answer
6 them.

7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Do we have
9 any questions? Does anyone have a question? Susan.
10

11 MS. WELLS: You didn't give us your name.
12

13 MR. SAM: Oh, I'm sorry. I not only fell
14 asleep back there but forgot to give you my name. My
15 name is Gabe Sam, I'm the subsistence advocate for
16 RurRALCAP. Before that I was a director of wildlife and
17 parks for the Tanana Chiefs conference in Interior.
18 Sorry about that.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Kind of a question and
21 comment. You know my experience with RurRALCAP has been
22 outstanding as a resource and I think they've really
23 recently acquired a former chair of the Board of Game on
24 their staff who might also be really helpful. And
25 former, I think he was director of resources for AVCP.
26 So I think it's a real rich relationship potentially that
27 we could have in working with RurRALCAP. I'd encourage
28 us to take advantage of Gabe every chance we get.

29
30 MR. SAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Thank you
33 for coming. With that, we're on to Item 15, new
34 business. And I'm not going to say I'm not going to
35 recognize you if you have any but -- no, if you have any
36 new business, put it on the table.

37
38 MR. CHURCHILL: Is this where you say,
39 hearing none, we go to Item 16?

40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none, we go to
42 Item 16. Okay, establish time and place of next meeting.
43 Ann and I were talking about this prior to the meeting.
44 We had an offer from Cordova at the last meeting and we
45 kind of indicated that at all possible, we would go there
46 this fall. Is that still the wishes of the Council? I
47 mean, do we have any objections from any members of the
48 Council, I guess is a better way of putting it.

49
50 MR. ELVSAAS: I think that's a great
00313
1 idea. We talked about it for two meetings now.

2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right. Okay, that
4 establishes the place. Next is the time. We have a
5 window that goes from -- Susan.

6
7 MS. WELLS: Oh, I was just going to
8 remind you that moose hunting doesn't end until September
9 20th.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I was going to remind
12 you of the same thing, so. Moose hunting ends September
13 25th where I'm at so -- no, 20th, I guess. You're right.
14 Maybe some people's moose hunting ends the 25th.

15
16 MR. ELVSAAS: It seems to me when we met
17 at Mentasta Lake, it was the last day of the season.
18 Wasn't that right?

19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, it was. In this
21 case, if you're going to go to Cordova, you want to
22 finish your moose hunting here and have time to take your
23 animal before you go to Cordova. Or you want to put your
24 name in for the drawing in Cordova.

25
26 (Laughter)

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, from what we just
29 did, if it's passed, there's only going to be five

30 permits you can put your name in for anyhow. But with
31 that in mind, if we look at it and we look at other
32 Councils that are already in place for the end of the
33 season and we want to give Ann some room because she has
34 to go for the Council at the end of the session, that
35 gives us the week -- I don't know why I don't dig my
36 paper out so I can look at it without trying to look that
37 far.

38

39 MR. ELVSAAS: It's the last page.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I know it's the last
42 page. I'm sitting there trying to look across the way at
43 hers.

44

45 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman, the one
46 that's in your book is incorrect. We had a handout
47 that's a blue sheet that's the new one.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay, blue sheet. Right
50 in here.

00314

1 MR. ELVSAAS: What is incorrect in the --
2 the dates?

3

4 MS. WILKINSON: September 15th is the old
5 one. This one is September 8th through the 11th of
6 October.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Take a look at
9 it. Look at it with Ann and see where she is and see if
10 you can come up with a suggestion. Now, the one thing we
11 might want to take into account -- I suppose everybody
12 will probably fly but if we knew what the ferry schedule
13 was, it would be nice to know the ferry schedule into
14 Cordova. Whether we wanted the start of the week or the
15 end of the week. But I think, and Mark can correct me if
16 I'm wrong, the ferry usually runs somewhere like around
17 Tuesday then runs on the weekend doesn't it?

18

19 MR. KING: I think so. I'm not sure.
20 (Indiscernible - away from microphone).

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But probably the
23 majority of people would fly over there. Of course you
24 can't go berry picking if you fly. Okay, anyhow, take a
25 look at the thing and, Ann, I can't find my blue one, I'm
26 sorry. I looked for it. Have you got a spare copy?
27 Well, Ann has to be here on the 10th and 11th of October.
28 We say that moose season ends on the 20th, right here.
29 And I'm pretty sure it ends on the 20th up where we are
30 too. Then that would give us the week of the 23rd
31 through 27th; the week of the 30th through the 4th of
32 October. And whichever is in the -- you know, whichever
33 the rest of you would prefer. It would be nice, just in
34 case you got a moose on the last day, to have a couple
35 days to take care of it.

36

37 MS. WILKINSON: And I was thinking of
38 the 4th (indiscernible - away from microphone) and all
39 those other people that need to be at these meetings.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right. So why don't we
42 look at some -- yeah, that looks good to me. Somewhere
43 between the 30th of September and the 4th of October.
44 Does that fit into your schedule? And we need what, a
45 two day meeting or a three in fall? Ann.

46

47 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman, I don't
48 know yet. I haven't seen the proposals for this fall
49 yet.

50

00315

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Should we schedule a
2 three and we can always cut it down to a two? Well,
3 would everybody -- let's take the end of the week because
4 that gives us a chance to take a weekend ferry because
5 more than likely there will be a weekend ferry. If
6 somebody wants to drive over there. Because by that time
7 they're normally taking kids to ball games and they
8 usually leave on a Thursday and a Saturday or something
9 like that then bring them back on a Sunday so a person
10 could go to the meetings and leave there on a Saturday if
11 they wanted to.

12

13 MR. CHURCHILL: Before I comment, is
14 there any letters that have to be written about this?
15 No, I'm just teasing you, anything will work out fine
16 with me.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You have to write
19 letters to all of the motels to see if there's -- Ann.

20

21 MS. WILKINSON: Well, while it is
22 possible for me to get things done in two days, I'm not a
23 real miracle worker.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You'd prefer to
26 have.....

27

28 MS. WILKINSON: And I am getting older
29 and it takes me a little longer now.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So if we took the first
32 of the week, that would be easier for you?

33

34 MS. WILKINSON: It would. It would be
35 much easier for me. However, I will check with the ferry
36 and see if there's some problem with that. And if people
37 do want to take the ferry and it works out that we need
38 to have it later, I can contact everybody and say, you
39 know, would you rather have it later in the week, that's
40 fine.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Like I said, there's
43 normally -- once ball season starts, there's normally a
44 ferry going back to Cordova on Sunday from Valdez because
45 it hauls ball teams back. And then somewhere towards
46 Thursday or Friday, it goes back to Valdez because it's
47 normally hauling a ball team back in that direction. So
48 it doesn't really matter whether you put it in the front
49 or the back. So let's try the first three days of that

50 week then, at this point in time. If that's okay with
00316

1 everybody on the Council. 30th, 1st and 2nd. If there's
2 no conflict. Do we need a motion to that effect? No,
3 okay. In that case, we've settled the time, we've
4 settled the place. We need a motion.

5
6 MR. CHURCHILL: I move that we adjourn.

7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second?

9
10 MS. WELLS: Second.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The meeting has been
13 adjourned. Thank you.

14
15 (Off record)

16
17 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

00317
1 C E R T I F I C A T E

2
3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)

4)ss.

5 STATE OF ALASKA)
6

7 I, Joseph P. Kolasinski, Notary Public in and for the
8 state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court
9 Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:

10
11 THAT the foregoing pages numbered 173 through 317 contain
12 a full, true and correct Transcript of the SOUTHCENTRAL FEDERAL
13 SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME II, taken
14 electronically by Nathaniel Hile on the 6th day of March 2002,
15 beginning at the hour of 8:00 o'clock a.m. at Anchorage,
16 Alaska;

17
18 THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript
19 requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by under
20 my direction and reduced to print to the best of our knowledge
21 and ability;

22
23 THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested
24 in any way in this action.

25
26 DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 13th day of March 2002.

27
28
29
30
31 _____
32 Joseph P. Kolasinski
33 Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 04/17/04