SOUTHCENTRAL FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL
ADVISORY COUNCIL PUBLIC MEETING

VOLUME II

October 8, 2003
Talkeetna Alaska Lodge
Talkeetna, Alaska
8:30 o'clock a.m.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ralph Lohse, Chairman
Robert Churchill
Gilbert Dementi
Fred Elvsaas
Sylvia Lange
Susan Wells

Regional Coordinator, Ann Wilkinson

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Talkeetna, AK - 10/8/2003)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Call the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council meeting to order. Good morning.

MS. WHEELER: Good morning, Mr. Chair, Council members. If you'll turn to Tab D in your Council books, you'll have the fairly meaty section on the Fisheries Information Services and this morning I'll walk you through it. If you have any questions as we're going along by all means ask them. Pretty heavy duty competition looking out the window but I'll try to stay focused here.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, we can't see it so we'll look at you.

MS. WHEELER: I know. That's why I keep thinking.....

MR. CHURCHILL: I think we've got the better view.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We can look at a mountain any time.

MS. WHEELER: Yes, it's pretty beautiful.

(Laughter)

MS. WHEELER: The introduction to the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program is on Pages 97 to 108 in your Council books. And just to give you a little bit of historical overview because I know there's some new members and some of you may not be as familiar with the program as others are so I'll try and run you through it. But this is sort of historical or some background information.

The goal of the program, the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program, and just to remind you, it's the Fisheries Information Services, which is part of the Office of Subsistence Management and we are a research arm of subsistence management. The goal of our program is to fund projects that address the highest priority subsistence

fishery issues. We fund projects that are technically sound that have broad public support, which is, of course, why we're here, and also provide, or most importantly perhaps provide information for managers to manage Federal Subsistence fisheries.

The projects that we fund provide both immediate information, for example, in-season harvest monitoring and we've got a number of those kinds of projects and we also fund long-term information needs, the traditional ecological knowledge projects as an example. And I know Dr. Simeon came and spoke to you a year or so ago about the findings of his project. And we fund, again, those projects are to provide information for Federal Subsistence fisheries management.

The way that we get at important issues is through you, through the Regional Advisory Councils. The Regional Advisory Councils identify the issues and information needs. These can be revisited on an annual basis, should be revisited on an annual basis to ensure that we are, in fact, when we put out the call for proposals that we are, in fact, addressing the highest priority information needs.

We also work with Federal and State managers so that if there's something that comes up in season, you know, we make sure that we get at that as well. The criteria for project selection and this is an important one because I know you've got a couple of projects in front of you that you may have questions about and we will certainly address those later, but the criteria for project selection are strategic priority and under that sort of broad category, we look at Federal jurisdiction, whether or not we're talking about waters over which there's Federal jurisdiction. We look at the conservation mandate, we look at allocation priority, is there a subsistence allocation issue. We look at data gaps, is this a species that we know a lot about, that we don't know anything about, where are we in the information needs. We look at the role of the resource as far as subsistence users go. And we also look at local concern, have local concerns been raised about this particular issue.

So that's all under the category of strategic priority.

We also look at the scientific and technical merit, is the investigation plan sound, does it have technical flaws, is it scientifically and

methodologically sound. We look at past performance and administrative expertise of the particular organization. So if we've had this -- if we've funded this particular organization to do work before, how have they performed. Have they turned in their reports on time, have they invoiced us, that sort of thing.

And finally we look at capacity building and partnerships. Are we involving local people in a meaningful way. We have the full range in our programs. We have tribal and local organizations serving as principal investigators. We have them as co-investigators and we have them sort of hiring on. But our goal is to involve people in a meaningful way. So in other words, it's not good enough to just pay a tribal council to arrange logistics, that's not particularly meaningful, we want to involve them in a meaningful way so that we get people involved in the whole management process.

In terms of the process for project selection, we put out the call for proposals typically in November, that's when we have a good idea of how much monies are going to be available for the following fiscal year projects. We put out the call for proposals, the Technical Review Committee meets and reviews the initial proposals. And those initial proposals are a page or two. The Technical Review Committee goes through them, selects which ones should be further developed into an investigation plan. We get back to the principal investigators, they submit the investigation plans which are reviewed in depth by the Technical Review Committee. This summer we had a three day meeting during which we reviewed -- or the Technical Review Committee reviewed 81 investigation plans. So it's a fairly detailed process.

The Technical Review Committee goes through the investigation plans, makes their recommendations for which projects should be funded -- for which projects they believe satisfy all the project criteria selection and they forward that recommendation to you all, which is why we're here today, we'll look at the recommendations of the Technical Review Committee. Then in December at the Board meeting, the Federal Subsistence Board, the Board will look at both the Technical Review Committee and also the recommendations of the Regional Advisory Councils.

So it's a fairly lengthy process and I know it's frustrated some people because they have to submit an investigation plan in May of one year for funding for the following year, but in order to have a process where we

have broad public review, where we can look at broad public support, that's the way that the program runs.

There's a couple of guidelines that the Federal Board goes by and I'll mention just a few of them here. A minimum of 60 percent of project monies go to non-Federal sources. So the goal of this program is not to fund a bunch of Federal agencies to do the work, it's to get other people involved. We do fund, as I said, Federal agencies, State agencies, and NGOs, non-governmental organizations. Projects can be funded and often are funded for up to three years duration. The Federal Subsistence Board has decided because, even though it seems like a lot of money it's really not a lot of money in the context of research, so the Federal Board has determined that some activities are not eligible for funding under this program, and some of these include, habitat protection, restoration and enhancement, hatchery propagation enhancement, restoration and supplementation, and contaminant assessment, evaluation and monitoring. So those are three sort of general topics that are sort of not considered for funding under this program, and it's not because the Federal Board doesn't think they're important it's because we have a limited pool of money and there's only so much money that can go around so they determined that those three general areas are not going to be funded under this program.

The Board also has several guidelines for funding. They have a guideline model of funding by region. So a certain percentage of the available funding goes to each of the 10 regions. Table 1 on Page 101 of your book shows the guideline model for funding by region for 2004. You can see in that chart that Southcentral, the guideline model is five percent of Department of Interior funding and 32.5 percent of Department of Agriculture funding, for a total of about 681,000, so it's a nice sum of money to spend on research.

The Federal Subsistence Board also has a guideline model by data type. There's the stock status and trends projects that they've determined should get about two-thirds of the available funding for a particular region. And then the harvest monitoring and traditional, ecological knowledge projects which get about one-third of available funding. This year for Southcentral the project submissions for harvest monitoring and traditional ecological knowledge didn't actually meet the guidelines, sort of the target of about 227, so we'll have to work on that for next year to make sure that we get a good healthy

supply of projects to actually select from.

So for 2004, just to give you an overview, there were 81 projects submitted for funding consideration statewide. These included nine projects for this region.

Yes.

MR. CHURCHILL: My understanding, though, even though the percentages aren't a target, that one of the operating principles you have is you may have a larger percentage in one category to fund the quality of project you need to rather than go down on maybe a lower quality project in the other area. So personally I think that's really a healthy way to look at it rather than just funding by category and locking yourself in and not funding the projects we really need to. I think that just is good judgment.

MS. WHEELER: That's an excellent point, and thank you for bringing it up, Member Churchill.

Yeah, these are soft guidelines, I would say they're soft guidelines. We use them as guidelines, we have a rough idea when we're looking at these projects, but certainly if there is a higher priority project on one side of the data type or another. I guess where we don't have a lot of flexibility or the TRC certainly doesn't have a lot of flexibility is between regions because determining research priorities or which is a higher priority project across regions is a real judgment call. So within a region we have these soft targets but not necessarily across regions.

So we had 81 projects submitted for funding consideration statewide. There were nine projects submitted for Southcentral region which included six stock, status and trends and three harvest monitoring TEK projects. And overall, 64 projects were recommended for funding by the Technical Review Committee statewide, and that included six projects for Southcentral, and I'll talk about that in a little bit.

Yes.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Isn't there more than that.

MS. WHEELER: Well, there's six but one of them has two options.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Sorry.

MS. WHEELER: That's okay, make sure -- I keep knocking this table here, sorry about that Nathan.

Yeah, so by all means if you have any questions as we're going along to clarify, please do. The overview for Southcentral region begins on Page 109 and goes through to Page 153. The overview begins with the discussion of issues and information needs and how well funded studies have addressed the issues and information needs for this region. There's a summary of Southcentral issues and information needs on Page 110 and 111 in your book and I have a full set with me if you're interested in looking at the full set.

As I said earlier, the Technical Review Committee and, just to address, again, some questions that some of you may have with regard to the Technical Review Committee as to who sits on it, we have representation from each of the Federal agencies on the Technical Review Committee, as well as three State of Alaska representatives from each of three divisions, the Division of Sportfish, the Division of Commercial Fisheries, and the Subsistence Division. In addition, we have two of our project partner -- or the Partners in Fisheries Monitoring positions that sit on the Technical Review Committee, both for their insights but also to teach them about this whole scientific review process. And I believe we have the Park Service's member at this point is Dave Nelson who is in the audience, so I think he's the only Technical Review Committee member we have in the audience today.

As I said the TRC forwarded nine projects for development of investigation plans. These projects are located throughout the region and on Page 112 in your Board book there's a map showing the locations of all the different projects that were forwarded for investigation plans in this region.

Eight of the nine projects address assessment of salmon harvest or abundance, clearly salmon are an important issue and information need in this region.

Table 1 on Page 113 shows project costs by organization, Table 2 on Page 114 shows local hire and matching funds for the investigation plans. And these are more background information. We do publish -- we look at, again, in order to satisfy the Board requirement of no more than 60 percent of the funding going to Federal agencies,

we have to look at what's going to Federal agency -- or no less than -- what is it, I always get confused on that one. In any event, we're not supposed to have a lot of the funding going to Federal agencies, so we have to look at what's going to Federal agencies, what's going to local organizations, what's going in terms of local hire, all these different things which is why we ask these questions in the budget.

Table 3 on Page 115 shows the stock, status and trends projects for this region and shows the Technical Review Committee recommendation as well as the requested budget for each of the three years that all of those projects are looking at. There are six projects submitted for funding consideration, one with two options as we mentioned earlier, and the TRC recommended funding five of the six projects in this category. And I'll just give you a quick rundown of these projects just to highlight a couple of them. And I would say that on Page 116 in your book there is the stock, status and trends projects and also the harvest monitoring and traditional ecological knowledge projects are there listed in order of funding priority. And there's a line below -- there's a line -- on the stock, status and trends there's a line below sort of the available funding level for that data type, and I'll talk about this in a little bit as far as the funding goes because in Southcentral we do have a little -- there's a little flexibility there.

Project 04-503, which was thought to be the highest priority project by the Technical Review Committee, the reason why the Technical Review Committee recommended this for funding is basically because it improved assessment of chinook as the greatest information need for this region. The project basically continues a previously funded project, which demonstrated the feasibility of estimating in-river abundance through tagging and provided crucial information for both Federal and State managers. I would note that Native Village of Eyak is the principal investigator and certainly this project is a great capacity building project and so it got high marks all around from the Technical Review Committee, and again was the highest priority project for this region in the stock, status and trends data type.

Project 04-502 looks at assessment of sockeye escapement into Tanada Creek. This project was also was previously funded. It provides important escapement data to assess and manage Batzulnetas subsistence fishery and the PI performance has been

excellent. It's got a strong capacity building component, again an important project. And Park Service is the PI on that project.

As well as the next project, 04-501, which looks at assessment of sockeye escapement into Long Lake. This is a new project for this program, but it will continue the longest escapement data set in the Copper River drainage. It's our understanding that this project is in danger of being lost as it's been run as a volunteer effort for the past 30 years so this is putting some funding into this pretty critical data set.

Project 04-507, for which the Alaska Department of Fish and Game is the PI, it's looking at Copper River genetics. It was originally proposed in 2001 but deferred pending development of an in-river abundance estimate for chinook. We have such an estimate now so this project is timely to fund along with 04-503.

Now, the next project, 04-506, which on the chart on Page 116 is below the line. This project was recommended for funding by the Technical Review Committee because of excess funding in the traditional ecological knowledge data type. So there was -- not all the funding was being used in that data type so there was some excess so the TRC recommended this project thinking that it was an important project. This project, 04-506 is an index of in-season abundance in the lower Copper River. There's sufficient application to management of subsistence fisheries and Federal conservation units, and the Technical Review Committee recommends funding option A, primarily because it's the most expensive of the two options and the jury is still out on which option is going to work so they recommended funding the more expensive of the two just so that the bases are covered on that one.

The last project in that data type is not recommended for funding by the Technical Review Committee. The Technical Review Committee felt that the application to assessment of in-river abundance at Miles Lake sonar is not sufficiently developed at this time and there's limited need to develop another program to measure timing and abundance of sockeye salmon in the lower Copper. So they did not recommend that project for funding.

Moving on to the traditional ecological knowledge and harvest monitoring projects. Table 4 shows those projects, Table 4 on Page 117 shows those projects as well as the Technical Review Committee recommendation. As

I said there were three projects submitted for funding consideration. The total funding requested for those three projects was 197, which is below the $227,000 guideline for this region.

The TRC only recommended one of the three projects for funding in this data type, Project 04-553 is the traditional ecological knowledge of long-term changes in salmon runs in the Copper River, it's a good idea, it's strategically important. The investigation plan is scientifically and technically sound and the PI is certainly more than capable so the Technical Review Committee did recommend that project for funding. I would add that that project was also submitted for funding consideration last year but the Technical Review Committee felt that given the obligations of that particular investigator that he needed some time to finish up existing obligations before they felt comfortable recommending another large-scale project of this type. And that is a three year project -- I'm sorry, two year project.

The latter two projects, 04-551, the title of it is traditional ecological knowledge pink salmon and ecosystem dynamics in Prince William Sound. The Technical Review Committee felt that it was a good idea, pretty provocative materials in the investigation plan but there's really no Federal application. So in spite of the fact it was an interesting idea, the Federal application wasn't sufficiently developed in the investigation plan and the Technical Review Committee didn't feel that they could recommend it for funding.

The last project, I know I've had a number of questions about it already so I'm sure you're curious as to why the Technical Review Committee did not recommend it for funding. It's the reasons for declines and subsistence harvest in the Copper River. That project, you've all identified this as an information need, it is an information need, it is strategically important, however, the investigation plan was technically flawed. It was -- there were enough problems in the investigation plan that the Technical Review Committee felt that it's a very important idea, it's strategically important, this project needs to be done but this isn't the way to do it. And so they recommended that that project be -- you know, the idea is important but that it be developed further and better and resubmitted for funding consideration next year.

Also we would add that the principal investigator on that project is very busy and the Technical

Review Committee, again, felt that he needs to focus on -- you know, rather than sort of redeveloping a new investigation plan in time for funding consideration for this year, that he needs to satisfy some other obligations on projects. So again it's not attacking the idea, there's recognition that it's an important idea, this just isn't the way to get there.

On Pages 119 to 153 in your book are executive summaries of each of the nine projects in front of you. But, Mr. Chair, that's all I have at this point unless the Council has any specific questions on any of the projects before you or on any recommendations.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, I'd like a little explanation on 04-506, Option A and Option B. I kind of lost the difference between the two of them. And they were both going to be operated by the same investigators, right?

MS. WHEELER: That's correct. At this point it's my understanding that the reason why the recommendation was for funding Option A at this point is because there is still ongoing discussions about which option is the best option so they felt if they had -- if they had recommended Option B that would preclude doing Option A.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

MS. WHEELER: And at this point since there's still discussions they felt that they'd recommend Option A which is the most expensive of the two with the understanding that if they did Option B that's what it would cost, it would cost what they have in the investigation plan.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So basically it was just to give them the option to do the best of the two and if they do Option B then the money will be returned to the pot?

MS. WHEELER: That's correct, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Any questions from any of the Council for Polly on the different decisions that the TRC made and the projects that have been proposed?

Bob.

MR. CHURCHILL: Well, I guess it's more of

a comment, you know, I really like to see the direction that's being -- that's taken and continues to be taken about local education and development of talent in communities. That's an ongoing problem, it seems across the state and I was looking at how these budgets are distributed and it's loaded heavily to local training. Obviously, I think that's a great way to go. I appreciate that on these projects.

MS. WHEELER: You bring up an interesting point because that's one of the things -- you know, it's a new way of doing business and there is some resistance to it, as you might imagine. And one of the criticisms is that it's more costly to have this capacity building component, and it is, it's more costly in terms of money and also in terms of time. But we feel that it's a really important element of this program and so far it's working really well.

MR. CHURCHILL: I guess an insight from my other lives and working, at the get go it is really pretty expensive but in the long haul where you have the existing talent in these communities to do the ongoing projects over the next 40, 50, 60 years and the cost goes down and it's much more cost efficient. So start up costs, yeah, but I would caution people, you know, pay me now, pay me later sort of thing, I think it's a great investment.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'll make a comment on that, too. I go along with Bob on that. But also, there's only other thing that it does to, it gives ownership. And anytime people have ownership in a resource they take care of it a lot better than they do than if it's being managed by somebody or for somebody else. And by getting local involvement in it you've got local ownership. And the resource all of a sudden becomes important to them, even more important than it was.

Well, at this time, I think we need to make some decisions, don't we, Polly, we need to come up with whether we take the TRCs recommendations. Does anybody have any information they'd like on any of these projects? There are people here that can speak to some of the projects. Some of us know something about some of them. I see we have Native Village of Eyak people here that could speak to the projects on the Lower Copper River.

Anybody want to ask questions about Long Lake, I can tell you about that. I don't see anybody else here other than Staff, but if you have any questions on any

of these projects or if you feel like there are other projects that you'd like to recommend that we look at for future years or if you feel that these don't fit what we've described as our needs, then now is a good time to speak up on it otherwise we need to make -- as a Council, we need to make some decisions as to whether we accept the TRCs recommendations or whether we want to put our stamp on something else or whatever, or whether we don't like any of them.

Bob.

MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, I'd like to move that we accept the TRCs recommendations as contained in our Council books.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second.

MR. DEMENTI: Second.

MS. WELLS: Second.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I hear to seconds, so we.....

MR. CHURCHILL: We have support.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: .....we have a second and a third. Okay, it's been moved and seconded that we accept the TRCs recommendations. Does anybody feel like they need anymore discussion or information on any of these or can we move?

(No comments)

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

MR. CHURCHILL: Call the question.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Question's been called. All in favor of accepting the TRCs recommendations for these fundings -- for these projects for funding signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed, signify by saying nay.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. Polly.

MS. WHEELER: Mr. Chair, at this point I would ask, too, that we at the winter Board meetings we intend to have some of the principal investigators here to give you sort of a description of their project, and if you have specific projects that you would be interested in, if you want to just let me know, me or Doug McBride know at some point in time or I guess the coordinator as well, just so we can line up the PI to come in and just let us know.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Polly, and we'll be looking forward to that. I can speak to the effectiveness of one project, and that's the one that's been done by Eyaks down in Cordova. That has had an impact on our fishery -- both on our commercial fishery and on our subsistence fishery in a number of ways. The information has been very valid and very good, so it's been a real add-on to the Copper River. So I think that we have actually, as an area, we have already gained value from these projects, not only knowledge but value itself. So I appreciate them.

Bob.

MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, I've gotten to be a little concerned about the possible impact of some of these projects on smoked salmon and if they can bring some of that to test the quality I'd be more assured.

(Laughter)

MR. CHURCHILL: No, I'm just teasing.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, we could ask the principal investigators to bring some smoked salmon when they come to the winter meeting so we can all try it and see what it tastes like. Because one of the principal investigators is sitting over there won first prize for his smoked salmon at the Cordova Food Festival or something like that. So if he had some samples, we'd appreciate it.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Polly.

MS. WHEELER: This doesn't have anything to do with smoked salmon but I did want to.....

(Groans)

MS. WHEELER: .....sorry, bring us back to work. I did want to just mention one thing, you in Southcentral have the unique and exciting status of having the only Partners in Fisheries Monitoring social scientist, Erica McCall and she's just done a stellar job, and she's a really tremendous resource for this region. And in part because of her excellent work, the program has now just put out a call for another social scientist. We have six biologists and one social scientist, but we've put out a call for another social scientist in the Partners Program. Unfortunately -- or I guess it speaks to Erica's abilities because Southcentral is excluded because they already have a social scientist who's doing such a great job. But anyway, I just wanted to bring that up.

The Partners Program is another program that builds capacity, that builds commitment to the program, builds commitment to management and resources and everything else and it's been going well. But I did want to point out that Erica's just really doing a fine job and you all are lucky to have her as a resource.

So thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think we've been lucky in a lot of ways.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We've had people who have done a good job on these projects in the past and we've had good projects put before us. It's been easy to select projects simply because there's been good projects to select from.

MS. WHEELER: Pat just reminded me, Mr. Chair, in the back -- this is one part that I always forget, there are several inter-regional projects, and these projects are -- they begin on Page 155. There's an inter-regional overview and there's several projects in this data type. These are funny projects because they tend to be more organizational or data set development or database development, I guess, with the exclusion of the eulachon project. But there's three projects, two in the stock, status and trends data type and one in the harvest monitoring and traditional ecological knowledge data type. And the Technical Review Committee has recommended all of these projects for funding. And again, they're more -- two

of the three are developments of databases and part of this is trying to coordinate between the State and the Federal system and getting these databases organized and on line. And the one, harvest monitoring, TEK project, 04-751 is a continuation of a project that has been funded for three years, the 01-107, and it's again this continuing, pulling existing data types together, it's not collecting any new information, but it's organizing existing information so that it will be available in one place.

I will say that most of these projects don't have a real high capacity building component, but part of that is because they are, again, just pulling together existing information and in the long run having that information in one place is going to be really critical both for managers and also for users to have these reports. This 04-751 project, they just finished -- well, the 01-107 project that's funded, and this is a continuation of it, they just finished their 2001 subsistence harvest overview and it's got subsistence harvest by region. And if any of you are interested in getting a copy of that I can make sure that you do it because it's hot off the press.

But again, the Technical Review Committee has recommended all of these projects. They satisfy the project selection criteria, and they are inter-regional so they're across regions, often have a statewide application.

So with that you might want to consider making a recommendation along the lines of the TRC or pull out all of them or whatever you want to do.

Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Looking at the projects I only have questions about one of them and how it affects inter-regional and that's the effects of salinity on the hatching success of eulachon eggs in Alaska. I was wondering how that's connected to inter-regional, but.....

MR. ELVSAAS: Well, it's Southeast and the Cook Inlet.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And probably Prince William Sound, too. But I was just wondering how the effects of salinity had anything to do with.....

MS. WHEELER: This project was submitted originally just for Southeast and then they broadened the

application and that's why it's included as an inter-regional project.....

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

MS. WHEELER: .....because there's Cook Inlet and Prince William Sound and also Southeast.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. I'll have to look at the project.

MS. WHEELER: Mr. Chair, I would add that all three of these projects are well within the guideline cost parameters, I think it's five percent. Inter-regional projects get five percent of DOI funding and they're well within that parameter.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. I was just trying to, you know, with inter-regional like that, I was just trying to see why that had a priority like that. But I can understand it after I look back at it what they're trying to do anyhow, and it's a low cost project that we might learn something from it and we might not. We might find out that they don't spawn in saltwater.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We need a motion to accept these inter-regional projects, one, all or TRC recommendations. Do I hear a motion.

Bob.

MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, I'd like to move that we accept the inter-regional projects as written.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second.

MS. WELLS: Second.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and seconded that we accept these inter-regional projects as written and recommended by the TRC.

Discussion.

(No comments)

MR. CHURCHILL: Call the question.

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

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed, signify by saying nay.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. Thank you, Polly.

MS. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, I bet you most of us haven't spent that much money in that short of time in and for the rest of our life.

Okay, with this we're going to go on to Subsistence Resource Commission appointments, Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve. Barbara Cellarius is going to give us an overview of it.

MS. CELLARIUS: Mr. Chairman, Barbara Cellarius, Wrangell-St.Elias National Park and Preserve, subsistence coordinator.

And we have a position that needs to be filled on our SRC. It's a position for appointment by the RAC. Whoever is appointed to the Commission must be the member of either a Regional Advisory Council or a local advisory council, and also engaged in subsistence uses within the Park. And I passed out a handout this morning that's a map which shows Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve and surrounding communities. You'll see that there are circles around a number of the names of communities on the map. The resident zone communities for Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve extend from Yakutat in the southeast, far southeast corner, to Healy Lake in the northwest corner of the map. And the other thing you see on the map is there are a number of stars, which I've highlighted in yellow. Each of those starts represent a current member of the SRC. So you'll see two in Yakutat, one in the middle of the park near McCarthy, three in Tazlina, one in Gakona, and one in Dot Lake.

I provide you with this map because it's one of the concerns of the SRC is having a geographic distribution of our members, that they're not all clustered

in one place. It's useful for when we're dealing with proposals to have people with experience, since we have such a large geographic area and the different units.

We discussed, the SRC discussed the vacancies at the last couple of meetings and have come up with a couple of names. One of the names is also supported by the local advisory committees in the area. So I polled the local advisory committees as part of this process.

So I'll just -- if that is what would be useful to you, just give you a little biographical information on each of the two individuals. I also have with me, you know, a list of the AC membership, there's one member of the RAC who lives in the area that's a resident zone community for the Park as well.

So Joseph Hart you met yesterday. He was speaking for the Chitina Native Corporation. He lives in Tazlina and is a Chitina indian working for his village corporation, Chitina Native Corporation. He's a military veteran having served for just under nine years in the Army. Since returning in 1996 he's been actively involved in resource management, including State and Federal regulatory processes on fish and wildlife. He serves on the Copper Basin Advisory Committee. And being a Native Alaskan has a perspective on local Native customs and traditions. In the past Mr. Hart has served on different committees and boards. He was the chairman of the Alaska Federation of Natives Land Committee dealing with land and resource issues on a statewide basis, also as a member of AFN, the AFN Right-of-Way Committee, he's addressed concerns on the pipeline Right-of-Way renewal, discussing many items of concern with State and Federal agencies. He is currently the Chairman for his village Native corporations land committee overseeing and addressing harvest conservation and access concerns relating to their private properties. He participates in several regional organizations for the Copper River Valley discussing a large list of issues and concerns and more importantly seeking solutions. These organizations include the Copper River Native Association, Subsistence Committee, Copper Valley Economic Development Council, Copper Valley Chamber of Commerce, Chitina Native Corporation Lands Committee and the Copper Basin Advisory Committee.

So the other name that was suggested was William Cole Ellis of Nabesna. Although he lives on the Nabesna Road it's just barely in Unit 12, the SRC members asked that his name be put forward for this under-

represented part of the Park. I will also note that he's a hunting guide and his guiding area is Jacksina which is in Unit 11. Cole Ellis serves as vice-Chair at the Tok cutoff Nabesna Road Fish and Game Advisory Committee. He served on the AC for about three years. For a bit of context, Cole is the son of Bill Ellis who serves as the Chair of the Wrangell-St. Elias SRC in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Cole was born in Anchorage and moved with his family to Nabesna in 1960. He has been hunting, fishing, trapping for most of his life. He home-schools his children in Nabesna. In addition to a subsistence user he is a master guide and air taxi operator. He has served as a board member for the Alaska Professional Hunters Association. I have received letters supporting Cole's appointment to the SRC from both the Paxson and the Copper Basin ACs, and I have those letters with me.

So if you have any questions.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, Barbara, where, on our map right here, where would we put Cole and where would we put John?

MS. CELLARIUS: Joe.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Joe.

MS. CELLARIUS: Okay, thank you for the question. Since I gave you the map I should have done that. The three stars that -- there are three stars together, you see, in sort of the middle part of the map, Joe Hart lives in Tazlina as do three sitting members of the SRC. Cole Ellis lives on the Nabesna Road. And if you look at the northern most star which is Dot Lake, and that's along the Tok Cutoff, the Nabesna Road, if you know where Slana is -- can everybody find Slana on the map, he lives -- there's a road going east from Slana going into the Park and he lives on that road. I can give you the mile marker if you'd like.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, Barbara. I guess what I'm looking at is it seems like we have a lot of members down in the Tazlina area and few up north, but could you contrast Joe versus Cole; what they would bring to the committee that doesn't now have -- I mean instead of getting maybe more of the same we would -- would one add maybe a little different perspective than we now enjoy on that committee?

MS. CELLARIUS: One of the concerns, as I mentioned, of the SRC, is the geographic representation. We have a lot of people with experience, which is more focused on Unit 11. And then of course we have the two people from Yakutat, which represent sort of a different part of the Park. We do have another guide who is on the SRC. But both of the individual -- both that individual and Cole are also subsistence users.

Obviously, Joe Hart would bring the Chitina Native perspective as opposed to the guide perspective.

But as I said one of the things the SRC was concerned about was the geographic representation from -- somebody from the Chistochina, Slana, Mentasta, Nabesna area, the Tok Cutoff area.

MR. CHURCHILL: Which, if I'm understanding you right, Cole would bring that that it doesn't now enjoy.

MS. CELLARIUS: Yes.

MR. CHURCHILL: Is there anyone now that represents the Chitina Native Corporation on the committee?

MS. CELLARIUS: We have no one who represents Chitina on the committee. We have representation from Yakutat Tlingit. From the Ahtna area we have two members from Tazlina, an Ahtna elder and the village council president from Tazlina. And then Dot Lake, the upper Tanana we have Chuck Miller.

MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you. But the committee is asking us to really consider the geographics on this, bringing somebody in from the more northern part?

MS. CELLARIUS: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Barbara, who do we have -- we've got the three from Tazlina, and then we have one that's just off to the north of that slightly, is that.....

MS. CELLARIUS: That's Gakona, Suzanne.....

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's Gakona.

MS. CELLARIUS: .....McCarthy, who works for the local community college and also is a river rafting.....

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay, so that's on the Gakona River there -- I mean that's from Gakona?

MS. CELLARIUS: From Gakona.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Not Gulkana, but Gakona.

MS. CELLARIUS: Devi.

MS. SHARP: Yeah.

MS. CELLARIUS: Gakona or Gulkana?

MS. SHARP: For who?

MS. CELLARIUS: Suzanne.

MS. SHARP: Gakona.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gakona.

MS. CELLARIUS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

MS. CELLARIUS: Gakona.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, Council, you're heard the two who have said that they would serve. Do you have any recommendations or any questions you'd like to ask Barbara or a motion to put on the table to put one of them on the SRC. It sounds to me like both of them would be totally capable of filling the post.

Bob.

MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, I mean I don't know Cole Ellis, I've talked to Joe Hart a lot, I have heard about Cole Ellis through the AC system, and both seem to have excellent reputations. I'm leaning towards respecting the committee asking us to bring in somebody from the north. I mean if that's their desire, I don't have any real on the ground sort of knowledge but I'd tend to respect that, which would lean me toward Cole Ellis, if that's what they're asking us to do. They must have a good reason for asking that.

But if anybody else has some insights I'd sure like to hear them.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Did you make a motion, Bob?

MR. CHURCHILL: No. I just -- I guess in summary, if I'm hearing it right the committee's asking us to put somebody on from the more northern part of the area, which is Cole Ellis, and I'd lean towards that unless we had good reason to feel that Joe would add a greater value. And I'm not -- both seem to be excellent candidates from what I understand.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gilbert.

MR. DEMENTI: Did you say you had a guide on your committee already?

MS. CELLARIUS: Yes. Paul Claus is an air taxi operator and a guide.

MR. DEMENTI: Okay, and then Cole is a guide also.

MS. CELLARIUS: Cole is also a guide. I'd like to ask Devi.....

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Barbara, I don't think Paul Claus is a hunting a guide, though, is he hunting guide?

MS. SHARP: (Nods affirmatively)

MS. CELLARIUS: That's what I.....

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, is he hunting guide, oh, okay.

MS. CELLARIUS: He's a hunting guide but I believe he's also a mountaineering guide.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's what I thought he was, was a mountaineering guide.

MS. CELLARIUS: And that's what I wanted to ask Devi about.

MS. SHARP: Devi Sharp, Wrangell-St. Elias. Paul Claus represents a subsistence family. He is a mountaineering guide. He runs a lodge. And he also has a hunting guide license and is active.

Cole comes from a family of people who have guided but he also leads a subsistence lifestyle. There's no mistake about it. They home-school. They live at the end of the road. They are very much a very traditional subsistence family, and it's a very strong value.

It's always disturbed me that we make such a big distinction between commercial fishermen and subsistence users and commercial guides and subsistence users, because as you know, as many of you wear both hats in the real world, it's not an either or.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, does the whole Ellis family or clan pretty much all lives up there, I mean this is an extended family, isn't it?

MS. SHARP: There's two of the Ellis brothers who live at the end of the road. Another one, the third one lives in Glennallen and runs an air taxi that also runs the mail run to McCarthy and May Creek. And then there's a fourth brother who is, I think, a fireman in Wasilla.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But they've been in the area a long time and they know the area?

MS. SHARP: Bill Ellis was the original SRC Chair.

MS. CELLARIUS: They've been there since 1960.

MS. SHARP: You know, our biggest concern is that when a Unit 12 proposal comes up there isn't anybody on our SRC who lives in Unit 12 who can speak about the proposal so what we have to do is we rely upon our Staff who live in Unit 12 and are contacts and people we know, so it's a big hole for us. We're not as effective for that portion of the Park, which, you know, in all fairness, is probably four million acres or five million acres, I don't know it's a quarter of the Park, it's a huge chunk of land.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Just off the top of your head, can you tell us where Unit 12 is -- is Nabesna Road the border on Unit 12 or where does Unit 12.....

MS. CELLARIUS: I think it's about Mile 25, about half way.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay, so Unit 12 actually cuts down here from what I see, it cuts down -- Dot Lake, just this side of Dot Lake?

MS. CELLARIUS: It's approximately where you see on the map there's a dark area which is the National Park, and there's a place where the road leaves the National Preserve and goes just into the Park -- well, leaves the Park and goes just into the Preserve and it's about that point.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So we have Nabesna, Chisana, Northway basically in Unit 12?

MS. SHARP: Tetlin, Tanacross and Dot Lake.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And Tetlin and Tanacross.

MS. CELLARIUS: Yeah, most of the Alaska Highway communities, they're resident zone communities.

MS. SHARP: Tok, Tetlin.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay, thank you. Okay, a recommendation or a motion is in order from somebody on the Council.

MR. CHURCHILL: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, based on the expressed need to get somebody from the geographic area, I'd like to move that we appoint Cole Ellis to this committee.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second.

MR. ELVSAAS: Yeah, I will second that. And in looking at the map and the areas, I have to agree with the needs of the Park Service, if they need a representative from that Unit 12, I think this will help in that regard. I'm not familiar with either person myself so my second in support is based just on geographic area.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, I guess where I'm at, where I can't imagine Joe Hart not being actively involved in all these processes and us benefitting from his input,

and that's what I'm kind of balancing. And I don't see us losing his value, and this really does seem to fit with the expressed needs of the Park, and that's why I'm coming down on this side of it.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, I, myself, I hate to lose the input that Joseph would have, I wish he lived in Chitina instead of Tazlina. But we do not have anybody up in that upper end of the Park, and I don't know Cole at all, but I know his dad from the standpoint of flying the mail and everything, and if there's anybody that's going to know what's going on in the Park it should be them, because they fly the mail to all of the little communities and things like that.

So I could vote for either one of, whichever is put up.

Any other discussion.

(No comments)

MR. CHURCHILL: Call the question.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. All in favor of the motion in front of us signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed, signify by saying nay.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. And I think we need to keep Joseph in mind and on the hook in case we get another opening down at that end.

MR. CHURCHILL: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Because he has a lot of experience.

We've taken care of everything up to 13, agency reports. We have a report coming at 1:00 o'clock today, so we're going to have to be here for that, so if we

can take care of everything else before 1:00 o'clock, then maybe that will be the only thing we have to do this afternoon. And I've been requested to take a break at 10:30 so that if anybody wants to check out or anything, they can check out at 10:30. So we're going to see how good of time we can make, it's 9:30 right now. Let's go on to Elijah Walters.

Oh, and Barbara, I apologize for saying your name, your last name wrong, but don't feel bad, everybody says mine wrong too.

MS. CELLARIUS: That's fine.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I should have put my glasses on first.

MR. CHURCHILL: You got your mike on though.

MR. WATERS: Good morning, Mr. Chairman. Council members. Speaking of last names wrong, that is Elijah Waters, not Walters.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What did I say? What did I say?

MR. WATERS: You said Walters.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, all right. No, that's just my accent.

MR. WATERS: Elijah Waters, Bureau of Land Management, Glennallen.

First of all I'd like to give you the update on trails and easements. Trails and easements does not lend itself to good updates because nothing really changes. However, we did do 70 miles of trail maintenance this year, and that included, if you remember from a year ago I showed some of the trail hardening that we do, that includes that trail hardening. Now, we didn't do 70 miles of trail hardening, you know, that would be way more money than we could do, but that did include about 400 feet of some kind of mechanical trail hardening.

I'll keep you updated on that as it goes. But basically that's just an ongoing program now, we have

money for it. We have a seasonal crew in place. They'll be coming back every year and we'll just be doing it as long as we have money.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Was most of that on the Swede Lake trail?

MR. WATERS: I wouldn't say most of it but a significant part of it. Most of the trail hardening was, but the rest of it, just maintenance, brushing, marking, that kind of thing, that was all over. But most of it is kind of that area leading into the river.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Is the Swede Lake trail pretty much the biggest used trail in the area?

MR. WATERS: I wouldn't necessarily say that. It is certainly heavy -- possibly, we actually -- you know we have register stands but a lot of people don't sign in on those, including myself.

(Laughter)

MR. WATERS: But I think that's more a function of where the animals are at the time. But that is certainly a heavily used one.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

MR. WATERS: Okay. Next, I'd like to.....

MR. ELVSAAS: Excuse me.

MR. WATERS: Yes.

MR. ELVSAAS: This trail work, was some of this work done on the trail that we saw the video of a while back?

MR. WATERS: No, it was not.

MR. ELVSAAS: It wasn't, okay, thanks.

MR. WATERS: That trail that the video is on is actually a 17(b) easement which goes only about just a couple miles of that trail was actually controlled -- it's not even controlled by BLM but we control the easement. And the rest of that trail is actually on other land.

MR. ELVSAAS: Thank you.

MR. WATERS: Okay. Next, I'd like to update you on the caribou season. To date, we have issued 2,186 caribou permits, that's 1,392 to residents of Unit 13 and 794 to residents of Unit 20(D) or Delta Junction. We've issued, of course, moose season's over but we issued 1,007 moose permits, 628 to residents of Unit 13, and 379 to residents of Unit 20 -- 20(D) or Delta Junction.

Out of that, if you do the math there, residents of Unit 20(D), it's a little over 1,100 to residents of Unit -- of Delta Junction, out of that 1,100 we went to Delta Junction for two days and issued permits at Delta Junction, and we issued over 700 of those in that two days.

Now, the reason that's important or the reason I want to point that out, there's been a lot of discussion in the last couple of days about the affidavit that we have for, you know, verifying residency. We have seen an increase this year in people trying to get permits who are not rural residents. And I'm not entirely sure why that is. I don't know if it's -- it's probably a combination of the State giving out less, fewer Tier II permits, it's probably a combination of seasonal, you know, construction going on in Delta Junction, construction going on in Glennallen, people thinking that they can get permits and also the Anchorage Daily News didn't do us a favor when they wrote that article about a year ago saying that anybody could walk into Glennallen and get a permit, you know, that's not the case, you know, you have to prove your residency.

Now, with that said, we are taking some steps to tighten up on that. First of all, we looked at -- you know, we turned down people on the spot. But obviously some people are going to get through the cracks. Now, we've done a review of all the people and as best we can figure it that there's about one percent of the permits that we issue are actually people who don't technically qualify. So you treat that different ways. You know some people are going to get tickets. They haven't yet, but some people are going to get tickets for fraud. And other people, I think, probably may be honest mistakes and we'll just have them surrender those tags. And usually that's the way people do it, they just surrender the tags. Some people, you know, maybe in good faith obtain one and don't realize that they're breaking the law. So each case is a different case, but it is only about one percent. So even

though we issue over 3,000 permits total, that's only about a thousand people, a little over a thousand people, one percent, you know, that's a pretty low number there of what we're actually getting permits -- or what we think are frauds.

Other ways that we're stepping that up, the best way that we prevent people from getting tickets is when you come in to get a permit you get grilled. We either know you when you walk through the door or we're going to know you when you leave, you know.

(Laughter)

MR. WATERS: We're going to know where you live. We're going to -- I mean we have Fish and Game employees that get grilled. Again, we're going to know where you live, who you rent from, you know, you better know who delivers your oil, that kind of thing, and it's -- the people who issue those permits are lifelong residents of Glennallen and like I said, if they don't know you they will. That's the biggest way.

We also have people who turn other people in when -- if they do slip through the cracks.

And the biggest loophole we're seeing that right now is Delta Junction because we just don't know the people that live in Delta Junction, we don't live there. So what we're doing next year, rather than going to Delta Junction for two days, we're going to go for three days and we're going to try to get, you know, 90 percent of the people in Delta Junction that get permits, we're going to try to get them in that three days and we have some offers of assistance from the local sportsman club who's going to help us, you know, verify the residents because there's a large temporary construction camp in Delta Junction. And those people, the long-term residents of Delta Junction have concerns about those people getting permits. So we're going to step up those efforts to, you know, reach out in Delta Junction.

The other thing, currently as it stands, you can get permits from Fairbanks if you live in Delta Junction. And we're going to do away with that because we have a couple of cases where people have been turned down by Glennallen, they've went to Fairbanks and gotten permits. You know, it's just a loophole. So they come down, they might not have something. We turn them down because they don't have the proper driver's license or

something. They go get it and then they go somewhere else and get a permit.

We're working with the Park Service on that, too. The Park Service is issuing caribou permits out of Nabesna but only to residents of Nabesna. So again, we have that local knowledge. If they don't know you in Nabesna, you're probably not going to get a permit.

Now, on to additional violations since we just had kind of the peak of the caribou herd crossing the highway, just a rundown of the violations. And this is a combination of State and Federal tickets that have been written.

There's been three cows killed that were self-turn ins. Two warnings written for shooting caribou outside the Federal area. And they write warnings when it's close. You know, since people who have, in good faith, thought they shot them in the area. Two tickets for shooting from the road. One controlled use violation. Controlled use, that's the Sourdough controlled use area where you can't hunt from a four-wheeler except on the designated trails. That's a case of somebody going off of the trail to retrieve an animal. And then one ticket written for possession of antlers with no meat. Now, I don't mean to dwell on the negative here but what I'm -- the reason I'm pointing these violations out is that's a significant reduction in what we've seen in the past, especially in the cows killed. You know, people when they do accidentally shoot those cows they're turning themselves in. This might be an odd year because essentially caribou wasn't available until the last week of the season, so, you know, it really condensed everything. We had extra law enforcement up and, you know, pretty much blanketed the Federal hunt area.

So I'm not sure, I hope that education has played a part in that but it might just be a function of the way the caribou crossed this year.

I can see you shaking your head.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It wasn't my experience Elijah.

MR. WATERS: So you think there was more violations going undetected?

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, in two times going

off the road into the woods we found a dead caribou.

MR. WATERS: Both times.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Both times. And we saw, at least, five people shoot off of the road, and right down the road.

MR. WATERS: Uh.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I mean it's hard to get those -- but there are people parked along those roads right on curbs parked in cars sitting in the back of the pickup trucks with their rifles and you know that they're not going to see the caribou cross the road, jump out of their pickup truck and -- we saw caribou coming across the road, the boys and I got ready to jump out of the car, run across the road and follow them into the woods, and my little son and I got ready to jump out and my other boy said, don't get out of the car he's going to shoot and sure enough the guy on the other side of the road shot right down the road and hit a caribou right in front of us and then never even followed it into the woods. We went and found it for him and told him where it was. Like idiots we should have just taken it.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But I mean we saw so much shooting off the road those last two days that -- there was enforcement there but they can't be everywhere, but they need to stop when people are parked along the road like that and they're sitting in their car with their gun, they need to stop and tell them -- we told this guy what you just did is illegal, and he said, it is? I mean, you know, they need to be informed when they're parked there that they cannot shoot off the right-of-way.

MR. WATERS: I think they know.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think they know, too.

MR. WATERS: They just choose not to. The two shooting from the road tickets that were written were actually -- the enforcement officers didn't observe either one of them, it's people who reported them, who got their license, who stopped the officers when they came by and reported them. And so in cases like that, that's the only way it's going to get better, is for just self-policing. It's hard to prove. You know, it will be hard to get them

in court but they were, at least, cited.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Can we give a license number and have them at least give them a warning and inform them?

MR. WATERS: Sure. Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Because we have the license plate number on one of them.

MR. WATERS: Absolutely. The final thing I want to talk about on the caribou season is, if you remember, the Board action set the sex of animals in the second season to be determined with the field office manager in consultation with ADF&G and the Chairs of the Southcentral and Eastern Interior RACs. And that coordination has been done and the sex of the animals for the second season it will remain bull only. We have a letter that will go out Friday to everybody who got a caribou permit this year, you know, our database really facilitates sending those letters out. The only reason the letters haven't gone out already is we're just waiting on the fall population estimate from the State. Bob Tobey said they'd have that this week while I'm at this meeting. So as soon as I get back we'll just put that number in the letter and stuff a thousand envelopes and send those out. So they'll be going out next week.

The final thing, I want to end on a positive note. I'm really proud of this new map that we have and I just want to show it. We've gotten a lot of complaints in the past about the maps and people not knowing where they are and now, granted this map is not perfect, but it's a lot better. We printed out about 3,000 of these and it shows the Federal boundaries but it also shows the USGS quads where if people really want to be absolutely accurate they can purchase the USGS quads and trace the lines. Unfortunately we have to sell these instead of give them away, but they're a pretty nominal cost and we're pretty free with them. If people don't quite have the buck to pick one up, you know, we'll let them have one.

So with that, I'll answer any questions you have.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'd like to compliment you on the maps. And they're a nominal cost, it's a cheap way to get a good map of the area.

MR. WATERS: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So I really felt that the map was a real asset.

MR. WATERS: We have maps for the southern half as well, that doesn't apply to caribou hunters but we have those and they'll be available next year during moose season.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Can you give an estimate of how many caribou and how many moose were taken off the subsistence?

MR. WATERS: No.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Not even a guess?

MR. WATERS: Not even a guess. You know those harvest reports go back to the Fish and Wildlife Service and the way we have to get that information is call and, you know, they have other things to do and other hunts and so there's a little bit of a time lag in that. Next year what we're going to do also though is we will do like the Park Service and have those sent to us where we can tabulate that. And we intended to do that this year but since there was not going to be any in-season management, we just didn't, we held off a year.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do you feel like the moose take was average?

MR. WATERS: You know, average -- the moose take has been about 35 animals, and, you know, you hear a thousand moose permits and people, you know, you get over the gag reflex, but you have to realize that thousand moose permits, we give people moose permits even if they don't ask for them because it's just as -- it takes less time to issue somebody a moose permit than it does to explain to them whether -- you know, whether they want one or not.

(Laughter)

MR. WATERS: So we just issue them even if people don't necessarily want them.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: When they come in for caribou permits.

MR. WATERS: Right. Right. But the take

is about 35 animals a year. I think probably this is going to be right along on that average, about 35, and possibly less. I mean if you look at it it's been kind of steady decline with the moose population in -- the moose population in Unit 13 has been declining, so has that Federal harvest, but I think it's still going to be around the 30.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And the caribou hunt you feel is lower because of the fact that the caribou just didn't become accessible?

MR. WATERS: Well, it was extremely low up until that last week. And I'm not sure what it's -- I think we'll end up having an average year, you know, again, that's pretty predictable. We take, you know, 350 animals. I think by March 31st, I think it will be about an average year.

Any other questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Elijah.

MR. WATERS: Okay. And during the BLM time, Jeff Denton, we'll recognize Jeff.

Thank you.

MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

MR. DENTON: Thanks, Elijah. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Council members. My name is Jeff Denton. I'm a biologist with the Anchorage Field Office of the BLM, which basically covers the Mat-Su Valley, the Kenai, both sides of the Cook Inlet, and portions of your folks' region. And of course, most of those lands are not unencumbered Federal lands that fall under the definition of Federal public lands for the Federal Subsistence Program.

However, what I want to present today is there's a major, basically Senator Stevens has tasked BLM with a major acceleration of the conveyance program in Alaska. He's actually removed some of the legislative, and by legislative some of the procedural hindrances to that program. The tentative target date for completion of all

conveyances in Alaska is 2009. And of course, this involves millions and millions of acres in Alaska. The significance to the Federal Subsistence Program, especially regarding BLM lands is over selected lands when all this comes down to the end of the pipe will return back to the Federal public land land base, which will be within the Federal Subsistence Program land base. So over the next six years, you can expect major changes, and actually major additions to -- just like the map that Elijah had there, you will see significance acreages come back into the Federal land base and for Federal subsistence.

There's been considerable staffing increases in both cadastral survey and the conveyance office. They've actually got their strategy and their first three years of how this program's going to take place planned out and ready to go. We expect, you know, major changes every year in your regulation books as far as the little ownership maps. So I expect over the next six years some pretty radical changes from year to year, probably.

So this is a fairly significant event relative to the Federal program.

Is there any questions on that?

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So if I'm understanding you right currently over selected lands are out of they're -- as selected lands, they're out of the BLM management for subsistence purposes but when conveyance is done, over selected lands will return to the BLM management for subsistence purposes?

MR. DENTON: Yes, that is correct. Once everything -- some of the selected lands, that are Native selected, are top filed on by the State, so there's several layers of this conveyance procedure that will happen, but at the end the lands leftover will basically come back to the BLM Federal land based under the subsistence program, that's correct.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions on that.

(No comments)

MR. DENTON: Okay. The only other thing that we have is the Anchorage Field Office is currently undergoing a land use plan. Our particular planning area we're working on right now covers all the BLM lands in the

southcentral area that would be in the Anchorage Field Office. Kenai Peninsula, which we have scattered tracks. The country in the Mat-Su Valley. The west side of Cook Inlet. Chugach Mountain areas that we have. And this is just kind of an update. We've gone through public scoping meetings already. This is kind of a prolonged process. We would like to have you folks actually be on the mailing list, at least, maybe the Chair so he can distribute those materials on scoping concerns and so on so you'll have an opportunity for input, if that's the best way you'd like to go about that.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Me, definitely. Anybody else that would like it speak up.

MR. CHURCHILL: I would like it. Might it be easier for him to send it to Donald Mike and have Donald distribute it to the entire AC?

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Very good, Bob. I think that's excellent. Just send it to our coordinator and let him distribute it to all of us.

MR. DENTON: Okay, we'll certainly do that.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

MR. DENTON: And currently that's all I have for you folks at this time. Thank you.

MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. That's it for the BLM. Let's go to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

MR. TAUBE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the record, Tom Taube, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Glennallen Field Office.

There's two documents I'll go through. The one I just handed out is a summary of the commercial fishing season, and then there's a second one that you should already have regarding the Upper Copper River subsistence and personal use fisheries that should have been passed out yesterday. Since you have the one I just handed out in front of you, maybe we'll start with that.

This was provided to me by commercial fisheries and it breaks down the preliminary commercial

salmon harvest for this past season between Cook Inlet and Prince William Sound. As you can see the Upper Cook Inlet harvests were approximately 18,000 chinook salmon, 3.5 million sockeye, 102,000 coho, 51,000, almost 52,000 pink salmon and 121,000 chum. For Lower Cook Inlet, just over a thousand chinook salmon, 600,000 sockeye, close to 10,000 coho, 850,000 pink, and 31,000 chum. All these harvests for Cook Inlet were above the 10 year average of 2.9 million. And it's actually above the long-term harvest of 2.77 million over the last 38 years. Escapement goals for sockeye were exceeded this year so overall it's a pretty good return for Upper Cook Inlet. The Lower Cook Inlet sockeye catch was above the 10 year catch, but the pink salmon catch was below 10 year average. Again, sockeye escapements were above expected. Pink salmon return was below the projection of 1.2 million for Tutkla hatchery pinks. And wild pink salmon returns were strong and were all at their sustainable escapement goals.

For Prince William Sound harvest of chinook salmon was 49,000, sockeye was 2.8 million, coho was nearly 500,000, pink salmon was 49 million and chum was 3.7 million. Specifically for the Copper and gillnet fisheries it was 49,000 chinook, 1.2 million sockeye, 400,000 coho, 14,000 pink and 8,000 chum. Escapement for sockeye into the Copper River exceeded the anticipated by about 90,000. The sonar counted over 700,000 sockeye. The escapement goal was right around 620,000. Delta stocks for sockeye were also -- the escapement goals were achieved there.

And regarding that, that's all I have for the commercial. I can try to answer any questions that you may have regarding that fishery before we move to the subsistence and personal use fisheries.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anybody have any questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Go ahead.

MR. TAUBE: The second handout, if you can find it, has the State of Alaska logo on there with the caribou crossing the road on it. And I'll just go through the tables briefly. I don't have a whole lot of information on the Chitina subdistrict State personal use fishery as both subsistence and personal use seasons closed at the end of September, so we don't have a whole lot of previous information -- or information for this season on

there.

But based upon, this year was somewhat a similar year to 2002 as in water levels dictated fishing success on the Upper Copper River. We started out the season with real low water levels, both dipnetters and fishwheelers were -- had a difficult time catching their fish and then due to the warm weather and rain, not more so the warm weather with glacial melt we had the Copper River come up and a lot of fishwheels got washed down stream from their site and catches probably weren't all that good. But just based upon what happened last year I expect that for the Chitina subdistrict, harvest will probably be the same, right around between 90 and 100,000. Chinook salmon harvest will probably be down again, probably close to 2,000 and I would expect permits would probably be about the same, between six and 7,000. The road was still closed due to the landslide at Haley Creek so access was again limited and a lot of people had to rely on boat access or the charter operators or just didn't come. So I think we're still looking at a decline in participation in that fishery, mainly because of the road closure and then lack of success for harvest.

For the Glennallen subdistrict we do have a little bit more information because all that harvest information's handled out of our Glennallen office and we have about 40 percent of the permits returned so far. And, again, that looks like it's going to be right around 50 to 60,000 total harvest for salmon this year. Our permits dropped off slightly, 1,010 permits had been issued, and that may change by 10/20, we're still waiting for a couple of permits, probably from some of our other area and regional offices.

The one thing that was still somewhat surprising is that we were still issuing about 225 permits to those residents that would be Federally-qualified. I talked with Eric Veech before I left Monday, and he said that they had issued about 225 permits or 223 for the Glennallen subdistrict and that's what we had issued to those that -- from communities that were Federally-qualified. So we're still seeing about a 50/50 split that are still getting State permits as opposed to getting the Federal permit.

Still about the same split in the Glennallen subdistrict for gear types, about 40 percent dipnet use and 60 percent fishwheel. The number of fishwheels declined slightly. We had 130 fishwheels

registered, that's both Federal and State. That's down from 145 which was the highest we had issued the previous year. Why that is is, you know, somewhat uncertain. I expect there's some people that just didn't get around to putting their wheels in this year or had been damaged and just never got fixed and used someone else's wheel. So it's still pretty stable right around 130 wheels that are registered. Some of those never operate, they just are registered and never fish.

Aside from that, the rest of the tables, I think you can look through and so I'll just end it there and take any questions to keep it brief.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: When you say fishwheels, is that individual fishwheels or is that individual operators that register that they're going to use a fishwheel?

MR. TAUBE: That's individual fishwheels and there may be multiple operators on that wheel. So that's owners come in, register the wheel, and they'll provide us a list of users that are authorized to use that wheel, and then when someone comes in to use that wheel they have to be on that list or we contact the owner to make sure they are authorized to use the wheel.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, how many went down stream?

MR. TAUBE: Well, you know, there were some that had gone downstream up above Chitina, you know, even -- it was the Tazlina River that caused most of the problems. It was really high flood stages for several weeks, and I know there were a few that got knocked down, just down stream of that. But just from the Chitina area, I believe five or six went down below the bridge. And I think two or three of those were recovered and a few others are still below Haley Creek and down stream further.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Did anything ever come of that requirement to have the fishwheels off of the Federal land right away along the river by a certain date or did that get dropped?

MR. TAUBE: The case has been particularly at the bridge, just at the bridge where you've got the 20 or so fishwheels there. That's DNRs responsibility. They did have people come out and look at it this year. I went out with them and showed them the case and basically they

don't want to deal with it. It would require a special use permit or some type of subdividing of that area and go through a permitting process to have those wheels used. We still notify at the end of the season on our message -- or phone message when people can call for an update of the fishery that they need to be removed from public lands but very few people, you know, probably last year, I think, last winter down there in March and there was still 17 wheels that were down there. So it's not something that's really followed.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So that's nothing that's been enforced then?

MR. TAUBE: No. No, I, actually a few years ago wrote a letter and sent it down to DNR and said I'd be willing to send this out to fishwheel owners and they decided, no, that would require permits and we don't want to deal with it. They're based out of Mat-Su and Anchorage, so I think it's just outside of their range to deal with it. They're more than willing to give it to Fish and Game and let us handle it but we've got enough things to do without becoming land managers also.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right. Well, I was just wondering because I know that they apply that to ice-fishing shacks on a lot of lakes and stuff like that.

MR. TAUBE: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That you have to have them off the lake by a certain date and stuff like that.

MR. TAUBE: Right. That was something that just happened this past year at the Board meeting that we're doing that now for the Copper River drainage also, where you have to register your ice shack if it's out there overnight.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You have to what now?

MR. TAUBE: You have to register your ice fishing shack if it's going to remain for more than 24 hours on the lake. That's mainly just to see.....

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That even applies up the Chitina River drainage?

MR. TAUBE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Let's see, can we call it a trapping shack?

(Laughter)

MR. TAUBE: As long as you're taking -- if you're taking water from the hole, you know, just for personal use it's probably okay, but if you're.....

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay, thank you.

MR. TAUBE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. That will teach me to ask questions. Okay, with that, we'll go on to the Office of Subsistence Management.

MR. CHURCHILL: Forest Service.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Forest Service. I didn't see the Forest Service, thank you, Bob. Is it going to take you a little while, we could take our break now and then.....

MR. ZEMKE: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay, let's take a break now. It's a half hour early but we'll take a break now and then we'll look at this.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I see all you got to do mention it and things show up at your table, thank you. There's some smoked salmon up here and I'm going to pass it around to the Council first and then anybody else that's hungry, if there's any left can have some.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We're going to have the Forest Service report right now.

MR. ZEMKE: Good morning, Mr. Chair and Council. My name's Steve Zemke, Chugach National Forest Supervisor's office and with me is the honorable Tim Joice, Cordova Fisheries biologist and also in his other life he's the Mayor of Cordova. I'd like to talk about our fisheries subsistence report and what I'll do is kind of go over projects on the Glacier Ranger District and the Seward Ranger District and then Tim will take it over and discuss projects applicable to the Cordova area.

The first project I'd like to talk about is Solth Lake enhancement project. It's actually the fish way -- kind of in its background, they used to have a natural population of sockeye salmon into Solth Lake and it was extrapolated in the 1930s during the -- there was a big earthquake and a subsequent landslide which created a debris dam across the mouth of Solth Lake and blocked sockeye. So over the years Forest Service actually kind of tinkered with trying to reintroduce sockeye into the area. It's kind of an important sockeye project, primarily for the community of Chenega. They've kind of expressed interest in being able to obtain sockeye within the area.

For those that don't know where Solth Lake is, it's kind of right here in the northern end of Knight Island and Herring Bay. It was an area -- Herring Bay, you probably don't know or may not, was heavily oiled during Exxon Valdez, the Solth Inlet which was kind of the east side of the main Herring Bay wasn't oiled and so it kind of provides maybe a little pocket of refuge where oiling didn't occur.

Because of the area, the fishway was reconstructed using Exxon Valdez Oil Spill monies and then in conjunction, since the population had been -- I guess, here's a more detailed map showing Herring Bay with Solth Cove and then Solth Lake, about a 200 acre lake, relatively sterile right now, though, with the input of sockeye the nutrient levels will probably go up and production would ramp up. This is another -- again, it's kind of a series -- it was actually a waterfall going in, and that was actually physically blocked off so that this area of fish pool run and then a fishway could be constructed to bring sockeye into the lake.

Using Chugach National Forest subsistence dollars contracted with Prince William Sound Aquaculture Association and have been introducing sockeye fry into the lake for a series of years, this year we put in 250,000 sockeye fry and they were actually stocked on July 4th.

They came from the Main Bay sockeye hatchery and airlifted over. The expected returns from those sockeye would be about 2007. And we have just kind of a ball park estimate of about 2,500 adult returners. This year we had about 300 adults return from earlier stocking, though, there had been some problems in the past where putting fish in the lake and they were immediately dropping out and so there was some question about what the actual seeding of the lake was. This year we put in a blocking smolt weir so that the fish couldn't move out of the lake and it appears that very few of the fry moved out.

Also in conjunction with that, kind of a monitoring program, we do have quite a few years of basic water quality work, but there isn't current zooplankton work, and so with conjunction with ADF&G we instituted a zooplankton study and we're looking at two sites once a month, six months and then it'd be running that -- trying -- we'd do that before the stocking and then run it through while the fish are in and see how the zooplankton are cropped off to get a better understanding of the carrying capacity of the lake.

So if there's any questions on that you can either ask now or.....

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You said the lake is fairly sterile at this time but once you start getting salmon returning to it it will self-fertilize and become less sterile?

MR. ZEMKE: That's the idea behind being able to stock sufficient enough -- the other one is that because there aren't fish in it the zooplankton levels are actually fairly high even though the lake isn't a very rich lake and so there's quite a bit of food availability for the fry in the lake.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So there is quite a bit of zooplankton in it right now even if it's a comparatively sterile lake?

MR. ZEMKE: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Could you use some pink salmon carcasses up there for fertilizer?

(Laughter)

MR. ZEMKE: Probably not.

(Laughter)

MR. ZEMKE: We can grind them up and put them in, I'm not sure about the disease and problems associated with that.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Sylvia.

MS. LANGE: You may have said it and I missed it, where does the stock come from?

MR. ZEMKE: Stock is actually from the Main Bay hatchery but it's Coghill Lake stock that's raised in the Prince William Sound Aquaculture Association hatchery there at Main Bay.

MS. LANGE: It's been several years since I was down in that area hiking around but there are lakes in that -- on Knight Island that have wild stock in them already, I'm thinking like Martha Lake and around in there, is there any thought of actually taking wild stock?

MR. ZEMKE: It has been considered. Otter Lake on the other side has a few sockeye but most of the sockeye stocks are very small and the problem is being able to raise enough fish in the hatchery so -- because of the IHN problems, others associated with sockeye to bring them back in -- say, something like Main Bay hatchery, you'd have to have an isolate facility and raise the fish in isolation from the other stocks and so the cost would be significantly ramped up. One of the advantages right in that general area, there aren't other sockeye stocks and so being able to get a fish transport permit for Coghill, you know, is available stock and so it reduces the cost of being able to sufficiently seed a large enough number to make a realistic return.

Okay. Any other questions on that?

(No comments)

MR. ZEMKE: The next project is one that maybe was looked at by the Council last year, kind of in the proposal and this is the first year that the Billy's Hole weir and then stock assessment and then also the krill census was done. And it was a cooperative project between the Forest Service. Essentially we basically just funded the project. ADF&G was the primary investigator and they had help from the Chugach Regional Resources Commission basically providing people on site to be able to help build

some of that capacity.

And obviously, kind of the major objectives were to, one, it was kind of -- a krill census trying to find out the harvest by subsistence, recreational anglers within the area. And then kind of try to get harvest proportion by those groups and then also the census, sockeye and coho populations. Tim will talk later on about the actual census of the numbers of sockeye, coho as well as other species from the system. But the krill census, it's actually currently being worked up but unfortunately it's probably not going to show much this year because there wasn't much effort at all out in the area. Previous, Tatitlek has used sockeye within that area, they didn't go out there this year, I don't know whether or not that's because there was the weir and the people censusing the site so -- you know, I guess we're going to have to look at that long-term and see what's going to go on. So we should have those results available for the Council by this winter's meeting in March.

And those are kind of two of the subsistence-related funded studies on the Glacier Ranger District. Then we also have other projects that weren't funded kind of through subsistence dollars on the Glacier that might be of interest. Just kind of a real general survey, basically do foot surveys, kind of try to verify small stocks of coho and sockeye trying to be able to identify kind of their presence, absence and then working on a model to try to develop kind of an area under the curve, that population estimate so we have a little better idea about where those small stocks are. And then how many there are and maybe what their vulnerability are, not primarily to subsistence users but to recreational harvest. Since the tunnel went through Whittier, you know, there's expectations of greatly increased recreational use within, particularly western Prince William Sound which is where the Glacier Ranger District is. So those foot surveys would be -- stream surveys would be a valuable source of information.

The other idea is to take a look at the lake fertilization. It's been around for awhile. Coghill, it was fertilized earlier in lifecycle, currently appears to be adequate escapement as Chairman Lohse mentioned about sockeye and carcasses, you know, fertilizing the lake may be -- you know, it's probably sufficient right now, but when the numbers go back down -- the idea about looking at getting lineological work, maybe to see what the levels are during those high escapement levels versus some of the

lower ones earlier in the year. You know, those are some of the potential projects we're looking at.

And then finally we've got quite a few fishways out within Prince William Sound, mostly pink -- to service pink salmon but there some others like Otter for coho and sockeye. And Otter Creek is one that was done with Gavian baskets primarily and those, over the years have been subject to intense pounding by October torrential flows, which are probably experiencing right now out on Prince William Sound and so those are going to be rebuilt with concrete and aluminum boxes, so that was a major project that was done this year out on western Prince William Sound.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's Otter Creek on Knight Island?

MR. ZEMKE: Correct. That's the one on the eastern side of -- and Bay of Isles.

And so that's kind of the major focus on the western Prince William Sound. Again, I think a lot of it's focused in on small vulnerable stocks and take a look at what are -- which are important to local subsistence communities, primarily Chenega and some at Whittier, but at the same time that are subject to the potentially increasing recreational use and harvest.

Seward Ranger District -- yes.

MR. ELVSAAS: This Billy's Hole, isn't that by Tatitlek?

MR. ZEMKE: Yeah. The current -- it's on the kind of central Prince William -- northern central Prince William Sound, about 20 miles.....

MR. ELVSAAS: It seems like I heard quite a bit of talk at one time how important it was to the village subsistence fishery. They were concerned about the sportfishery and so forth and now you say there's no effort, were the village people there?

MR. ZEMKE: That's correct, Fred. That's only for this one year. The data is still preliminary but it doesn't -- again, the idea is we're going to run the project -- it's going to be run again next year. And if that's the case then maybe some of the information -- the use patterns may have been changing or they may have

changed because of the weir crew that was in there. So I think ADF&G is looking at -- and their census methodology may be trying to -- maybe next year try to sift some of those ideas out to try to get better understanding of what the use pattern is and why it may be not what it was expected.

MR. ELVSAAS: Okay, thanks.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And the other thing that could have happened, Fred, is we had a fairly large sockeye run in Prince William Sound if you look at that.....

MR. ELVSAAS: Oh.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So there were sockeyes available in the Sound in numbers that they haven't been available in the past. So it could be that they just ended up taking the fish there.

MR. ELVSAAS: Easier, yeah.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I guess it was easier.

MR. ELVSAAS: Yeah.

MR. ZEMKE: Correct. Yeah, Coghill was above expectations. Again, 75,000 escapement and I'm not sure of the run but it was several hundred thousand of commercial take and then Shamy, which is another primary producer, those numbers were down at first, but then they actually exceeded escapement levels also later on in the year.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. And Main Bay put in about 800,000 so there was a lot of sockeye available over at that side of the Sound.

MR. ZEMKE: Seward Ranger District, I don't have -- didn't have a lot of direct fisheries projects but one of the projects that had been kind of described before was a community profile data study for the community of Seward and Moose Pass. And even though they're non-rural communities, when the study was initiated, you know, the Council had recommended that the Kenai Peninsula, all the communities would be rural and that combination of Seward and Moose Pass would have gone to rural if that would have followed through. But nonetheless, those communities of Seward and Moose Pass were the only communities on the Peninsula that didn't have a formal community profile study

so it was kind of a hole in the information that would be needed by the Council and the Board for making deliberations later on.

I have a copy of the -- it's been recently published, the 2003, the formal community data profile, you know, it's 150 pages. I brought five copies and I'm not sure if all of the Council members would like it but I have enough for everybody here and then if -- I can get some for everybody if everybody wants one.

Again, it was conducted in the spring of the -- the actual survey was done in March, late March/April of 2001 and it was -- the survey period is actually for harvest from April of 2000 to March 31st of 2001. And there was 203 households surveyed done through random methodology and then it's basically -- essentially a -- the standard community profile survey methodology.

Again, it was just published in 2003. The information is also on line at community profile database -- State database which can be accessed that way. Again, it provides demographic and information on the communities. Seward's grown quite a bit in the last 10 years. It's grown about 100 percent and then Moose Pass about 82 percent. So the total community of that area is about 5,000 individuals now. The economic data, it's more of a cash economy but at the same time it shows harvest and use patterns similar to other roadside communities on the Kenai Peninsula. And then also in conjunction with a study there was locations of where the harvest patterns use areas are on -- around Seward and Moose Pass and that was based on a 10 year period rather than where did you harvest this animal or catch this fish last year, it was where do you -- and within the last 10 years have you harvested wild resources.

And then just kind of a real brief summary, you know, it's kind of again, in Seward 97 percent of the people use wild resources, 97 pounds per capita, that was about 260 or 70 pounds per household which is similar to what you saw yesterday like for the community of Paxson; 93 percent use fish. About -- and again, as you'd expect along coastal communities, most of the high percentage of actual use is fish, 69 pounds per capita, all fish and then 46 pounds per capita of salmon so salmon is, you know, nearly half of the use of wild resources.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, Steve, is 97 pounds all or just fish?

MR. ZEMKE: That's 97 pounds per capita of all wild resources, but that would be per person so that's man, person and child.

Moose Pass very similar 99 percent use with 87 pounds per capita. If you look at the competence intervals of those you probably couldn't say there's much difference between 87 and 97 pounds is all I'm saying.

They have a little higher use of fish but they use more freshwater fish because if you know where Moose Pass is it's up along Kenai and Trail Lakes and so there's more freshwater fish availability, dolly varden, lake trout, that kind of thing.

And so that was basically just kind of a real quick summary. One of the things -- let's see, this slide -- I can't go back right now, the diversity of uses is a little less, it only had about seven for each one of the communities, which was probably -- yesterday you were looking at, like I said, Paxson was around 10, so again as you noted, Mr. Chairman, I think it was probably a result of what the available resources are within the area.

And then the other work on the -- kind of off work on the Seward Peninsula, that's -- if you've been on the -- not the Seward Peninsula, on the Kenai Peninsula around Seward Ranger District, if you've been on the area -- the one that focuses on the Russian River just because of the outstanding sockeye resource that's there, and it receives hundreds of thousands of visitor -- or angler days, and so there's been a continuing battle to try to be able to maintain the habitat while still allowing for this intensive fishery. So a lot of work has been focused on bank stabilization, and if you've been down there there's large numbers of boardwalks now that are there. Vegetation -- I can't remember what the term is but basically allow sunlight through the grate so they have vegetation growing underneath the boardwalk. It's almost managed like a grazing allotment where only certain areas you're allowed onto the stream, kind of similar to the fencing riparian off just because of that -- just large amounts.

Then there's also kind of a smaller program of recre -- it's primarily for recreational fishing but it would also apply for those freshwater fish for subsistence users of managing the nearshore lateral zone to try to

provide more cover for the fish to bring more fish ability in shore, not to provide -- provide a local higher productivity but also probably provide for higher catchability of the fish.

And then there's also -- we'll discuss a little bit later on, one major project on Resurrection Creek, which is a creek that flows through Hope, which is one of the rural communities on the Kenai Peninsula. And back in the early 1900s there was major placer mining done where they actually had alluvial mining where they scooped up the gravel to get the gold out and then just redeposited the gravels. And the streams been entrenched in a -- basically in an armored channel and it's very straight, and the idea is -- one of the alternatives, which is probably the preferable one is to take a look at the old meanders if you look at aerial photos and you can actually pick out what the old stream channel is and the idea is to actually move the channel back into that area and so that would be looked at, a possibility by actually construction in 2004, but most likely probably 2005.

And finally we've got the schedule of proposed actions in the Chugach -- and I'm not sure but everybody should have a copy of this, it's like 12 pages, it comes out quarterly, I mentioned before it's on the web at that web site. For the Chairman, who may not have a computer, we've got a hard copy for you here. And I think -- and I'm not sure if you're on the mailing list but anybody -- okay, everybody who wants to be on the mailing list and wants a hard copy can get one every quarter as they come out. This one is the third quarter report, which is actually published July 15th, there should be another one coming out in July -- October 15th or somewhere about there, basically have the same thing. But again, what you have is the project title, you know, somewhat self-explanatory, location and description of the project and then kind of status of what we call the environmental assessment. And so these projects aren't being done, most likely these projects -- most of them will probably be done either next summer or the summer after.

What we could probably look at, or focus your attention on if you have it, a little bit, is kind of examples of the projects. On Page 2 we've got one that's called the 18 -- Mile 18 Road improvement, fish protections, an example of maybe a subsistence project which would be focused on protecting resources that might help subsistence users, and again there's an old road out on Copper River Delta that's not maintained. People are

using it so they're driving through the stream channel and it'd be somewhat similar to maybe what Elijah was talking about, trail developments, unauthorized use, and the idea is to try to take a look at options of being able to either reroute the road or put some type of crossings that would prevent habitat degradation. And then it has, probably one of the important things is the actual contact person with a phone number if you're particularly interested in one or two of those projects, who you would talk to on the ranger district, and directly deal with them and actually get better information, you could be better involved with the scoping or actually working with the option developments. So somebody like Sylvia Lange, a member who may be interested in the Cordova projects and by using this she would be able to take a look at those specific projects that you would have interest in.

Also on the Seward Ranger District we talked about Resurrection Creek, Page 5 of the project is kind of a description of where it's at, who's the contact person. And then I know we've talked about the spruce bark beetle infestation on the Kenai Peninsula, and this is kind of the start of looking at some rehabilitation techniques. One of them would be prescribed burning. It was looking -- we were looking at maybe even a more aggressive program but if everybody remembers back in 2001 we had a little too aggressive of a program and the fire escaped and about burned down Moose Pass.

(Laughter)

MR. ZEMKE: And so it took a little while to kind of recycle through and maybe get a little better planning.

One of the problems, say, on the Kenai, the prescribed burning, it's not a real intense fire ecology and so to be able to catch the window when you can get adequate burning conditions, at the same time be able to control the fire is a real fine line. And then that area, like a lot of areas in the Forest Service, there's been much more -- what's called the urban wildlife interface, and a lot of those people that move to Seward and Moose Pass, we've talked about the 100 percent increase in population, people are moving out into those areas and so those are the National Forest system lands next to those communities are probably high -- high priority but at the same time they're very hazardous if you would want to look at prescribed burning. There's also other methods such as mechanical treatments which could be logging but currently

the market for logs are down and we actually do have some mechanical treatments they're looking at which would be similar -- actually some of the trees would be felled but maybe some small scale timber sales, firewood sales, that kind of thing, but a lot of it would be contingent on, kind of a stewardship project where we would enter into a stewardship contract with a group that would agree to manage that pod of land to meet certain objectives, one may be wildlife habitat for subsistence resources, another one would be reduction of fuel hazard adjacent to wildland communities.

And that's basically all I've got for the Council right now, if there's any other questions.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions from any of the Council members.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Why don't they do, like on these spruce bark beetle stuff, why don't they do their burning in the wintertime? I mean I can remember years ago looking at a project that they had in Canada where, just like on the Copper River Flats where the brush is overtaking habitat down in the Alberta area, in the hayfield area, used to be the old hay meadow area of Alberta and they went back and researched what the Native Americans did in that country, why there was all meadows there when they got there that were being taken over with trees and they found out that they burned them, they burned the grass flats every spring. And by burning the grass flats every spring you burned a layer of brush and timber around the outside edge of it so the grass flats expanded and the brush and timber was used for firewood and everything. You improved the goose habitat, duck habitat, muskrat habitat, and, yet you didn't have any chance of the fire taking off and burning anything down, you did it while there was still snow in the woods. But when the flats had opened up -- and these spruce bark trees burn very good in the winter. I mean if a fire would ever start in one of these spruce bark forests in the winter it just jumps from tree to tree to tree to tree and you could burn all the trees off and never touch the underbrush when you got two foot of snow, three foot of snow there.

MR. ZEMKE: Mr. Chair, not being a fire expert, I'm not sure -- the purisity of fire, there's some research on Kenai, it isn't like an Interior fire ecology where they're relatively short-term. It looks like it may

be three to 500 years so it's more large stand scale -- or stand replacement type of events.

The idea about winter burning, that would be one that if you have ideas you could contact the person that's on those prescribed burns and discuss your ideas or we could talk later on and I can get your ideas and bring them back to the person that's involved with those areas. Normally, the Kenai Peninsula it gets in those -- where there's hundreds of thousands of acres of bark beetle and there are some areas where they do pile and burn and where they actually cover the piles and wait for winter snows to be able to burn the piles, you know, and they'll be still be dry where everything else is covered with snow around or waiting to try to predict a period when there's precipitation moving into the area to try to burn and then catch a window right before where the precip comes in. A lot of the areas are -- where the spruce bark beetle's gone through, the beetle's gone through quite a bit ago and so a lot of the material is actually down or most of the fine materials are off the trees and so I'm not sure they would carry fire anymore. So that might be an area where you could do it on, say, a newly impacted spruce bark beetle infestation area, it probably wouldn't work on some of the area, much of Chugach areas are -- have been infested five or 10 years ago and so they're probably beyond that. But that is still speculation right now.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I was just wondering because I know it would work and it also doesn't impact the understory. You know, because your understory is all protected with snow so all it does is it takes care of the fire hazard and eliminates the fire hazard without doing any specific damage to anything else.

So anyhow, I can maybe talk to somebody else on that. But it's always looked to me like, from what I saw in Canada, it just looks to me like a real option, that that'd be one way to alleviate the problem without taking care of anything else or doing any other damage.

MR. ZEMKE: Well, I'll talk with Pat O'Leary on the Seward Ranger District. He's the vegetation manager and we'll see if we can't scope that out more for you. Thank you very much for the offer.

With that, I guess, if there aren't any other questions I can turn it over to the Honorable Tim Joice and he'll go through the rest of the Cordova projects.

MR. JOICE: Mr. Chairman. Council. As soon as my program gets put on and we'll go through, I have a pretty short one. It's only about six or seven slides long. It's just mainly talking about the projects, the OSM projects in Cordova, and I have a few slides, mostly -- I don't have too much wording on them.

As you can see, you know, this is a satellite photo that came out this last year of Prince William Sound, you can see the Copper River dumping into the North Pacific. This little bit over here is actually silty freshwater that's coming off the Bering Glacier drainages and it's -- and you can see the circulation pattern, it brings it up this way and you can see where the Copper River pattern goes and comes around this way. There's a little bit of glacier meltwater, too, that's coming down through the Sound. So it's a pretty interesting photo and it's available out there on the internet.

One of the projects we had this last year, this final year, was a eulachon project. It was a krill survey. And in 2002 it was interesting, some of the information we gathered was that the eulachon, most of the eulachon were coming up the Copper River and they were harvested on the Copper River by subsistence users. And then in 2003, which was this last spring, a majority of the eulachon, well, I shouldn't say the majority but most of the subsistence harvest occurred in Ibeck Creek which is must closer to Cordova. Early in the year, in February and March, when those fish were available, in 2002 they didn't return to Ibeck Creek so it was just a little bit different, and, again, most of the harvest occurred there. There was some harvest that did occur on the Copper River in May. We don't have all that data analyzed yet but we'll have a report finished here probably this winter, a final report on those two years of krill survey information and we'll have length, weights, ages, sex, percentages and things like that for these fish as they return.

One of the other projects that's going on around Cordova on the Copper River is the Lower Copper River test fishery. There's actually two projects there that are occurring. One is use of a short, shallow gillnet and the other one is a sonar counter. Both projects are an attempt to get an idea of river entry timing and prior to Miles Lake -- the Miles Lake sonar is up river, it's anywhere from four to seven days travel time for the fish to travel up to the Miles Lake counter to be counted. That is used to manage the commercial fishery, the subsistence

fishery escapement, et cetera. And so these projects are down just above tide water and it will give anywhere from -- depending on the water flow, from one to three to four days advance lead time as to what's entering the river and heading towards Miles Lake. This gives the managers an idea of whether fisheries should be open, closed or duration just a little bit more idea. It doesn't give a count like the Miles Lake sonar does it's just an idea of whether there's fish entering the system and moving up the river.

One of the other projects that was done several years ago was installing a new substraight at the Miles Lake sonar site and you can see the upper concrete structure there is the new site or the new substraight and the lower one is the old substraight and it was in there, gosh, 25 or 30 years and it's taken quite a beating over the years and it's almost unusable. What they did this year, this summer, they bought -- the Department of Fish and Game bought a new Didsen sonar, and I believe I showed that to you last year, we had a little video clip that was on there of the fish swimming by. They put a new Didsen sonar on the new substraight and they had the original, the old Bendix sonar that was on the substraight and they did some comparison counts. And those are still being analyzed too but preliminary they look like they're very close. You're going to get almost identical counts, not quite but pretty close to being identical counts between the two different substraights and the two different types of counters. So in that respect it's very good and you know numbers aren't going to be changing or doing radical changes to the escapements that are needed in the river that these counts are very similar using the different site as well as the different system of counting these fish. So in that respect that's good.

The other thing that's going to be coming down the pike is at some point they will need to probably put in a new sonar on the other side of the river, the north bank. There are fish that go by over there, although the south bank is by far and away the place where the majority of the fish do travel up the river. The Bendix sonar systems are old. You can't get parts. There's only one person in the world that can service them and he's about 80 years old and so we're looking to getting a new system simply because we're not going to be able to use the old system here pretty soon. At least the Department is and, of course, this is having to do with the subsistence uses of the Copper River with the fish that are going up the river, we need to know that.

One of the other projects that was operated this last year and has been in operation for several years now is the chinook escapement monitoring. This is a project that's run by the Native Village of Eyak. I should have mentioned earlier in the Lower River test fishery, those two projects, the sonar project is also run by the Native Village Eyak with their consultant and the test gillnet fishery is a Department of Fish and Game project and they're using both of those to try to get an idea of what will work and what's the cost going to be for each one. This one is a Native Village of Eyak project. They have two fishwheels in the lower river just above the sonar site above Miles Lake in Baird Canyon and they have two more fishwheels up river in Woods Canyon which is just below Chitina. And the idea would be here that these fish, you can see one coming down through the fishwheel there, they're taking chinook and they're tagging them, either with -- some with a radio tag and some with spaghetti tags, and then they're captured live, of course, and they're released back into the river. And then upriver they're recaptured fish -- fish are captured in a second set of fishwheels and they take a ratio of those fish that have tags on them and look at that ratio and come up with an estimate of what -- how many chinook salmon are passing up the river. This is all done above the sonar site. The sonar doesn't distinguish between species. It just counts salmon. Actually it just counts big fish. So if there's a big dolly going through it will count that. If there's a coho going through it will count that. It just counts salmon. So this is an idea or method to come up with how many chinook salmon are actually going up the river.

And this year it was a preliminary total of, again, these are preliminary numbers, they haven't been totally looked at and totally analyzed, preliminary total of 2,087 chinook that were marked, and then upriver in the Wood Canyon area they had a preliminary total of 1,843 chinook salmon that were recaptured. And out of that, there was 102 of those chinooks that had tags on them, either a radio tag of a spaghetti tag that they noted that were tagged. With this ratio, again, very preliminary numbers, these are not final numbers by any means, that would give a mid-point estimate of around 37,400 chinook that went up the river. So that would be the escapement number that went past these sonar sites before they got into the subsistence areas of Chitina and the Upper Copper River district.

There's a range on those numbers. I don't have that range here with me but it's a little -- this is

the midpoint of it and which falls within the escapement goals set by the Board of Fisheries.

So the other thing that the radio tagging goes, which is very interesting, too, is it allows you to get an idea of where these fish are traveling, the run timing, where they're going on the river system. There's a series of radio antenna's that track their location. As they go by it tells you that that fish has gone by so you can see how much time it takes for that fish to go from Point A to Point B, if you will. You can also track them into the different tributary systems. They do some aerial survey flights with this, the Department of Fish and Game does and tracks those fish into the different tributaries so you know where they are, when you can use that again to get an estimate of how many fish are going into each tributary system. So it's a very interesting and very beneficial program that we have with that one.

The other project that was mentioned earlier was this Billy's Hole sockeye monitoring. These are some pictures of the weir that was put in at the creek there at billy's Hole and some of the salmon that were behind it. And this was a new project this last year that was started, this area is used by the village of Tatitlek for some of their subsistence uses for sockeye salmon. Again, this year they may have not gone over there because of the abundance of salmon that were available from maybe nearby. A variety of different species that were available, there were a lot of chum salmon around this year as well. This year, again, preliminary numbers for this first year, there was about 1,642 sockeye that were passed through the weir, 272 chum salmon, 3,830 pink salmon, and 108 coho, plus about a little over 1,800 dolly varden that were counted through the weir. Now, this was a cooperative project with the Village of Tatitlek. And they had some of their villagers who were out there that were working on this project so there was some capacity building that was going on. They, again, had a little bit more of a vested interest in the system because they were there, they were participating in this project. So all in all it turned out pretty well, I think.

One of the other things we had this year, we had the Board, the Subsistence Board, or Staff members came to Cordova and we spent three days looking at projects and being in the district or Prince William Sound. This was at the lower river test fisheries site. This trailer is where the -- just to the right there's a radio antenna. The sonar site down river has another radio antenna where

it transmits the data back to the trailer here and it's all recorded inside in dry and warm facility. You can see some of the -- Elijah is there, he's there with the sunglasses, it was one of those banner days in Cordova again.

(Laughter)

MR. JOICE: And there's a few other folks there, folks onto the right, against the trailer are some of the workers there for the Native Village of Eyak and Don Degan is there in the sunglasses next to Elijah who was the consultant that runs the aqua acoustics and takes care of the sonar equipment.

That's the last slide that I have. And I do want to point out again, I mentioned yesterday a little bit to some of the members that there is an American Fisheries Society Conference that's occurring in November in Fairbanks and on the first day of that conference, which is going to be November 4th, we have about a four hour session scheduled that's going to be a Partners in Fisheries overview, Steve Klein is Chairing that session and he has representatives from nearly all of the regions within Alaska that are going to be there presenting their projects, you know, talks on their projects. I'm looking forward to this, it's going to be pretty exciting. And there is, of course, going to be two more days of other topics that are going to be involved there, too, going from GPS projects to ocean carrying capacity, a variety of different issues that are going to be discussed. But if anybody's in Fairbanks during that period of time it would be an opportunity to take a look and see what's going on in the rest of the state with the variety of these other projects that are happening.

And with that, I'll take whatever questions you might have.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: How long is that meeting going to last?

MR. JOICE: The first day is -- actually a reception starts on November 3rd. It's at the Wedgewood Resort in Fairbanks. And then the meeting itself will start on November 4th. It starts at 8:00 o'clock in the morning and it goes to about 5:00 and then goes again on Wednesday and then again on Thursday. It's over about 4:00 o'clock on Thursday.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So basically a three day

meeting?

MR. JOICE: It's a three day meeting, right. And there's concurrent sessions so there's a lot of things going on. There's a lot of talks and presentations occurring.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If anybody has a chance to go to it it might be worthwhile.

Bob.

MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, I will, in all likelihood have business that would take me into that part of the country pretty close to that. The Partnership will -- most of that will be on the first day?

MR. JOICE: Most all of that will be on the first day. There's another session on that first day, it's also called Human Dimensions, which is a similar type topic, but it will all be on that first day, right.

MR. CHURCHILL: And with your pleasure, I'll just make plans to attend that on our behalf and report back.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It'd be appreciated.

MR. JOICE: I will send you the registration form and all the information that goes along with that then. I think I have your e-mail address.

MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you.

MR. JOICE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anybody else have any questions for Tim.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

MR. JOICE: With that, that's our presentation. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: How about the draft predator management? We can do that one?

MR. LaPLANT: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Good.

MR. LaPLANT: Good morning, Mr. Chairman. Members of the Council. For the record my name is Dan LaPlant with the Office of Subsistence Management. Glad to see you all again. I know you're agenda says this presentation will be given by a member of the Staff Committee, I'm substituting for Greg Bos here today. So that's why I'm in the chair in front of you today. The presentation here on the draft predator management policy, the information is behind Tab F in your book, if you'll turn to that.

The Federal Subsistence Board met on August 5th of this year, just a couple months ago and they approved for Regional Council review a draft predator management policy and that policy is based on an analysis that's in your book and the analysis itself starts on Page 181, and hopefully you had a chance to take a look at that, it's about a 15 page document that provides some background information on predator control activities in the state, a little history on it. It provides some information on predator/prey relationships as described by wildlife researchers. And then there's a description of the current regulations policies and authorities of the various Federal agencies involved in the Federal Subsistence Program as it relates to predator control and predator management followed by a discussion of the Board's responsibilities.

Also in your packet there on Page 177 is an executive summary of that analysis. So if you want the two page version, hopefully you had a chance to look at that executive summary, again, on Page 177. And then the policy itself is on Page 179. And, again, this is a draft policy that the Board will be taking up at their December meeting.

The Board had a work session on predator management back in August of 2002, so over a year ago, and at that workshop they considered the various ANILCA, Title VIII references relative to the potential for doing predator management for the Board taking on a role in predator management, predator control. They reviewed their regulatory authorities and responsibilities and also previous program guidance that they've received, again, relative to predator control and habitat management.

The influencing elements of the analysis that the Board weighed most heavily were the language in Section .802, paragraph two, where it talks about the Boards responsibility to provide for subsistence uses, and

then in Section .803 under the definitions it talks about subsistence take for the purpose of providing for subsistence use and it says that subsistence take is for direct personal and family consumption.

The Board also considered the language or the information in the environmental impact statement and the record of decision that was prepared in 1992 at the beginning of the Federal Subsistence Program. In that environmental impact statement it says that predator control is not discussed in the statement. It's not a responsibility of the Federal Subsistence Board. It says it would be remaining with the responsibilities of the individual land management agencies, similar to habitat management. So the EIS specifically does not cover predator management.

So the Board then recognizes that they need to differentiate between predator control and predator management. Predator control being the controlling one species for the benefit of another species and again the EIS says that's the responsibility of the individual agencies. And then predator management is a more comprehensive approach to addressing predators in the same way that the Board has responsibility for management of other fish and wildlife species.

So if you look at the policy then on Page 179, that's what the Board's trying to describe in their policy statement. The first -- I'll spare you the language in the first two paragraphs which is basically introduction and I kind of paraphrased that already, but the two policy statements there in paragraph A and B, the first one says that the Board will consider all Federal proposals to regulate seasons and dates, methods and means, harvest limits and customary and traditional use determinations for the subsistence take of fish and wildlife. It also says that the Board will ensure that the primary effect of its decisions is to provide for the subsistence take and use of subject species. The Board will also take into account the approved population objectives, management plans, customary and traditional uses and recognized principles of fish and wildlife management.

So that's the Board, their role in predator management. Making those adjustments in methods and means and harvest dates and so on.

The second bullet talks about predator control, and it says that the Board will direct the Office

of Subsistence Management to return to the proponent all Federal proposals that specifically indicate that the reason for the proposed regulation is to reduce the predator population for the benefit of prey populations, again, predator control. Proposals returned to the proponent will include an offer of technical assistance from OSM Staff to promote understanding of the Board's management of predators and proponents with predator control objectives will be referred to the appropriate Federal land manager or the Alaska Board of Game to seek resolution of their concerns. It goes on to say that, however, the Board will monitor the actions taken by the agencies to address such concerns and will provide appropriate support where necessary to ensure the continuation of subsistence harvest opportunities.

And what that last sentence means is that the Board recognizes that they do have a role, again, in predator management. And predator control generally is part of a recovery plan, a species recovery plan. And example would be the Fortymile Caribou Herd species recovery plan. That plan had a predator control component. And that component was carried out by the State. It was wolf sterilization, wolf relocation. But the Federal Subsistence Board in that recovery plan had a role to play in making adjustments in harvest limits and seasons to allow the caribou population to recover. So again, the Board recognizes that in these management plans they do have a responsibility, not specifically predator control but part of the overall predator management.

So the Board has recognized that in the past they've received basically two different types of proposals to liberalize the harvest of predators, one for personal and family consumption, for subsistence use and the other type being for reducing predator population for the benefit of prey population. So because the Board doesn't have the authority to engage in active predator control they've decided that it's necessary to distinguish between the two types of proposals and then act only on those requests that will provide for direct family and personal consumption.

So they have provided this draft policy, again, this is a draft policy that they will take up in December. They said that they intended to adopt the draft policy that results from this process following Council review and consideration of any comments or recommendations that Councils may have. They said that they believe that this predator management policy statement will provide

clarification to the Federally-qualified subsistence users and others regarding predator management responsibilities and they also said that they anticipated benefit of a clear policy will be more consistent expectations by those requesting predator management actions and a clearer understanding of the factors that will influence their decision.

So, Mr. Chairman, that's all I have for you on predator management, predator control issues and I'll be happy to try to answer any questions you might have.

As far as an action item on your part we're not specifically asking for action, but, in the event that you want to provide some comments for the record or a motion or whatever, that's the Council's choice.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Dan. Any questions.

Bob.

MR. CHURCHILL: Just so that I understand, I have a fair background in this arena as well. What I'm hearing you say, any proposal would need to be much more broad-scoped than a single, we need to reduce this predator in this area to increase this prey species? You'd want a much more broad-scoped proposal that would talk about how that would fit into the entire area, how their subsistence uses in the entire area, if I'm understanding you correctly?

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Dan.

MR. LaPLANT: Mr. Chairman. Member Churchill. The Board's responsibility is to provide for subsistence take, provide -- to meet subsistence needs. So the proposal would have to be in that context of what's necessary to meet subsistence needs.

MR. CHURCHILL: Follow up.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

MR. CHURCHILL: Okay. So for example, if I was in Hughes, Alaska and people were having a hard time catching a moose and certainly the on-ground anecdotal stuff says it's due to predators, it would be enough to say

based on our information we have a predator pit situation, we want to reduce predation through whatever, bears or wolves or whatever we want to do to increase the number of harvestable moose in this area, and that would be kind of the context you're looking for?

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Dan.

MR. LaPLANT: No. Mr. Churchill, the request as I understand it, as you've stated in your example, it would be asking for an adjustment in the wolf harvest regulations because of the depressed population of moose. The Board will look at what's the subsistence need for harvesting wolves, and they would make adjustments in the seasons, bag limits to provide for the subsistence harvest of wolves. And if there is adequate opportunities to harvest wolves to meet the need, the subsistence need for wolves, they would view action beyond that as being predator control which would be a responsibility of the State or the local land management agency.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

MR. CHURCHILL: So what you're really saying is there's no way to address, other than to say -- have the community saying we need to harvest more of the predator population for that purpose only? We need more wolf pelts. We need more bear meat. And we couldn't ever link it up with a prey species or at least that would be returned or referred to either the State Board of Game or the individual land manager?

MR. LaPLANT: Basically that's correct. The Board is recognizing that it's the land manager's role or the State's role to do that predator control, to take that predator control action. They're not saying that it's not needed for full recovery, but their responsibility is to provide for that subsistence harvest opportunity of wolves or the species that they're making the regulation change for. So, you know, they want to be a player in that overall predator population management but specifically they're saying that their responsibility is not the predator control action that would be part of that recovery plan.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Dan. That's what I understood, as long as it's first party, in other words, basically management of the predator for the sake of the predator or the product that you receive from the predator is okay if it's second person, where if it's

management of the predator for and other species it'll be returned.

MR. LaPLANT: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions. Gilbert. Susan. Fred.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What is the wish of the Council on this, do we wish to make any comments on it? Bob.

MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, I'd like to see us make some comments and maybe we could flow those into you. When would be the best time to have those to you by?

MR. LaPLANT: Well, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Churchill, the Board will be taking this up at their December meeting. So prior to that -- prior to the Board's December meeting, the Staff Committee addresses the issues. So in a timely manner, I don't have the date of the Staff Committee meeting prior to that, but in a timely manner to get the information summarized from all the Councils prepared for the Staff Committee meeting which is generally a week or two before the Board meeting, so we're talking mid- to late November would be the proper time, I believe.

MR. CHURCHILL: If it would please the Chair, we've taken a number of positions on the impact of predation and its impact on subsistence harvest. If the RAC wants to flow the information into me I would be happy to prepare a letter for your signature to the Board, if that pleases both you and the Council.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill, I know that as a RAC we have recognized the impact of predators on wildlife populations that are needed for subsistence. This draft policy, I'm going to be very point blank and honest what I feel about this draft policy. This draft policy changes nothing, it just tells us they won't do anything. And I mean do you have that feeling Gilbert?

MR. DEMENTI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I mean it basically says if it has to do with what we've always asked them to do, they'll return it to us, otherwise if it has to do with the fact that we would like to get another wolf or another bear

they'll do their best. But as far as having anything to do with other species, it -- so it doesn't change anything that hasn't been done before. I mean this is basically what's come back to us.

As a Council, I would say that this clarifies things but it's unacceptable. I mean I don't know any other way to say it.

MR. CHURCHILL: I think I could probably draft a letter consistent with that position and use some specific examples. But if that's our pleasure, maybe that's the best thing to do.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Would that be the pleasure of the rest of the Council?

(Council nods affirmatively)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: This clarifies things but is this what we were wanting?

(Council shakes head negatively)

MR. CHURCHILL: No.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No. So should we just draft a letter to that effect?

Fred.

MR. ELVSAAS: Mr. Chairman, I recognize, you know, what's said in the policy and so forth, but I have a personal problem with the idea of predator management, I like predator control and I'll say it right out. The less predators the better it is. And I recognize people like to look at wolves and coyotes and so forth, but what's this line between management and control, you know, I just don't understand why we need to manage something when really we know throughout the state predator control is a real problem. The argument over the moose populations and caribou has been going on and on and on, and, yet, in our area there's more bears than ever. Bears are a real problem throughout the state now. Where does the management of bears fit into this. I think what we need is control.

So I have no problem with how you wish to draft a letter, I just want to state my own views.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Fred. I think that was what both Bob and I were trying to express as a feeling from this Council. Management, to me is for the benefit of the species managed, control is for the benefit of other species that subsistence users consider important. And that has always been the expression of this Council, whether we agree with it as individuals or not, as a Council and as the people that have come to us as a Council, that has been their expressed opinion.

MR. CHURCHILL: You know, I guess I'm reflecting back on some of the conversations I've had how in subsistence areas, these things have been dealt with and I think Fred is exactly on target and I won't start relating geographic areas because that would probably endanger some folks, but that's exactly what they've done in their area. They've realized they're -- in the area I'm thinking of, the moose population was severely depressed, it was a predator pit, the communities in the area agreed not to harvest moose and then they dealt very forthrightly with the predators. And after five years they had a viable moose population again and they were able to supply their needs. And you study the history of it and by and large that's -- I mean denning was something that was done routinely and things that aren't being done, and folks are not eating moose because they don't have them.

So, yeah, I think we could put something together that would reflect this AC's feelings on it and maybe provide the Board with some guidance.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill, I don't expect, you know, we've been told that they're not in that, at the same so we can recognize that they're not going to be capable of doing anything in that area, but we can still recognize the fact that this is not what we wanted as a Council, and, you know, while recognizing what kind of constraints that they're under.

MR. CHURCHILL: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But this doesn't change anything, this just tells us what we've already had happen to us. So if you want to write that that would be fine.

Dan.

MR. LaPLANT: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I just

wanted to follow up on that comment. You know, this policy doesn't say that the Board is against or in favor of predator control it's just saying that the current guidance and regulations authorities that's given to them by the Secretary doesn't include predator control, you know. The individual agencies themselves -- and one of the reasons for that is each agency has separate regulations on what methods and means of predator control is appropriate for their lands. So the Board, you know, individuals may very well be in favor of predator control of one type or another but it just hasn't been given to them as a responsibility by the Secretary.

I do have the date of the Staff Committee meeting, it's November 12th through the 14th. So if you could get your responses to our office prior to that it would be appreciated.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think we do recognize that it's not within their mandate, but at the same time as a subsistence Council and as what we receive from the people that we represent, this is a problem that we still want to have under their attention so that they recognize it. And so while I don't see where they're going to change their policy because I don't know if they can, this is not -- this is not what we wanted as a Council. So I mean I don't think we can -- we can't support this, or, you know, we maybe don't expect them to change it but we can't support this because this is not in what we have been directed by the people that we represent and how we've acted as a Council.

We're disappointed, I guess, is a good way to put it, you know. But we probably will be disappointed.

Any other questions for Dan.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And you can write a letter to that effect then, Bob.

MR. CHURCHILL: I'll use no hyphenated words that the Council has to shrink when they read the letter.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. LaPLANT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: My mike, is that what you were going to tell me or were you going to tell me something else -- Ann.

MS. WILKINSON: If you were suggesting we break for lunch now I would agree with that because.....

(Laughter)

MS. WILKINSON: .....I found out we don't have use of the dining room here and people will need time to go down to eat.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes. I was going to suggest that we break for lunch. We have a couple of other -- Wilson.

MR. JUSTIN: May I be afforded the opportunity to make a comment on that predator issue?

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Definitely. You could fill out a slip for Ann later.

MR. JUSTIN: Thank you. And I apologize for slowing the lunch traffic rush here. My name is Wilson Justin and I represent the Chiefs of the Mentasta villages and Mt. Sandford Tribal Consortium. I have always refrained from being drawn into the predator control issue because it's a sensitive issue among our constituents who are tribal constituents and who live with trappers and who live with guides and outfitters in the area. So we have a mix of all of the groups that are most sensitive to the issue.

But I felt that the subject needed to have some comments on it from our perspective, meaning the tribal type.

First of all, I appreciate your concern about the report not being definitive. I think that's a major concern because in my estimation I have said this innumerable times to the Federal agencies, you have a proprietary right to the agencies, I've said this, to make known and define those issues that are most impactful upon the people that they deal with. So in my estimation, the report, as you say, says very little. It points out some of the -- and I have read this a number of times. I read this proposal off and on for the past -- since I got the

book, I think it's been several months now, and I've puzzled over it. Because to me, while the issue is not cut and dry, there's two background or what you'd call context issues that need to be looked at in terms of what's been written on this predator control issue and this summary of this book here.

Number 1, there never has been or what would be called a true predator management activity in any agency of the State or the Federal. They've had several -- they've had the poison control back in the 40s by the Feds, they had bounties, but those are not predator control.

Those were what you'd call emergency management procedures that ran on and on and on. Nobody ever has done predator control in the state of Alaska and I think that's a serious point that needs to be dealt with. You're correct in my estimation by saying, hey, listen let's get more than just these bland words about ANILCA's history on the table here because you represent live people with definite needs. And I think that an agency that comes out here and says, well, all we can say is all we can say, that's a cop out. And agency personnel should not be allowed to do that. If you can't get off the chair and say definitely for the record, this is what it's all about, this is how it should be handled and this is our recommendation then you're doing a disservice to not only the constituents that I represent, tribal constituents but in estimation the Federal agencies are failing their primary constituents, which is the public. You cannot, in my estimation, come up here and say that nothing is going to change because nothing can change, that doesn't work.

Wildlife management is a total and 100 percent emotional activity that everybody should participate in, yes, but it's also wildlife management means the food on my table and the food on many, many people's table who can't get it otherwise.

Given that context, I can't for the life of me understand why a person from a Federal or State agency just can't come up here and say when it comes to choosing between what Wilson Justin's going to eat next fall as opposed to the number of bears or wolves we got to take this fall, the bears and the wolves are going to go first. That's what it's all about in my estimation. That's all it's ever been about, and I think Mr. Fred here will agree, that's what it's been our whole 20 or 30,000 year cycle of history.

There's always a choice that needs to be made, and the choice doesn't have to be evil, the choices always have to be favorable in my estimation to the constituency you serve. In my particular case it's the tribal elders who can't go out and do anymore of their own hunting and who are, what you would say, starved for their traditional foods. And as long as they're alive I'm compelled to speak out on these subjects, loudly. And if at times it's not the kind of thing that agencies want to hear then it's really not something that I can change. We are who we are. We are what we are. We came along considerably longer in my estimation than you could have history point to. Our verbal history is so long that it speaks about sabertooth tiger, wooly mammoth, there are stories and legends of the giant bears, so our oral and our background goes back a long ways.

I have to say, also, that I don't doubt that it's an extraordinarily difficult position for an agency's personnel to be caught in, caught between a rock and a hard place so to speak, and caught between legislative history interpretations that force, you might say, their hands to be tied. But that, in my estimation, should not stop the issue from being brought to the floor. Because the issue is about people, it's never about predators, it's always about people. It was about people to begin with, it stayed about people through the entire discussion and I was there, with the environmental groups in the late 70s, early 80s when ANILCA was being battled out, it was about people then and it's about people today, and it will always be about people, predators are second.

And I wanted to make sure that was said in this context because I think that's what you were trying to emote in your discussion, that it really is about the people who eat the food who is a part of the ecosystem out there, not about whether or not we should protect and preserve predators because in my estimation you can't make a predator equal, to me, ever. And I think that's where we're headed, and I think we need to say, wait a minute, let's back up a step here. The people who are consumers, the regional consumers of the resources, have to be a little bit higher than the predators who are a part of that ecosystem, and I wanted to make sure that was on the record.

So thank you for the opportunity to speak, and those constitute my comments.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

MR. CHURCHILL: No, I just wanted to thank him. I really appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I want to thank you, too, because you said exactly what we were trying to say which is basically, even if this is the policy, this Council cannot go along with it because we represent the people in our area that are subsistence users, and the subsistence users have cried out that there is a predator that's taking food off their table.

MR. WILSON: And I have, over the years, if I may, Mr. Chairman, gotten to know many, many, many agency personnel who are, what you would call, value-driven, they attach a high value to the work that they do. And I compliment them and I understand where they're coming from in terms of having to deal with the Federal laws, but you cannot get away from the fact no matter what you do or say out there, it's a people issue, not a predator issue.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Will you fill out a paper and give it to Ann so that she has a record?

MR. WILSON: I don't have to use my name, do I?

MR. CHURCHILL: No.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay, we're going to break for lunch. You're going to have to give us a couple extra minutes because as much as we didn't want to -- we're going to have to give some extra minutes because it takes longer if everybody's got to go downtown and eat, so shall we try and get back here at 1:15, is that reasonable, or do we need until 1:30.

MR. ELVSAAS: Let's go for 1:15.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Let's shoot for 1:15 and make sure we get the meeting started by 1:30.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'd like to call this fall

meeting of the Southcentral Regional Subsistence Advisory Council back in session -- Southcentral Subsistence Regional Advisory Council back in session.

We're going to go on with organization reports, and in this case we're going to Cook Inlet Subsistence Fisheries Update, Office of Subsistence Management.

MS. PETRIVELLI: Mr. Chair, this is Pat Petrivelli again, and we're doing the update -- well, with the Cook Inlet Subsistence fishery study, the phase of the project we're in now are stakeholder meetings. Household surveys were carried out in the spring of this year and the stakeholder meetings reviewed preliminary results with -- in three communities so far. We've held meetings in Kenai, Cooper Landing and Ninilchik last week. And we invited interested people. The Kenai one was the most well attended, I think 15 people attended that meeting. And then two to three people attended the Cooper Landing, and three people attended the Ninilchik meeting. And we were planning on having another one in Seldovia. The household surveys were carried out in those communities, well, Hope, Cooper Landing, Ninilchik and Seldovia. And Liz Williams is going to be presenting pretty much what we did in the stakeholder meetings except for they were more interactive because the goal of those stakeholder meetings were to present the preliminary results of the surveys. And what we're going to do is just share those preliminary results with you but unless -- and just hold any feedback until the very end so that you could -- unless you want to interrupt, you know, with major interruptions, but it will move faster if we just hold questions to the end.

And so this is Liz Williams with the Division of Subsistence, and she oversaw the Hope and Cooper Landing household surveys and then she also did the Seldovia household surveys, and I was lucky enough to do some of the training for that and got to go to Seldovia in late May, early June which was a very pleasant trip for me. So here's Liz.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

MS. WILLIAMS: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair and the Council. What we're about to show you is a powerpoint that we gave at the stakeholder meetings in the communities that Pat mentioned. And in the stakeholder meetings we went over this information over quite a bit of time, and I have a limited amount of time today so I'm

going to kind of flip through it quickly but if there's something that catches your interest please signal me so I can stop.

You're probably familiar with the workshop objectives. Basically we told the communities that this is very preliminary data, it's not conclusive and the whole point was to get their feedback and make sure that what came out was within the realm of reality.

I'm sure you're aware of the project objectives. Basically to look at how people are using fish now, how they used it in the past and what the potential for potential subsistence harvest would be. We did what Pat said. We did household surveys, we're working on historical literature review, we've done key respondent interviews with knowledgeable people in many communities, and all of that's still going on.

And as Pat mentioned, the stakeholder meetings were really important as we prepare to write the final report. I just want to show you here our survey sampling achievement. If you can see those numbers, they're kind of small, we planned a random sample survey in every community. But as it turned out several of the communities that we worked in have large seasonal populations and we only wanted to interview year-round residents. So in Cooper Landing, where we had a random sample planned, we actually ended up doing a census survey, and we found approximately 137 permanent households, and of those we conducted surveys with -- where is that number -- with 104 of those. Eighteen we couldn't get in touch with and 15 refused. And for the Cooper Landing and Hope crews, I was the crew leader there and we hired Fish and Game technicians that are from the Kenai/Soldotna areas, which was very helpful because they were familiar with all the local fisheries.

The same thing happened in Hope. We ended up doing a census survey. Borough property records indicated that there were 182 residences there but we found out that there are really only about 74 actual year-round permanent residents and we interviewed 60 of those, the rest we couldn't contact. Nicholisk was similar. There are two columns there, one is the old believer community and one are surround -- it's surrounding rural households. Again, we did a census survey there and the total we did there were 42 surveys.

Ninilchik we did do a random survey because

it is such a large community and we ended up doing, let's see where is that one, yeah, actually 100 which was our sample. And in Ninilchik and Nicholisk, we had people from Ninilchik Traditional Council hired for us to work which was really nice because they knew who was where and when and we also had a couple of Fish and Game techs from Kasilof help on that one.

Seldovia, these were all done in May -- in Seldovia we went in June and two women from the Seldovia Tribe worked with us there which was wonderful because they, too, knew how to find everyone and we had a random sample of 50 surveys to do there and we ended up with 50.

The important thing to notice is that we were really welcomed in every community. Our refusal rates were really low. People were very hospitable, they really wanted to talk about this.

It's the third column from the bottom, you can see Cooper Landing, it was 13 percent, Hope was nine, Nicholisk was the highest with 22 percent in the old believer community, Ninilchik 18 percent and Seldovia 14 percent. So it was really pleasant to have such a good reception.

This is just a demographic breakdown from our surveys. We'll probably sort our data according to these -- compared to these different population groups. We're just in the preliminary data analysis right now, so this is pretty early stuff.

This shows the percent of population surveyed in each community and which type of fish they harvest, that they tried to fish for. So in Cooper Landing you can see 57 percent of the community fish for salmon, 44 percent other freshwater fish, marine fish 22 percent, and any fish 65. And the numbers, if you look at Hope, Nicholisk, and other communities, they're all pretty similar for salmon. Other freshwater fish it varies a little bit more from community to community, and of course, you see much higher marine fishing in Ninilchik and Seldovia, not surprising.

This is harvest of fish useable pounds. It's not individual fish, and so again you can look by community at how much salmon each community harvested, how much freshwater fish, and again how much marine fish. Seldovia really is the high harvester among all the other places.

This is a comparison of surveys that we've done in the past with the survey we did this year. If you look at Cooper Landing, the red is salmon and the blue is freshwater fish. And you can see, they're not exactly the same between the survey in 1990 and the one we just did, but pretty similar. Same for Hope. Nicholisk is a little bit in decline, that may be because commercial fishing families have been relocating due to poor commercial fish prices. Ninilchik is almost identical, and then Seldovia we're still evaluating why this may have risen so sharply. Maybe Fred can help us with that later, but also I think the slough fishery may have increased a lot of people's harvest, a new fishery that was done out there in the '90s.

Household involvement and use, fishing for means people tried to get fish, using is how much they actually went through or how many households used fish. So if the numbers on the bottom look a little bit higher, it means they tried and up top it means they may not have received it. Sometimes people are confused because these numbers up here are a little bit lower. But if you look at Seldovia, you can see that 58 percent of the community used sockeye where as 26 percent fished for it. So you can kind of compare those.

Average household harvest of salmon and this is individual numbers and you can look by community here, Hope has a little bit of a chum fishery so they harvest some of those, silvers seven, not many kings just because there isn't a huge king fishery out there, pinks a lot of people like them fresh, and then reds. And so you can look by each community as to what species people are primarily harvesting.

In our stakeholder meetings, several communities mentioned that the high number of sockeye isn't' necessarily reflective of what people want but what they can get, regulations and high harvest impacts from sportfishing and regulations have led to a trend toward higher sockeye use according to several stakeholder meetings that we had. And this is the same sort of stats for freshwater fish. Let's see and look at an example. Cooper Landing, rainbow trout, 25 percent of the households we surveyed fished for rainbow trout and then 24 percent actually used them. One of the reasons this is so high there is because there are a lot of rainbows in the lakes and so that's pretty popular with people. And then you can just kind of look at the different species.

And what we learned also is that what we

have listed as smolt is really eulachon. There was some controversy if that was fresh or marine fish and freshwater, and we're anthropologists in subsistence division, not biologists so we looked for help from others, mainly at the stakeholder meetings which was very helpful.

This is, again, just the average household harvest of freshwater fish, and, again, this is individual fish. There are a few outlyers in some situations like I don't think anybody really used steelhead in Cooper Landing but maybe one person received a half of one or I should have said fished for, they might have gone to the Anchor River or something. But I think I remember one person used -- received like a half.

Another question on the survey is a type of question that we don't normally ask but because of the nature of this project we wanted to know how much fish people could actually use or what they thought they could use. And the question was framed where it didn't include fish that they give away to other households, but how much fish could they eat. And these numbers, seem pretty reasonable in many respects. They're higher than what people actually harvest is what we'll see on the next couple of tables, but what a lot of people said was that they really would like to eat more fish, but, jobs keep them from getting out and doing it and a lot of people want to eat more fish because of health. A lot of people don't like to fish in their area because it's too overrun with tourists, so there were all sorts of comments made when we asked this question.

Let's see, so here, we're looking at estimated salmon households could use, those answers compared to the actual harvest data they gave us. So if you look at Ninilchik, let's look at kings, people said they could use 8.6 kings, but what they harvested was one and a half. But this was a community where, at the stakeholder meeting people were very clear that they just can't get the kings that they need anymore and that kings are traditionally what people use a lot of, but they're not there or the regulations have routed them out.

Freshwater fish that people could use annually. Again, this is just a conjecture question. If you could get the amount of fish that you wanted in an ideal world, how many of each species do you think you would use. And a lot of people really like this type of fish, fresh only, so they even answered it on the condition that they would get fresh freshwater fish all the time.

And a lot of them reflect what's available in their area.

In Seldovia there's just not a lot of freshwater fish right in their surrounding area, so their numbers tend to be a little bit lower than most of the other places on the Peninsula that's on the road system.

Let's see, so again, this is freshwater fish on here. How much people could use versus how much they've harvested and so you can see, again, the numbers on the could use are always a little higher than what they actually harvested. And sometimes they're just not there, sometimes it's time, different reasons why people didn't harvest. And, again, it was a totally ideal world question.

This question asked people how they felt about the State personal use dipnet fisheries, and the one most people, of course, were familiar with was the one at the mouth of the Kenai River, and these answers are really interesting, too. You can see most -- the majority of people thought that the limit was about right, but the numbers of people that don't know aren't really small in places like Cooper Landing and Seldovia. A lot of people answered this question with conditions. They thought maybe Kenai Peninsula families should have one limit and Anchorage families should have a lower one. Some people thought economics should determine what sort of a limit was imposed on this fishery. The most common response to this question was that there should be more enforcement. A lot of people feel or perceive that there's a lot of abuse of this fishery. People talked about how when -- I forgot what the radio program's called in Kenai but some people donate a lot of the fish from this fishery for dogs or to the bird treatment learning center, again, this is a perception. We don't have any numbers on this. But people were also worried that a lot of people just go out and fish way past their limit day after today, they see the same people. So perceptions.

This was a question that told people right now the Federal Subsistence regulations for the Peninsula are currently the same as State sportfishing regs, do you want them to stay that way or do you want them changed? So in answer of agree was that people wanted the Federal Subsistence regulations to remain the same as the State sportfishing regs. The majority says they agree. A lot of people in many communities didn't know, you know, subsistence is such a highly publicized and controversial issue, but to sit down and pull apart what this type of

stuff means, you know, people are working, they have families and you can't always just sit down and worry about this kind of stuff. And so a lot of people said, you know, it's just confusing for me, I don't know. And there were a pretty big number of people that also disagreed. Some people really wanted a local fishery.

So this was an interesting question to ask. It spurred a lot of discussion.

Some people in Cooper Landing whose livelihood comes from sportfishing economy at first said they would like a few local fisheries just for locals, but then the second phase of their thought was how would it impact our businesses or our community and so then they would sort of say well, I guess I do want them to stay the same, but I'm also tired of fishing at night. So, again, that's just a few answers.

And if I seem like I quote more people from Cooper Landing that's because that's where I did the survey.

What we also asked was if there were Federal Subsistence fisheries, where would you like to have one in your area. We showed people a map of the areas in question and still some people just mentioned where they wanted to fish, period. So a few people mentioned State places. Some people said nothing, they didn't want a subsistence fishery, they liked things the way they are. So if you look at this, Cooper Landing, 37 of the households that we interviewed listed a subsistence fishery site. And in Hope, 36 did. Nicholisk, eight. Ninilchik 29. Seldovia 15. Those who listed no site are on the bottom line, 65 for Cooper Landing, 22 for Hope. So you can see again that those that provided no scenario matched that earlier question about how people felt about Federal and State regulations.

One of the other things we asked in this question, too, was if there was a place that you would want to fish, what type of gear would you use, what type of species would you target and how many, and some people only gave us partial answers. But on this next slide you can see that rod and reel was the highest type of gear people mentioned in every community. And these numbers down here, just to remind you, these numbers ar high because people could mention more than one scenario, but again, only 37 of the households in Cooper Landing that we interviewed out of 104 responded at all and the same for all the other ones.

58 people out of Ninilchik mentioned a place they might want a subsistence fishery out of 100 -- 36 out of 60 in Hope, 15 out of 50 in Seldovia. So you can see we spelled snagging wrong and some of the other things. We separated fly fishing and ice fishing from rod and reel just because it was interesting for us to see what type of stuff because there is a lot of ice fishing in many of these communities that have lake trout and things like that.

And then the next slides we'll show you are the places that each community listed, the people that actually mentioned one and so what you'll notice about these is almost all of them are very, very local. If you're familiar with the areas at all you can tell.

The interesting thing about Hope is that they would like to go closer to Cooper Landing for their subsistence fisheries except for Six Mile Creek and Resurrection Creek. As you can see the largest number of households mention these. There's controversies about the populations of kings in these creek and people in Hope really would like to be able to fish more the kings that are there locally. People seem to think that there might be enough but they're really concerned, too, they want to catch them if they can but they also said that they would like a king fishery there only if the health of the resource wouldn't be affected negatively. And that's pretty much true about almost everywhere.

Nicholisk probably listed the fewest places and those you can see there.

And Seldovia. I think I skipped Ninilchik, and I don't know how to go backwards, do you?

MS. PETRIVELLI: The other button.

MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. Those are the places that Ninilchik mentioned. And, again, they're really close to their community.

You can see they mention Tuxedni Bay, which is one of the areas under consideration and the other two communities didn't. That was also mentioned in Seldovia as was Chitina Bay, which again are both across the Inlet but weren't mentioned in the other communities.

Now, I'll give you just a few bullets from the stakeholder meetings that Pat mentioned that we had last night. Our first meeting was in Kenai, and even

though it's not considered a rural community currently it is one of the communities that will be affected. And what they said, one of the main concerns that they had was that this study focused only on rural communities and not in places like Kenai where there are long-term residents who know local long-term traditions. But they also found fault with it, in that we didn't acknowledge or talk about the fact, how important commercial fishing is for subsistence food in the area. Several people mentioned that when their families commercial fished, their home used food was pulled from the catch before any sales were ever made. Also some of the current personnel use fisheries down there, don't provide an opportunity for people to teach their children the traditional ways that people fished there and still would like to.

And they also talk about how, in the past, like I said before, people use kings and silvers for subsistence not sockeyes, and the high sockeye numbers reflect regulations and not preferences.

In Cooper Landing they generally thought the results were an accurate assessment of community opinion, which to them was they really didn't want any subsistence fisheries in their area and that was the majority, it wasn't everyone by any means.

They were really scared about regulations that would allow locals and non-locals to fish next to each other with different types of gear and different types of limits. Most of them fished locally and they -- just when we do our final data analysis, they'd like to see length of residency and harvest levels compared with amount of fish a household might be able to use, the ideal use thing.

But even though they said this at the front there are some older people there who mentioned how one day -- and this is a small minority that mentioned this, but they really would like Russian River one day a week for elders. You know, they talked about fishing at night when they weren't, you know, combat fishing and stuff. Also a winter silver fishery that they used to have is something that they really would like to come back.

In Ninilchik, again, we got the same comment that we got in Kenai, that kings and silvers were always the priority and the sockeyes are just the result of regulations and availability. They see a correlation between the decrease in king availability and silver availability as sportfishing and tourism have increased.

They also said that there's a real change in the types of preservation methods they used. They used to smoke most of their kings and silvers, and now sockeye you mostly can it. This was an interesting comment, too, is that in regard to the question about State and Federal regulations being the State sport regs, the majority of people in Ninilchik said that they wanted the Federal Subsistence regs to continue to remain the same as the State sportfishing regs. And so even though people want some local fisheries there, they also noted that in their community, this is an acknowledgement of how important the regs are for species conservation, and I thought that was an interesting perspective.

This is just mostly for us. We're supposed to have a draft ready at the end of the year and then we will have a final done in March after, hopefully a lot of public review, although the attendance at the stakeholder meetings was low in some communities, a lot of people that we ran into that we'd met during the surveys asked us when the report was going to be due and if they could get a copy.

And that's about it unless there's any questions.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No questions but a comment. It's understandable why Seldovia has such a much higher use of fish than other communities, they've got Fred there catching it for the whole community and distributing it.

(Laughter)

MS. WILLIAMS: Well, his catch would have shown in our previous study, too, and that's what confused us. But maybe he was sick that year.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: He was still working that year. He's retired now. So what he does is he just catches fish to give away.

MS. WILLIAMS: I've got it.

MR. ELVSAAS: A comment though. The concerns about the seasons and timing and so forth is real -- in Seldovia, that subsistence king fishing opens the 1st of April, there aren't any fish until the end of May. And Fish and Game says, well, what are you crying about you got 60 days, but you only got 10 days of fish. And the thing

about rod and reel being the preferred method, on the 24th of June in the slough in Seldovia, the fish are right in town, the fishery opens to snagging so people use rod and reel for snagging, so it opens on the 24th of June, on the 25th of June there's no more kings. They take -- you know, it's a total harvest, they're hatchery kings, and you can supplement with the wild kings outside the bay. But, you know, timing is critical.

We have a silver fishery the first two weekends in August. Well, this year the silvers showed up about Labor Day or after -- after Labor Day. So if you fish on the regulation days you get a lot of humpies. And the local people that use humpies for drying want to take them out of the creek because the fat's out of them then and they dry better and keep better. So you know, timing and seasons.

And then no matter what you do with the regulations, the fish don't read the book, so, you know, it's always a problem.

And like you mentioned, areas where they fish at night, you know, that's basically what you have to do at times, especially like this silvery fishery, snagging the silvers in Jakalof Bay, that's the only way you can get them, you can't use a net, you can't do anything, they won't bite when they're getting up in the bay. So when you look at the subsistence fishery it's not as simple as commercial regs or sportfishing regs, you know, and people want food. But who wants to go fishing the 1st of April, you know, when there's not a fish in the water.

The other thing about Seldovia is we do use a lot of fish because we have a longer period with halibut and other fish being's we're ice free and so forth.

So thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other comments from any of the Council on what they've seen so far.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It looks to me like you're doing a pretty thorough job. It'll be interesting to see what kind of conclusions come out of it.

Susan.

MS. WELLS: We did kind of lambast her in Kenai on some of the questions and I think there was a feeling that because of the residency that we weren't getting a real true picture of the subsistence use, the historical and the criteria for being a resident was, what, a month was it?

MS. WILLIAMS: Three months.

MS. WELLS: Three months.

MS. WILLIAMS: To participate in our survey we count a year-round permanent resident as someone who's been in the community for three months and who plans to stay there by registering to vote and having a permanent address.

MS. WELLS: And there was the concerns that how can you compare what the use was historically because you've got a whole new breed of people that don't know the resource like long residents may have. And so that would reflect some of the needs totally different. And then also we are regulated. I can't get my red salmon to dry before the flies become because there is no fishery in my area. Of course, I'm fishing under State regs, but -- and this data here includes that are coming, not just subsistence, you're getting fish with your State license and, you know, your State fisheries.

MS. WILLIAMS: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: In fact, Susan, I would think that most of the fish that showed up there came under State regulations because people are talking about the past and there hasn't been any other fishery there.

I don't know whether they can address the idea of residency on a survey like this even to the extent that the BLM is addressing it with the caribou hunt and things like that. It would be nice, like that one community asked for if you could, in the end, do you have length of residency of all of the people who took part in the survey?

MS. WILLIAMS: We do. We asked people how many years they'd lived in each community. We asked them how many years they've lived on the Kenai Peninsular and we asked them how many years they've lived in Alaska. And we also asked them the residence of their parents when they were born. And especially in Alaska, for people who were

born in Alaska we ask it, not where were you born but -- because so many people are born in Anchorage but their parents are really from somewhere else and so we are going to look at that.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So you have the ability then to correlate that in the future so that might answer some of the questions that's Susan's asking.

Thank you.

Fred.

MR. ELVSAAS: The local survey takers, did they respond to the questions themselves?

MS. WILLIAMS: In Seldovia?

MR. ELVSAAS: Yes.

MS. WILLIAMS: In Seldovia, they did. I think one did and one didn't. Because what we do is we have borough property records of whatever kind of community property records exist and they give them to us alphabetically but then we scramble them so that we won't go through the community alphabetically but randomly, and I believe at least one of them was on the part, one sister, was on our list.

MR. ELVSAAS: Yeah.

MS. WILLIAMS: And in the other communities, in Ninilchik, the local researchers were not -- we just didn't get to their name on our randomly selected list. And then the other people that were working with us weren't residents of the communities, they were from Kenai/Soldotna, although I did have them write an essay of their impressions and what they thought about the whole issue.

MR. ELVSAAS: The only reason I ask was usually when you use local people in a survey like this they are the consumers themselves so you'd want their input.

MS. WILLIAMS: Absolutely. I really get frustrated when I don't get to work in a community where I can have local researchers because it makes all the difference in the world. Just incredible information is shared when you're riding around looking for a house, not

just the stuff on the survey but lots of information about snagging and all sorts of food preparation and stuff.

(Laughter)

MR. ELVSAAS: Thank you.

MS. WILLIAMS: And gossip.

MR. ELVSAAS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions or comments.

Sylvia.

MS. LANGE: How come Nanwalek and Port Grahame weren't included in this survey?

MS. WILLIAMS: Do you want to answer that?

MS. PETRIVELLI: Nanwalek and English Bay -- or Nanwalek and Port Grahame have their own subsistence fisheries under State regulations and they fish mainly in marine waters and they've had a number of surveys in relationship with the oil spill studies. I think they've bene surveyed at least eight times in the last nine years, even though it doesn't have the potential uses, but their fishing areas have been well documented and they generally don't include Federal waters. And Ron Stanik, the subsistence division anthropologist that worked with those communities communicated with them and they weren't -- and we got feedback that they weren't interested in participating in the study.

There was a decision made in selecting survey areas, we also left out a few other Russian Old Believer communities, but they had been -- we had just completed a major study in '98 of the Ninilchik and Homer rural areas and so we have that data and with the random sampling, those sampling measure would cover -- we had enough samples to get an indication of those areas plus the use patterns from '98 of past areas.

I had -- and I don't know if you'd want more information about the next steps, kind of.....

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: A little, if you've got.....

MS. PETRIVELLI: Do you want that now?

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If it's applicable right now.

MS. PETRIVELLI: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

MS. PETRIVELLI: If you don't have any more questions about the survey itself.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No.

MS. PETRIVELLI: But I did leave a copy of the survey for all the Council members and you can either take it with you or give it back if you want, it's just -- and so you would have a better idea of what kind of questions were asked, and the unique -- what informations will be -- what information will be contained in the final report. But the draft final report will be submitted to the Board -- or will be submitted to our office at the end of December and then that final report will be submitted March 31st. Of course, the fish proposal period for our office, the regular fish proposal period ends March 26th, and so -- and then in the past the Board has not accepted any fish proposals in this area as Cooper Landing has already mentioned until the results of this study is done. And so the next regular proposal period would be the next year, you know, going January to March of -- for the next year.

So -- and there is the feeling it would be -- with the results of the study coming out, when we did finish these stakeholder meetings we did try to find out ways to distribute this report as much as possible or who would -- or at least there'd be an executive summary and then just making the full report available in the local Fish and Game offices and libraries and the Refuge offices and the Forest Service offices so that people who are interested that would want to read this wonderful survey results and the table upon tables of data that will be available, but -- but we would want to make as wide distribution as possible so that people could submit -- when they are making proposals that they would have as much information as possible.

That's all about the next steps that I have.

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

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you muchly, and that was a very good report.

MR. CHURCHILL: Yes, it was.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With that we're going to go on to Governor's request by Bob Gerhard. I'll get it right yet. And you can go right on into the regulatory cycle review afterwards.

MR. GERHARD: For the record my name is Bob Gerhard. I've got two presentations. One is a letter, request from the Governor. The other is the issue of Council concerns of the role of Staff Committee. I think the regulatory review is someone else. We added one item.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

MR. GERHARD: As I mentioned my name is Bob Gerhard. I work for the National Park Service but I'm here this afternoon in my role as a member of the Inter-Agency Staff Committee. And I have these two presentations, does it matter to you which one I do first?

(Council shakes head negatively)

MR. GERHARD: Okay. I'll take them in the order that I have them in my book then so I don't get myself confused. The first is the Council concerns with the role of the Staff Committee. This is in your Council booklet that's behind Tab F, Pages 199 to 202. And because these are briefings, I'll try to be true to that and keep it brief.

You may remember that at the last Federal Subsistence Board meeting in May there was a discussion of the appropriate role of the Inter-Agency Staff Committee in the decision-making process. During that discussion the Board Chair acknowledged that the perceptions of the various Regional Advisory Councils, that the Staff Committee has had or is having undue influence on the Board, on the decision-making processes and on the resulting rulemaking. Because of those perceptions and concerns, the Board Chair directed a review of Staff Committee procedures. The Staff Committee exists because

the regulations that were adopted at the beginning of the Federal Subsistence Program said that the Board shall establish a Staff Committee for analytical and administrative assistance. And I'm sure you're all well familiar with the role that we play.

But because of some of these perceptions and the Board Chair's direction for a review. The Board and the Staff Committee have discussed this issue a number of time and the Board has developed a series of proposed changes to the role of the Staff Committee. And the Board wants to get your, the Council's review of what we have to suggest now and any other suggestions, comments you might have.

So I'll go right into those proposed changes and, these, are again in your book. There are five major areas. The first is that to bring the Staff Committee and Council interaction together as soon as possible, that if Council's requested -- if you request that Staff Committee members would be available as you're developing proposals to offer our policy, procedural, technical perspectives in the development of those proposals.

Second item, is that, at the Regional Advisory Council meetings, Staff Committee will develop talking points on these proposals and other issues and then a representative of the Staff Committee will take it to the Council meetings. That will provide a dialogue between the Staff Committee and the Councils and, again, provide the same policy, procedural and technical perspectives as you, the Councils, develop your recommendations on the proposal analysis.

The third item, I hope that all of you know that after the Council meeting where you develop your recommendations on proposals the Staff Committee meets and in the past has developed the Staff Committee recommendation on all of the proposals. For the last several years, the Department of Fish and Game has had representatives at these Staff Committee meetings, and the proposal here is that at that Staff Committee meeting we would also include the appropriate Regional Advisory Council Chair or Chairs to be part of that discussion so that the Council will be a part of that process, and that hopefully these Staff Committee comments would be developed through a consensus building process that considers the Council recommendations, any comments from the Council Chair, ADF&G comments, public comments, any other latest

information that we have.

The fourth item is that Staff Committee representatives will be the ones to conduct briefings to the Councils on issues when the Board is seeking Council comments, like this briefing I'm doing right now. In the past these have been more often done by representatives from OSM, from the Office of Subsistence Management. But that on issues that go before the Board for decision, the Staff Committee will take that role and the OSM Staff will focus on conducting status report briefings on ongoing processes.

And then the fifth and last area is conduct at the Federal Subsistence Board meetings and there's basically two elements to that fifth item. One is that the Board book will include an Inter-Agency Staff Committee analysis of the issues in the proposal, but that there will no longer be a formal presentation to the Federal Subsistence Board of a Staff Committee recommendation.

And in concert with that, the Federal Subsistence Board will begin their deliberations on any proposals by entertaining a motion on a Regional Council recommendation, not a Staff Committee recommendation.

So those are the areas that we've identified so far that may change the relationship of the Staff Committee to the Councils and to the Board. But we'd certainly be interested in your comments on those recommendations, or any other perceptions or any other thoughts you have on the role of the Staff Committee and any changes that you think should be made.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any comment from any of the Council members, other than me.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob, I think you've made some steps in the right direction. And I know from talking to other Council Chairs and everything, that last one will have a real effect, the last one, I think, is where a lot of the perception comes. Is where the Board makes their motion on Staff Committee recommendations and then may modify it to take into account Council thoughts. The difference between making the motion on Council recommendations and then modifying it to take other

information in. And it is just a difference in perception, but perception is reality, too. And I think that that's what's going to make a big step.

I was going to ask you a question on number 3, where you're talking about building it by consensus, you know, and bringing the Council Chair's comments and the recommendations from the Council and everything together. This is probably going to require either another meeting or a teleconference, right?

MR. GERHARD: Yes. Well, not another meeting, per se, that meeting take places but in the past we have not routinely had the Council Chair participate in that meeting. And the recommendation here is that the Council Chair participate. I don't know whether that means it would be in person or by teleconference, I suspect that that might be based on the circumstances, how many proposals there are, the nature of them, but the idea is that Council Chairs would routinely be asked to participate in that meeting.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's what I meant. I didn't mean a full Council meeting, I just meant it would mean another meeting or teleconference for either the Chair or an appointed representative.

MR. GERHARD: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We should have known that before we had the elections, I wish.

(Laughter)

MS. WELLS: Oops.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other comments from any other members of the Council.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Does this look like they've gone in the right direction to you?

Fred.

MR. ELVSAAS: I would say, yes. I think this is good. I know I've heard and had concerns about how the Board, you know, who do they listen to first, the Advisory Council or the Staff and who do they listen to

most, you know, and I haven't seen a real hassle or problem so far but I've heard that off and on. But I think this is a good step.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think as a Council we might have had less of a feeling than that than some other Councils. There's been a couple times, I know that we've taken issue with what the Staff has presented as not agreeing with what we have said, or with the Staff presenting proposals to us instead of proponents. But I've heard more complaint, I guess, from other Councils than I heard from Southcentral. And I know a lot of them have more of a feeling that they're just sitting in the background and the Staff is doing the work. I think we've had a pretty good interaction with the Staff and, you know, no interaction is always perfect, but I think this is a step in the right direction. Especially the last is going to make an effect on the perception of a lot of the other Councils.

So I thank the Board and the Staff for getting together and working on something like this.

MR. GERHARD: Thank you. Shall I move on to the next item?

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes. Unless somebody else has a comment.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, please.

MR. GERHARD: Okay. The second presentation is on a letter from the Governor. You don't have this in your Council booklet, but I understand from Ann that you do have in your folder a copy of that Governor's letter and some excerpts from the record of decision that followed the environmental impact statement that was prepared in the early '90s.

So briefly in a letter dated July 17th of this year, Governor Murkowski wrote to the Secretary of the Interior and asked that a State official be appointed to the Federal Subsistence Board as a non-voting member. The Governor further requested that that appointee be either the Commissioner of ADF&G or his or her designee.

In considering this request, the Federal Subsistence Board has reviewed the record of decision that

I just mentioned. That record of decision provides or a State liaison to the Federal Subsistence Board that would be nominated by the Governor and appointed by the Secretary of the Interior. That has not happened before. This is the first time that the Governor has elected to nominate anyone for such an appointment. The current time, as I think you all know, Staff Committee members from ADF&G provide comments on regulatory proposals to the Federal Subsistence Board but they do not actively deliberate with the Board unless specifically questioned by a Board member.

The Federal Subsistence Board believes that under the record of decision, the Board itself has some administrative flexibility in how it conducts its meetings. For example, the Board may change the Board meeting procedures to allow the State liaison as well as the Regional Advisory Council Chairs additional latitude in deliberating regulatory proposals.

The Secretary and the Board are aware that this is a matter of considerable sensitivity and may effect the way the Board conducts its deliberative process. The Office of the Secretary of the Interior requested the Board meet as soon as possible to discuss the Governor's request. The Board did meet in executive session on September 26th, but during this meeting recognized that this was an issue of importance to the public. Because of that the Board refrained from making a final recommendation but decided that the next best step to take is to have a public meeting. The Board is currently scheduling a work session in early November to develop their recommendation to the Secretary. This work session will be open to the public. The Board may choose to ask questions or ask for comments from the public, the State or the Staff as it deliberates on this request during the work session.

We are providing this information to the Regional Advisory Council so that you are aware of this request and how the Board is handling it. If you have comments or recommendations you wish to provide to the Board it would be appropriate for you to do so at this time.

I believe and I'm not sure, but I think they're focusing on November 5th as the date for that work session but I'm not sure if that's been confirmed with all the Board members.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob, I'm going to kind of review what I just hear for the sake of the Council to see

if I understand it correctly and then we can go from there.

If I understand right, the Governor -- has the Governor nominated somebody to this position?

MR. GERHARD: The Governor asked to have someone appointed as a non-voting member to the Board.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay, but he didn't actually nominate anybody at this point in time?

MR. GERHARD: Well, he said that if that request can be accommodated that he would ask that it be either the Commissioner, Kevin Duffey, or someone that Duffey designated.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But he asked to have them on the Board, not the liaison that was mentioned in the thing of decision?

MR. GERHARD: That's correct. The request was for a non-voting member. The record of decision identifies a role for the State and for the Regional Council Chairs as liaisons to the Board. The record of decision also stipulates that the State liaison can be or would be nominated by the Governor and appointed by the Secretaries. There is no reason to have the Regional Advisory Council Chairs nominated and appointed because you already are nominated and appointed by the Secretary. But that liaison role has never been formalized as far as a State membership like the record of decision states.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But what the Governor is asking for is something other than a liaison though, isn't he?

MR. GERHARD: That's why they'll be another meeting early in November. You could infer that there is a difference between a liaison and a non-voting member. And I think the Board wants to further look into that issue and they want to do it in a public forum to discuss those items.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I don't think you could infer that there's a difference, I mean if Council Chairs are liaisons, they do not sit on the Board and they are not non-voting members of the Board, so if the Governor's appointee is a liaison then he would have to be at the same position as a Council Chair. He would not be a member of the Board, he would be an advisor to the Board, the same as

the Council Chair. Am I correct or am I thinking wrong?

MR. GERHARD: I've heard that position spoken by a number of different people, yes.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob, could you tell me what would be the difference between sitting on the Board as a non-voting member and acting to the Board as a liaison would be?

MR. GERHARD: I'm not sure how well I could answer that question because again a lot of this goes to people's perceptions as to what a member is as opposed to what a liaison is and we really haven't had that free and open discussion. I mean I think it's safe to say that some people feel there is a huge difference between the two terms, a liaison and a non-voting member.

Other people think that we have flexibility under either term that in actual conduct at the meetings, there may not be a lot of difference between the two terms and that's when it gets down to just how the role of the State liaison is incorporated into the conduct and the scope of the meeting, maybe really an important part of the discussion.

It's clear that the State wants an active role in the process, but where that role fits, where people sit when they are invited or allowed to speak is still open to discussion so I'm not trying to weasel out of answering your question but I really do believe that what you call that person may be less important than how that person is incorporated into the conduct of the meetings.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think I can see what you mean. If the Council Chairs actions as liaison gave them the same authority as a non-voting member of the Board then they would be able to participate in the discussion and give information and ask questions. Currently, the Board is capable of asking questions but the Council Chairs are not capable of asking questions at a Board meeting. If I remember right. I'm trying to remember if I've ever been given the opportunity to ask a question at a Board meeting and I think I have, but it's not a regular practice and it has to go -- you know, so that's the only difference that I can see right there and that's the biggest difference I can see in my mind.

MR. GERHARD: You know, Ann, do you have a copy of the Governor's letter? I don't know why I didn't think of this but I walked up here without the letter, because I think there's something I should read. I have it right here. You all have this but I think at least to get a sense of what the Governor is asking let me just read part of this letter. It says after reviewing several years of the Federal process, I am convinced that better decisions will be made if a Department of Fish and Game representatives is allowed to participate in questioning witnesses to assure that all necessary information is considered and deliberation occurs on biological and allocation questions.

That gives you a sense of what the Governor's office is looking for. And how they would define their role, whether it's a member or a liaison.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anybody on the Council got anything to make comments on that.

Fred.

MR. ELVSAAS: My thinking on this is that at this point that the Regional Advisory Councils address the issues in the various areas and are presented to the Board and the Board acts or doesn't act on the proposals presented, and they can do others also. I don't have a problem with the State having a person as a liaison person there, any issues that concern the State and the Fish and Game people. But on the other hand I would caution against having the State putting a person on the Board. Even though you call it a non-voting person, as I see it the concept is that they would be there acting as a Board member, asking questions and so forth, influencing votes through comments and what not. But it's only less than half a step away from the next thing as well, we have a member why can't our member vote when everybody else can, and I would have a problem with that. I would not recommend that.

So I think that this is like you say, getting the camel's nose under the tent and it would scare me.

So with that, I don't like the idea.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Fred. Any other comments.

Susan.

MS. WELLS: I really liked what Heather Kendall wrote in her letter to Gale Norton and I'll just read this one part here. It says Governor Murkowski's request is disturbing is that it pretends an increasing pattern of state efforts to bring Federal law into conformity with State law rather than being State law back into compliance with the mandates of Federal law. And I agree with what has already been said here that we don't want to take that step back. I think that would give them more of an opportunity to turn our Federal laws into State compliance instead of vice versa.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Susan. Gilbert, do you have anything?

MR. DEMENTI: Do we have to take a vote on this?

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Negative. We don't have to take a vote on it.

MR. DEMENTI: We don't have to have any action taken?

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We don't have to have any action on it.

MR. DEMENTI: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You don't have to present anything if you don't have anything that you want to say on it either.

MR. DEMENTI: I just don't feel comfortable with it.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Sylvia, you got anything?

MS. LANGE: I'm just trying to formulate all this in my mind because my first reaction is a very negative one and so -- but I think the beauty -- or let's see, I don't know that beauty is the right word, but the last few years have allowed more local control and input that wasn't felt before in this system under State management and co-management has allowed, through the rural Advisory Councils a more hands-on stakeholder ownership feel of the -- by the users themselves and I think, you

know, anything that diminishes that is a step in the wrong direction.

And like Fred said, you know, keep the camel out of the tent or whatever, but I just think more -- diminishing local control is not -- and certainly if the Chairs aren't voting members of the Council and don't have as much say to -- to be given the chance to interview witnesses and bring out certain things then I don't see any reason to allow somebody else to as well from the State.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Sylvia. I think that's kind of my opinion on it, too. I mean I think that they are -- I think that they have the authority to ask for a liaison and the Council Chairs are classed as liaisons so they have the authority to ask for somebody to be nominated of equal status as the Council Chairs, they are there to give input. I can't imagine having not only the Board but the Council Chairs and the State all asking questions on all these proposals because it's going to change -- it's going to turn it into a long meeting, that's for sure.

But I know that if there was gong to be adversarial questions asked, you'd also want to be able to ask adversarial questions in return. And from that stand point, I have difficulty -- I have difficulty seeing the rest of the Councils being very excited about having the State have a pro-factor Board member sitting up there, whether he can vote or whether he can't vote. I probably can't see much objection if he's there as the same kind of liaison as a Council Chair would be because then he would be there to give information and to share and he could ask questions if he asked permission and somebody gave him the permission to ask a question, but it wouldn't be in the role of a Board member who can ask anything that he wants to ask anytime he wants to ask it.

So that would be kind of my feeling.

Sylvia.

MS. LANGE: You know, I also just can't kind of wrap my mind around why? I'm not getting an answer, why? This letter from the Governor doesn't explain it to me. The ability to question witnesses, why? I just -- I can't understand that other layer in there. And frankly, I'm a little -- this is an administration and a state government that sort of forced this whole thing and now they want to engage in it a little more and control it

a little more and, you know, that's why we're here because they wouldn't take control of what they had to begin with.

I don't know, like I said I probably should be quiet about it.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, that's exactly what we're looking for today, we're looking for feelings of Council members. You have a meeting on November 5th and a work session and it's a public meeting, are the Council Chairs going to be invited, is the Council going to be -- I mean is there going to be opportunity for Council Chairs to be there at that meeting or is this -- I mean if we have a work session in Anchorage and the Council Chairs are scattered all over, you know, they're not going to be part of the work session?

MR. GERHARD: No, let me remind you again the date, I think is getting close to fixed but I'm not sure it's a positive so don't take that back as the gospel. I'm not sure all Board members have said they were available and that the meeting has been set for sure. Now, the question of the Council Chair's role in that meeting, I honestly don't know the answer. Personally I would hope that all the Council Chairs have a role in that meeting. I don't know the answer though.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, thank you and thanks for -- this isn't something that we need to take action on you have our comments. It's not something that we need to vote on or anything like that, is it?

MR. GERHARD: No. That is the very purpose and I appreciate all the comments that you've had. I'll take those back and, of course, they're part of the permanent record in the transcript. I'll be glad to report that this is another subsistence species we've identified and that's a camel, so.....

(Laughter)

MR. GERHARD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Do I see most everything as being done? Ann?

MS. WILKINSON: You still have the Park Service reports.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, we have a Park Service

report. There aren't any Park Service people here.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, you can't vote in this, you know.

(Laughter)

MR. TWITCHELL: Hollis Twitchell, Denali National Park. Chair. Council members.

Being the last agency up for many years running I usually get direct guidance from Gilbert and it's usually Hollis be brief we're trying to get out of here. Well, today Gilbert's advice to me was Hollis lighten up, don't take things so seriously. So at this point I'd like to exercise my right and I fully intend to filibuster the Council for three hours, so getting out early is not an option today.

MS. WELLS: But that is a joke, right?

MR. TWITCHELL: That is a joke. I do have three issues that potentially could go three hours but I will try to be brief with them. Only one of them requires direct action from the Council at this meeting. The three issues are going to be the residency -- durational residency request by Denali and also Wrangells. The second issue will be a request, hunting plan proposal, a request for predator/prey relationship studies in Denali. And the third item is going to be ATV use impacts and potential legal action going on in Denali as a result of events this summer and over a number of years.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And the answer is yes on all of those.

MR. TWITCHELL: Yes. At our last meeting I mentioned that the Park Service had advanced the durational residency request for Wrangells and Denali to the Secretary of the Interior, and subsequently that the solicitors were undertaking legal review as to that aspect for resident zones. We have just recently received the response from the solicitor regarding that and the indications are that they do not feel that ANILCA and the intent of ANILCA would support a durational residency for local areas. That is being reviewed by the agency, and subsequent responses will be going out to both the Chairs of the Commissions.

They focused their response on that. Since there isn't direct guidance from ANILCA itself in terms of durational residency into the legislative record and histories and they referred back not only to the Senate Bill but also the House report in terms of what was said in those mark ups as to determine what the intent of ANILCA was regarding durational residency. They also referred back to a legal opinion that was rendered by the solicitor's office in the mid-80s as a response to the Alaska -- State of Alaska's request in terms of rural preference provisions. And they also based that response to the 1988 Secretary's response, Gates of the Arctic National Park which had requested a 12 month residency for their resident zones.

So based on those composites of materials in previous opinions is they came to support their previous legal interpretations.

So that leaves the SRCs back to square one, having failed with roster regs to get towards these issues and also failed with the durational residency potential as a tool to address some concerns.

So where we go from here I really don't know until we get together with the Chairs later this month in Anchorage, put our heads together and think about where to go from here and we'll obviously be on the agendas with our SRCs on the next cycle of meetings.

If you have any questions.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, I don't think we have any questions on that Hollis. Basically the answer is no?

MR. TWITCHELL: That's the.....

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

MR. TWITCHELL: .....solicitor's opinion and I don't see any daylight for the agency to go in any different direction.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Moving on to the second issue, we didn't get in time for your notebooks but I think Ann may have also passed it out to you is the hunting proposal that was formulated at the last SRC meeting and I'll go over it briefly here and then have some discussion.

The proposed recommendation is that the

Commission recommends that a predator/prey relationship study be conducted in Denali National Park and Preserve. The purpose of the study is to facilitate understanding of natural and healthy populations and to provide some guidance for Alaska Parks regarding subsistence harvest of wildlife. Traditional subsistence uses in the new additions to Denali Park and Preserve depend on wildlife populations remaining natural and healthy. This requires consistent monitoring of both prey and predators. Denali has a significant body of predator/prey data, including particular base studies towards caribou and wolf populations. These studies have international value and would -- and should be continued in the future as the data is applicable to other populations in other parks and elsewhere. They could be used as a model to help define natural and healthy populations as described in ANILCA.

ANILCA, Section .815 does not define natural and healthy but species that nothing in Title VIII shall be construed as permitting the level of subsistence uses of fish and wildlife within a conservation unit to be inconsistent with the conservation of healthy populations and within the National Park or Monuments to be inconsistent with the conservation of natural and healthy populations of fish and wildlife. The proposed study would build upon this previous research and would help provide policy guidance and a biological framework for making management decisions affecting wildlife populations and subsistence use.

The SRC advanced this as a hunting plan proposal in the hopes that it would garnish greater support from various consultation processes as it moves forward to the Secretary. That has come about for two reasons.

We have, in Denali, proposed previous research specifically along these lines and it has not competed well within the NPS funding process for natural resource projects, and the criteria that the National Park Service uses for evaluating these projects very often are not very responsive to subsistence related type of issues. Because of that they wanted to advance this to another level beyond just the NPS internal funding process.

The second reason is around Denali and to the east, south and west of us we have declining populations of wildlife and particularly moose and caribou with Tier II being in existence or very near being implemented in Unit 13 and 16 for both caribou and moose.

So in regards to those concerns about intensive wildlife management and predator/prey relationships and the availability of resources and populations within the adjoining Park areas, they wanted to move forward with a better understanding of where the Park Service position is on this.

So that was the second item. I'll open that up to discussion.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That takes no action on our part, Hollis, that's more of an informational item, am I correct in that or is that something you'd like action on?

MR. TWITCHELL: This is something that we would like action on since it's been addressed as a hunting plan proposal which requires consultation with a variety of interests around the state. So if you were so inclined to support this kind of effort then the Commission would be very interested in some response to this proposal.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Gilbert.

MR. DEMENTI: Yeah, would this proposal be in the regulations then? I wasn't sure if we discussed that at the SRC.

MR. TWITCHELL: One of the items that ANILCA addresses when it organizes the Subsistence Resource Commissions is to guide the Secretary of the Interior, the Governor and the Park Service in terms of not only hunting programs in Parks and Monuments, but also to identify what sorts of informational needs that the Commission needs to have and the Park managers need to have in order to make those decisions. So there is a function of the SRCs to address those sorts of needs. And it's in that context that the SRC had advanced this proposal as a hunting plan recommendation.

So it wouldn't result in any change in regulations immediately but rather provide more clarity in terms of what the Park Service means by natural and healthy and how those determinations might be instigated in terms of management decisions.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If I understand right, Hollis, this would be build on research that's already been done in Denali Park on predator/prey populations and populations of game that have gone on over the years so

this would be a continuation or a building on that research to accumulate research that would come up with what can you define as a natural and healthy population so if in the future hunting takes one population down or predators take one population down, basically what you can do is you can say we need to adjust our seasons and bag limits to allow this population to come back to what would be a, I'll use the word, normal, situation, am I correct kind of in what I'm assuming from this?

MR. TWITCHELL: Yes, you are. The interest that the SRC was expressing is there is a fairly significant body of science that has collected over the last 15 years, in particular, dealing with wolves as a predator and caribou as the prey, and those relationships, those studies have never really been looked at in the context of what's natural and healthy and how those sorts of parameters might effect interests in changing regulations one way or the other. So they wanted to add that particular element into the database that already exists but then to continue that particular research it's been quite beneficial to subsistence users in the Park as they've faced many issues regarding wolf, issues around Denali, both buffer zones as well as internal challenges towards subsistence opportunities to take wolves.

So that was the intention.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, I know the subsistence community really appreciated the fact that that information was available when this last round of wolf talks for Denali Park went around and it was very helpful information.

What we're seeking then is whether we, as a Council, support the SRCs recommendation that this continue, right?

MR. TWITCHELL: That is correct. And with that, their interest is that it be elevated in terms of its stature as it competes for funding to continue this work.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gilbert, you were part of that SRC, right?

MR. DEMENTI: (Nods affirmatively)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And so you've gone over this. Would you, as a Council member, recommend that we support it?

MR. DEMENTI: Yes, I would.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Would you be willing to make a motion to that effect?

MR. DEMENTI: I do make a motion.

MS. LANGE: Second.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We have a motion and a second to the effect that we support the SRCs recommendation and would this be to the Park Service or would this be to -- who would the recommendation be to?

MR. TWITCHELL: As part of the consultation process, the SRC sends this out to a variety of advisory groups and entities expecting a response back to the Chair, Florence Collins, since it's their proposal.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So we would just pass a motion then that we support the SRC's proposal?

MR. TWITCHELL: (Nods affirmative)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We have a first and second so any discussion.

MR. ELVSAAS: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fred.

MR. ELVSAAS: I'm willing to support the proposal. The only thing is I don't want to support something that gets us back into predator management versus predator control. I mean I'm totally for control and if these studies show management for viewing purposes is better than control for subsistence, I really have to bite my tongue on those things. So just so we don't get into that.

Thanks.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fred, from my understanding and I want Hollis to correct me if I'm wrong, this has nothing to do with user groups, this has to do with the populations of the species themselves not whether these species are more profitable for viewing or more profitable for hunting or more profitable for trapping or anything like that. This is basically to define what a healthy population is so that if part of the population of

either kind gets off to one side or the other we'll recognize it, right?

MR. TWITCHELL: That's correct. There is guidance in the Federal program in terms of a definition of healthy populations and that's in the Federal regulation booklet. It's articulated by the Legislative record, and the Park Service was a partner in developing that definition in the Federal program. What is undefined, both in ANILCA and within our own agency in terms of clarity is what natural and healthy is and that's a significant trigger in terms of management decisions on Parks and Monuments. So the purpose of this study is particularly to try to get a better understanding of just what those terms mean and how they would be applied in a regulatory or a management regime.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So out of this would come an idea of what normal fluctuations and game populations are so that the fact that there was a decline in a population doesn't mean that the population is unnatural or unhealthy, it's within the normal boundaries of fluctuations, things like that. So from that standpoint, what it would do is it would facilitate allowing subsistence hunting without somebody outside screaming wait a second, the caribou are going downhill we can't have any hunting here type thing; am I correct?

MR. TWITCHELL: That is absolutely correct. And part of the thinking of the SRC in this particular aspect was looking at work that's been done in the past, in particular, the Mentasta herd, and how that particular population is looked at and the cooperative management plan that was put in place that had some guidance in terms of when opportunities would be made available for subsistence, when opportunities would need to be closed down based upon some management strategy. So it's along those lines that they're interested in getting more clarity on how that might be employed in other units and in particular, Denali, in relation to the caribou, wolf issues in Denali.

If I can take just a couple minutes, I'll share with you that's something, right now, just an internal document, it has not been out for formal review, so you need to keep in mind that it's just that, but it comes about from the NPS managers getting together to start to create some clarity for ourselves within this issue. If I can indulge yourself for about four paragraphs I think it might be useful.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Go ahead.

MR. TWITCHELL: And it comes out of work that's looking at -- in terms of fish and wildlife management under ANILCA and what our mandates are from the Congressional record. And it talks about healthy is a biological standard that can be measured. Biologists and managers can make a determination of the health of a species based on population dynamics and ecology. A healthy wildlife population is large enough to sustain itself over time and has the capacity to recover from natural disasters, climatic variation and other fluctuations. A population that isn't healthy is impaired and probably threatened and endangered. The concept of natural is much more subjective and value driven. The dictionary defines natural as produced by nature, free from artificial, made by human beings rather than occurring in nature, being primitive and unregulated state. In the history of wildlife, Frederick Wagner, defines naturalness as those dynamic processes and components that would likely exist today and go on functioning if technological mankind had not altered them. Wagner defines natural conditions as those that would have existed in the absence of the effect of European man.

In Alaska people have been a part of the natural landscape for at least 12,000 years, even though Alaska's indigenous people were primarily hunters, gatherers, with minimal agriculture, they altered the landscape with fire, they may have had a role in the extinction of large pleistocene mammals and affected the distribution population and behavior of game animals. Quantifying what level of human activity is consistent with a natural regime has been all but thwarted by the inability to measure past effects. Under ANILCA human subsistence harvest is one of the biological components interacting with other biological components that affect the natural system. Without being able to distinguish past human effects from the natural variability and disturbance in events, it has proved all but impossible to quantify the effects of traditional or preindustrial man on the eco-system, and thus to create a baseline to measure present day effects against.

Senate Report 9144-13 states that the reference to natural and healthy with respect to National Parks and Monuments recognizes that the management policies of those units may entail methods of resource and habitat protection different from the methods appropriate for other types of conservation units. By establishing Subsistence

Resource Commissions only for Parks and Monuments, Congress recognized that Parks and Monuments might impose greater restrictions and have greater impact on residents lives than other types of conservation units. Also by applying the additional standard of natural only to Parks and Monuments, Congress gave added importance to the value of natural in Parks and Monuments and greater discretion to the NPS to adopt policies to protect it.

So what does all that mumble-jumble mean? When we look at the regulatory process now and we have populations within a particular unit, I interpret this to mean that if the human factor and which we consider subsistence the human factor, a natural part of the systems, that if the human factor becomes the driver of the population, VH class or the composition, that is in turn driving the population then the Park Service is going to intercede in terms of some position on regulatory proposals for a particular species. If, on the other hand, that the human factor is not an element and not a driver in it then the Park Service is and has supported the opportunity for subsistence take. That has been consistent at Denali over the years, whether it's dealing with subsistence take of wolves within the Parks or the appeal of the State's determination that grizzly bears were not a traditional subsistence use in Unit 13. Park Service has not opposed any of those proposals as grizzly bears and bears were reintroduced as a traditional subsistence use species, nor taken any strong position on the over half dozen regulatory proposals in the Federal program that has liberalized wolf harvest in all units around Denali.

So that's how I interpret all that language that I read to you before.

Again, the main points there, it's very easy to define and clarify what healthy is. We can put biological parameters on it. When you get to the term natural, you need to have a much broader perspective of what you're talking about knowing the cyclic fluctuations of populations, whether it's caribou or snowshoe hares or martin or whatever the species.

So that is, I think, the reach that the SRC is hoping to do is to try to put a little more clarity on how the Park Service would respond in terms of management actions and decisions regarding the use of wildlife, whether it's a predator or whether it's a prey.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you Hollis. Is that

pretty understandable for everybody. We have a motion on the table to support the SRC's proposal. If there's no further discussion we can call the question on it.

(No comments)

MS. WELLS: Question.

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

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed, signify by saying nay.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. Thank you for your presentation on that Hollis.

MR. TWITCHELL: Thank you. It's not an easy one. And like I said, this issue is still being worked on within the agency and at the appropriate time it will be put out for review, and most certainly will be coming around through the Councils.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

MR. TWITCHELL: The last issue is not a happy one, I'm sorry, Gilbert, I can't lighten up, it's mixed in with controversy and all sorts of problems. Where to start.

I guess I'll have to reach back, it deals with ATV and subsistence use in Denali. And I'll go back into the mid-80s in which the Park Service, Denali, was going through a series of general management plan development. Our general management plan is a public process where we go through to identify how the units would be managed. In 1986, as part of the general management plan process, there was discussion in terms of subsistence use and a wide range of activities and areas, including access, and I'll read you just several more inserts from that to sort of set the ground for what I'm going to talk about.

The GMP, in regards to ATV use said that the use of off-road vehicles for subsistence purposes will be restricted to designated routes and areas where their

use is customary and traditional. The superintendent will designate routes in accordance with Executive Orders 11644 and 11989 and 36 CFR 11. No designations have been made of those routes. The GMP went on to say that subsistence access that off-road vehicles are permitted for subsistence access where they can be shown to be traditional means of access. Existing information indicates that specific ORV use has not been regularly or traditionally used for subsistence purposes.

The NPS has generally concluded through the GMP process, subject to public review and comment that ORV use off established roads and parking areas and on ORV trails that may exist is incompatible with NPS area purposes and values due in part to the adverse effect on natural resources which such ORV entails. Subsequent to that GMP process, which included the public hearings around the area, several Cantwell residents have stated that they were not aware of the GMC process and were not given an opportunity to review and comment and they were not informed about the GMP decision to restrict their ATV access.

In the GMP also there contains language that says that the Webster Dictionary definition of "traditional" which the NPS uses in applying provisions of access for ANILCA, the GMP states to qualify under ANILCA a traditional means or traditional activity has to have been an established cultural pattern per these definitions prior to 1978 when the unit was established. The definition does not specify the number of years necessary to establish a traditional or cultural pattern.

There was very little enforcement of that GMP provision subsequent to that in the '80s. It wasn't until 1991 that the NPS started to effectively prohibit the use of ATVs as a condition requirement before receiving a Federal registration permit. About in the mid-90s, Park Service received a letter from a Cantwell resident along with eight affidavits saying that ATV use for subsistence for the Cantwell area was a traditional use and they requested the superintendent to remove the ORV restrictions. The superintendent responded to the Cantwell resident stating that eight letters out of the community of 147 was not conclusive but there was sufficient reason to open the question whether certain modes of transportation may have been traditionally employed for subsistence purposes. Subsequently in the mid-90s Park Service held meetings in Cantwell to gather information and comments regarding the pre-ANILCA use of ATVs in support of

subsistence activities within the Park additions. Sixteen people attended that day long meeting completing questionnaires and depicting their use areas on topographical maps. The public comment period was open for 30 days. There was an effort at the end of that day, since there was no further comments coming in from any users, a telephonic inquiry for interviews was made by Park people and there were no additional maps received from those individuals.

Considering the limited amount of responses and information received, the superintendent extended the comment period and it went on for one and a half years. Subsequently there was no action taken further by the NPS since about this same period in the mid-90s a subsistence work group was formed and working on the ATV issue in Park areas. The Denali SRC commission was apprised of these actions and it was put on the agenda, it was discussed with the commission in the intention that the Park Service was still furthering information to make a determination whether there could have been a traditional use for the Cantwell area or not.

The superintendent at that time and myself accompanied to Cantwell, Subsistence Resource Commission members onto ATV trails to get a better expression of for and how the trails were used in Windy Creek and Cantwell Creek areas. As a result of that and waiting for a little bit more clarity on how the Park Service should deal with traditional access requests, the superintendent and myself working with members of the SRC identified three areas where there was previously impact to resources and that we felt that a continuation of use could occur without significant degradations to resources.

So where we are in this issue now. No decision has been made by the Park Service in terms of the traditional use of ATV use in the Cantwell area. A breakdown of the responses that were received from the Cantwell area in the year and a half comment periods, 16 people submitted information in person, eight additional people were interviewed by phone for a total of 24 responses. Of the 24 responses received, 16 people stated they used ATVs for subsistence use on Denali National Park lands, four indicated their ATV subsistence use on Park lands began post ANILCA and four individuals indicated that they have not used ATVs for subsistence purpose on NPS lands.

So out of the 20 people that indicated they

utilized ATVs for subsistence, one indicated their use began in 1940, three indicated their use began in 1960 and 12 indicated their use began in the late 1970s and four indicated their use began in the 1980s.

According to the Cantwell residents, the need for subsistence access is almost exclusively for packing out meat during the fall hunting season.

So that's where it is at this point. The issue becomes prominent now because the conditions that we have set forth in our Federal registration hunting permits have identified those routes that we traveled with SRC members, found that we did not object to a continuation of use on those routes and for the most part there was self-policing by the Cantwell community to try to stay into those corridors. Encroachments have occurred in recent years but they've been fairly minor off of those areas until this year. This year things have gotten significantly out of hand, we've had incursions over five miles into an area that had never before had any ATV impacts. The use occurred in Creek Bottom, Suiette, Grassy, Sedgy, Harious with no effort to stay on the hardened surfaces. Subsequently one of the two ARGOs broke down and the other Honda ended up making numerous passes hauling out two moose, a caribou and a broken down ARGO. And as a result did significant resource damage in an area where there had been no indication of any ATV use at all. Subsequently there's investigations going on with those.

At the same time in the Kantishna Hills area, an area where we allow subsistence use of travel on the mining roads with ATVs and four-wheel drive vehicles, we've had problems ensuing here in the last two years, and in particular this last year where we had a local subsistence shoot a moose about 40 yards off a road and subsequently drove a four-wheel drive pickup about 40 yards off until they buried it axle-to-axle in the tundra. We've also had some fairly significant incursions out in the Stampede Road corridor to the north.

As a result of these situations the issue in terms of traditional access is probably coming to a close very quickly. And there will probably be actions taken in terms of enforcement aspects of this.

Again, just wanted to put this on your horizon. I have met with a key member, the other member of our Denali SRC to come up on the flight to show him the range and extent of impacts that are occurring and I've

certainly asked for his guidance.

I'll leave that there. I know his response, and his response in essence would be you are going to have to do something about this because if you don't it will only get worse and that was quite a statement coming from someone who was an ardent supporter of ATV use on Park lands. But I think he clearly recognized that the level and extent of impacts that are going on would be undefendable in terms of resource degradation from a subsistence standpoint.

As a result, I've been contacted by the Chair of the local Denali Fish and Game Advisory Committee and asked to come meet with them in an effort to see if there's some way that there is more self-policing that can be done to resolve the issue rather than an outright closure. So our intentions are to travel down to the meeting next month to the Cantwell community and meet with the local Fish and Game Advisory Committee and present the information as a result of recent activities.

So there you have it. No particular action is requested on your behalf but we are clearly now in a different arena. We've tried to go through consultation and working with the SRC and the local people to the greatest extent that we could through the '90s and for the most part it was successful for a number of years. But considering the fact that Cantwell has gone from 89 to 147 to 212 people in the last three censuses we clearly have a resource use impact associated with that. The general comments are these impacts are coming from the more recent users, and by more recent users that's been clarified to me by members as being people less than 15 years.

So there it is.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That was just exactly -- that was exactly the question I was going to ask you. Since you had compliance for so long and then all of a sudden you don't seem to have that compliance, is it because of the growth in the community?

MR. TWITCHELL: It's multi-factor situation. The Denali Highway broadpass area has been essentially shot out. A lot of the local people in the Cantwell area who have utilized resources outside of the Park areas, across those areas, have been finding it extremely difficult to get moose or caribou in those areas and there's been a greater emphasis in switching back onto

NPS lands for those harvests. So not only do we have a significant use by newer members coming into the community, but we also have a shifting of use areas onto Park lands and the Cantwell people, having difficulty getting moose off of Park lands have shifted their use over to the Kantishna Hills area. And we have a significant amount of new use and harvest coming out of the Kantishna Hills by Cantwell residents as a result of lack of availability of resources, locally, to Cantwell.

So you have those issues there.

You also have in the effort of self-policing by the Cantwell community to try to get to some of the encroachments of new people into the traditional use areas of the Cantwell area. New people coming up and setting wall tents and facilities and camps right next to people who are multi-generational users through efforts to try to eliminate that sort of social impact. They have asked, and the new users have displaced their use from the traditional areas into new areas. They are the individuals who tend to be pioneering out into these outlying areas and not regarding the request to stay within these certain corridors.

So it's multi-faceted.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I don't know how to respond to it Hollis. I can recognize the multi-facets of the problem. My response would probably be the same thing as the SRC member that you flew up. It might not be the popular response but you can't afford to have that kind of degradation in that situation or the whole thing will tumble down, the whole idea of subsistence in the Park.

MR. TWITCHELL: Well, that's the concern. In my view, in all the years that I've been here in Alaska I don't see any subsistence that has clearly been a significant impact and degradation to resources other than ATV use. And the impacts are fairly significant and long lasting. And I question whether legitimate traditional subsistence use can really stand the level of scrutiny that this clearly is going to bring. And I think the SRC is beginning to recognize that as well.

It's been fun to defend subsistence use to the greatest extent possible that I can for Denali, this is the one issue in terms of subsistence use I have to go to the other side of the fence.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Hollis. Brings to mind what one of the Chairs said at one of the meetings that we attended a while back. And basically what he said is we have to recognize that there's a difference between subsistence use, the old way and subsistence use when we're driving a four-wheeler carrying a cell phone and using a fully automatic rifle. There is a difference.

Anyhow, I don't know if we have to respond to that one or not, but thanks for the information on that Hollis. I think that's a problem that we face -- it's a problem that this Council has brought up a number of times in Unit 13, especially on the BLM land in Unit 13. We've expressed our concern over it. We've seen pictures on it presented to us by tribal people, we've seen the impact on trails in different places, and I think that in general you probably have this Councils support on actions to stop that type of damage. At least I have never heard this Council object to or defend that kind of damage in anything that we've ever done.

So thanks for the information.

Any comments from anybody else on the Council.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

MR. DEMENTI: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gilbert.

MR. DEMENTI: I think I back up everything that Hollis Twitchell said and whatever needs to be done it's okay. I mean to uphold the law.

Thanks, Hollis.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Susan.

MS. WELLS: I feel very fortunate that we have this man and his people watching out for the resources and the Parks the way that he does, and I really appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Susan. With that, Ann, what?

MS. WILKINSON: The Park Service also includes another Park.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I know, I was just going to ask that. With that, we'll hear from the good Park, where everybody behaves themselves and only makes the front page of the papers.

(Laughter)

MS. CELLARIUS: Mr. Chair, I hope my presentation is a little more positive. I don't plan to talk about the recent media coverage but Devi Sharp is here and if you have questions she would be happy to respond to your questions.

(Laughter)

MS. CELLARIUS: It's unfortunate that Eric isn't able to be here today, but he wanted me to give you an update on some fisheries issues, and so I'm going to start with that and then touch briefly on a couple of other issues. I don't know if I can talk as fast as Eric but will give it a shot.

The Chitina subdistrict opened June 4th and there were openings through -- openings and closings through the beginning of August and then the district remained open from August 7th until September 30th. Fishing was relatively poor until mid-August when it improved substantially. Our best guess is that this was in response to low water levels following high water levels. When the high water levels started to drop fishing improved.

We issued 223 Glennallen subdistrict permits, to date 66 permits have been returned with the reported harvest of 5,092 sockeye and 220 chinooks.

We issued 101 Chitina subdistrict permits, to date 20 of them have been returned with a harvest of 43 sockeyes and one chinook.

We issued one Batzulnetas permit and 164 sockeyes were harvested in the Batzulnetas fishery.

We had a successful hear of operation at the Tanada Creek fish weir, that's one of the FIS projects which you voted to support earlier in the day. Water levels remained low throughout the season and maintaining

the weir was easy. It was installed and operational by the end of May. The first salmon were observed the 6th -- the 11th of June and the run began in earnest on June 20th. It grew slowly and about the third week of July we had only observed about a thousand salmon. The Batzulnetas Cultural Camp was scheduled for the following week, water levels were very low, water temperatures were in the 60s which is high for Tanada Creek and a hundred to 200 fish were holding in the creek downstream from the weir. We were concerned that if Federal users attempted to harvest fish during the cultural camp the fish in the creek using spears or dipnets that the fish would become extremely stressed because of the water, because of the warm water conditions, and that we could potentially use around 15 percent of the run. Rather than using our authority as the in-season manager to restrict the season, we chose to work directly with the users, so Eric contacted Wilson Justin from Chistochina and explained our concerns and suggested that the participants in the camp focus their salmon harvest on the fishwheel in the Copper River where there were higher water levels and cooler temperatures. Wilson agreed that they were concerned about the low number of fish and water temperatures and stated that he shared our concerns with the participants in the camp. The camp participants did focus their efforts on the fishwheel and the fish in the creek were not impacted. So we saw that as a very positive way of working with the local users to manage the resource.

Towards the end of the first week of August, the run picked up and we observed 2,500 fish in a three day period. So we called the village of Mentasta and told them that the fish were -- there were a lot of fish around and suggested that if they wanted more fish that they could operate their wheel.

The weir was removed the 19th of September due to ice build up. At that time 5,389 sockeye and two chinook salmon had been counted. About 600 fish were still downstream from the creek at that time.

Then moving on to Long Lake weir, this is another project that you voted to support. This year the Park found funding within its budget to help assist Cliff Collins with the operation of the weir. The project has gone well with about 4,500 sockeyes and 400 cohos having come through the weir as of, I guess, yesterday. And the weir is still in operation. This is the lowest number of sockeye since 1977 but this follows a record high of 49,000 last year. And Ralph probably knows more about that weir than I do.

So that's what I had to say about fisheries. I don't know if you have any questions, Devi and I could try to answer them.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions, Council.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay, go on.

MS. CELLARIUS: Okay. I just briefly want to touch on a couple of other issues. In terms of wildlife permits, as Elijah mentioned we do issue Unit 13 permits in Slana, we issue fairly small numbers, and those numbers have been -- it's for caribou and moose primarily and our numbers are about the same as they were last year.

For Unit 11 we have issued about 240 moose permits which is the same as last year. Around 50 goat permits, which is a 50 percent increase over last year. And thus far, in terms of the elder sheep hunt, about the same number of permits, about 20.

So that's where we are in terms of issuing Federal registration hunting permits.

Briefly, we have, in terms of our government-to-government relationships with the local villages, we have regular meetings twice a year with Mentasta and Chistochina and that usually involves lunch at some point in the meeting, and we just sit around and talk about the issues that are of concern to us and of concern to them.

We're working on an agreement with Yakutat, I think we're fairly close to being ready to sign that one. And talking to some other villages, so in the early stages of those agreements.

And some of these things sort of flow together, Mentasta and Chistochina alternate in their organization of the Batzulnetas Cultural Camp, we were -- the Park Service was invited down to the cultural camp this summer, both interpretive staff and resources staff went down and did an afternoon program. The kids -- or the participants, but when I was there a bunch of kids also went down and visited the fish weir, which is in close proximity to the camp, and we think that was a very positive experience this year. It turned out that because of their schedule my parents were here that week and they

went along and sort of got their introduction to some of the things that I do in my job.

And that's pretty much it. I wanted to invite you all to come visit our new facility in Copper Center, if you haven't had a chance to do so, either as a Council or individually, we don't have meeting facilities that could host a RAC meeting but we'd be willing to help find facilities and have you come over to the visitor's center. But also if you're just in the neighborhood, you know, come by if Devi or I or Eric are around, let us know and we'll give you a tour.

So if you have any questions.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Barbara. I saw pictures of you and your parents at the cultural camp and pictures of the weir. I also stopped at your center and was told you were closed.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And what has the success ratio been on the elder sheep hunt?

MS. CELLARIUS: It's too early in the season to know.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I don't mean for this year, I mean have we had any success ratio on the elder sheep hunt yet?

MS. SHARP: A little bit.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But we have had some take.

MS. SHARP: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Good. The last time I asked that question it was still at zero so I was just wondering whether there had been some success in it.

Any other questions for Barbara.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And you close at 4:00 o'clock now?

MS. CELLARIUS: Our hours are 8:00 to 4:30

Monday through Friday.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, 4:30, okay, it was a quarter to 5:00 when I stopped to get my elder sheep hunt tag and there was nobody there.

MS. CELLARIUS: You could have also contacted Marshall, actually he was out in your neck of the woods.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, thank you. Any further questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Barbara.

MS. CELLARIUS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Who have we missed?

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Nobody. We had a little presentation for Fred John, I was hoping he would be here. He's served on this Regional Council since it started, since 1993. I've sat in a lot of meetings with him since that time, and he's served as an officer, he served as secretary, he served as vice chair, he led the meetings when I wasn't here. And we were really hoping to honor him or toast him or roast him or something like that, which is why he probably didn't show up.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's interesting because in all of those year he only missed three meetings out of the 23 that were available, and that's a lot of time given up for coming to meetings. He also served on the Wrangell-St. Elias Resource Council for us, represented our Council on that for many, many years, and for me mostly what he did was he helped me to understand better the people up in the Mentasta and Chistochina area. His information, his insights quietly given were very, very valuable. And I guess he's moved out of our area and he's not going to be on our Council and I think we're going to miss him.

So if you see him, say hi to him, tell him we miss him, and I think we have something we're going to send him, don't we Ann?

MS. WILKINSON: (Nods affirmatively)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And I think we, as a Council, are going to lack the information that he can bring us. Just like what we did on this SRC thing, where we tried to get a spread of information, spread of people from different areas, the information he brought from that area was very valuable. Most of us don't -- I mean we have one person from the Interior right here, the rest of us have all spent time on the coast and I've spent time in both, you know, so it was real valuable to have his input.

So with that I'm going to say, thank you, Fred, even if you're not here and I'd like to put it on the record that I really enjoyed working with you Fred.

Now, with that it's too late for me to get where I have to go so we're going to extend this meeting until 5:00 o'clock and I'll do the filibusting. A motion -- I think we have done everything, if anybody can think of anything else we need to do, now's the time to speak up, if not, a motion to adjourn is in order.

MS. WELLS: So moved.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved to adjourn. Do I hear a second.

MS. LANGE: Second.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We don't take a vote on it, we're adjourned.

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
)ss.
STATE OF ALASKA)

I, Joseph P. Kolasinski, Notary Public in and for the state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 123 through 243 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the SOUTHCENTRAL FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME II, taken electronically by Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC on the 8th day of October 2003, beginning at the hour of 8:30 o'clock a.m. in Talkeetna, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by under my direction and reduced to print to the best of our knowledge and ability;

THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 20th day of October 2003.

_____
Joseph P. Kolasinski
Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 04/17/04