

1 SOUTHCENTRAL FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
3 PUBLIC MEETING

4
5 VOLUME II

6
7 SOLDOTNA SPORTS CENTER
8 Soldotna, Alaska
9 October 13, 2004
10 8:30 o'clock a.m.

11
12
13
14 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

- 15
16 Ralph Lohse, Chairman
17 Fred Elvsaas, Vice-Chair
18 Susan Wells
19 Doug Blossom
20 Richard Greg Encelewski
21 Gilbert Dementi
22 Gloria Stickwan
23 Dean L. Wilson, Jr.
24 James Showalter
25 Tom Carpenter
26
27
28 Regional Coordinator, Donald Mike
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 RECORDED AND TRANSCRIBED BY:
46 COMPUTER MATRIX COURT REPORTERS, LLC
47 3522 West 27th Avenue
48 Anchorage, Alaska 99517
49 907-243-0668
50 jpk@gci.net

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

2
3 (Soldotna, Alaska - 10/13/2004)

4
5 (On record)

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. I'd like to call
8 this fall meeting of the Southcentral Subsistence
9 Regional Advisory Council back in session. Today is
10 October the 13th, and we're going to go back to the
11 strategic -- don't tell me I grabbed the wrong one out of
12 my briefcase, but the strategic review -- the strategic
13 plan for the subsistence fisheries resource monitoring
14 program. And everybody, of course, did their homework
15 last night and read it, right? Good. Okay.

16
17 Doug, what would you like. Would you
18 like comments or do we need to take action on this.

19
20 MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, I'd say two
21 things. Any comments the Council has on the plan, and
22 then also if you want to appoint a second member of the
23 Council to attend our workshop on November 8th and 9th in
24 Anchorage, that would be appreciated.

25
26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Okay. Comments
27 on the plan. Anybody have anything particular that
28 they'd like to relay to Doug after your reading of it.
29 Gilbert.

30
31 MR. DEMENTI: Mr. Chair, Doug, the
32 monitoring program is -- I thought it was well thought
33 out, and I'd like to thank Gloria and the rest of the
34 Staff for taking time to write this up. And I read
35 through it, and I didn't -- I don't think what I can -- I
36 mean, I don't have anything to add, but is there any way
37 to -- it's good to count fishes, but we've got to make
38 sure the fishes are healthy. Is there any environmental,
39 like testing the water for contaminants and everything?
40 Does this cover? I mean, would it be included into this.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug.

43
44 MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman. Mr. Dementi,
45 the way we deal with those subjects, looking at water
46 quality -- the way we deal with subjects like water
47 contaminants is we recognize that that's very important
48 to sustaining and maintaining subsistence fisheries, but
49 for the monitoring program, the way we deal with that is
50 on Federal public lands that is a function of the land

1 management agency. So like for Denali National Park, it
2 would be the Park Service, or for the Chugach National
3 Forest, it would be the USDA Forest Service. And so we
4 don't -- there's actually a policy for this program that
5 we're not funding studies to measure water quality or
6 potential contaminants in the water or pollutants or
7 anything like that unless it's done as a -- it's almost
8 like a sidebar to a study. But if it's the focus of the
9 study, what we do is we basically redirect the request
10 for that funding to the land -- you know, the specific
11 management agency for that particular Federal public
12 land. So the short answer is, no, this program does not
13 cover that, but there's a policy that was passed by the
14 Board that addresses that.

15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug, one of your
17 objectives that's stated here is identify environmental,
18 demographic, regulatory, and socio-economic factors
19 affecting subsistence harvest levels. And wouldn't that
20 come under that, under the environmental part of it?

21
22 MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, I think
23 identifying it as a factor would -- the way I had
24 understood the question is if we had, let's say, a
25 project proposal that was specifically going to go out
26 and measure heavy metal concentrations in a water body or
27 something like that, that's what we would redirect to the
28 actual land management agency.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Doug. Any
31 other comments. Tom.

32
33 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah, Doug, once again,
34 well thought out and well done. Just another quick
35 comment in relation to what I spoke about yesterday.

36
37 On Page 4 you have the goals, objectives
38 and the information needed, and you kind of have them
39 listed in order of priority there. And I guess one of
40 the questions I have, and there's been conversations that
41 I've, you know, caught wind of the last few months, and
42 it's in regards to your last category, develop and
43 evaluate effective regulatory and management strategies,
44 and then one of the objectives is to assess impacts of
45 other fisheries on subsistence fisheries.

46
47 It's a well known and documented fact
48 that, you know, there are three primary users of the
49 river. There's the commercial fleet, there's the
50 personal use fishery, and then there's the subsistence

1 fisheries.

2

3

4 The commercial fleet in my opinion is
5 regulated and looked at as highly as you possibly could.
6 I mean, they know with sonar and all these other means
7 and methods that you've put in place over the last few
8 years about what kind of numbers of fish are getting up
9 past that fishery.

9

10 And I guess, do you think that maybe --
11 you know, I see that this is pretty low on the spectrum
12 of importance in regards to, you know -- it just -- I
13 guess in my opinion I think maybe it ought to be a little
14 higher, and, you know, when you get the objective amount
15 of fish through a fishery into the river to provide for
16 escapement, and also the other users upriver, which
17 subsistence has a higher priority, and then you hear
18 about certain areas above a personal use fishery, let's
19 say for example, that aren't necessarily or might not be
20 getting the escapement numbers necessary, I wonder who
21 really is having the greatest impact on the subsistence
22 fishery. And so, I don't know, just an observation.

23

24 MR. McBRIDE: Well, Mr. Chairman. Mr.
25 Carpenter, no, I think that's a very valid point, a very
26 valid concern. If you turn back a page to Page 3, sort
27 of at the bottom of the page, there are three bullets
28 there, and those are the criteria or the questions that
29 the work group addressed as they looked at ranking these
30 objectives relative to each other. And, I mean, I don't
31 think there's a right answer or a wrong answer, but the
32 reason that they -- what the work group did was they
33 addressed those three bullets, or those three questions,
34 and then that's how they weighted that in relation to the
35 others, but what I'm doing here is I'm simply taking
36 comments, and my intent with the work group is going to
37 be to address all of these comments.

38

39

40 Along a similar line, we've already
41 received a comment that actually came out of the Bristol
42 Bay workshop, which had a lot of the same participants,
43 but certainly not all the same, and they came up with a
44 similar kind of product, not surprisingly. But one of
45 the comments that came out of there is that, actually at
46 the goal level, that goals 1 and 2, that second goal, to
47 assess subsistence fisheries should be ranked higher than
48 it was in relation to the first goal which is, you know,
49 basically looking at the fish. And again I mean, I think
50 there's some pretty compelling arguments and reasons why
51 that should at least be considered.

1 So I think your point to basically look
2 at that -- what we look at as objective 3(a) and raising
3 that in importance is a legitimate point for the group to
4 debate.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other comments.
7 Doug.

8
9 MR. BLOSSOM: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. Doug,
10 I guess I'd just voice what Gilbert said. The fish can't
11 do anything if you don't take care of the river, so you
12 better check it out careful. Kind of an example is the
13 Kenai River here locally. All of a sudden this year the
14 silvers all have cysts in them in the river. No one
15 knows why. Well, I'd never heard of that in 57 years of
16 fishing silvers, so if you don't take care of the water
17 they live in and tell us what's wrong there, you're not
18 going to gain.

19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Doug. Any
21 other comments.

22
23 Doug, I'd have to go along with Gilbert.
24 I don't have anything that I can add to this, because of
25 the work that's been put into it. I would -- I'm curious
26 about a couple things.

27
28 I'm curious how you came up with your
29 number ranking. I mean, did everybody give something, a
30 number and you threw it in a hat and added it all up, and
31 that's why something came up higher than something else,
32 or to that effect sort of.

33
34 MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, yeah, that's
35 -- in the full plan, you know, it lays out the full
36 methodology, but actually what we did was at the workshop
37 we hired a professional facilitator, and it was Dr. Peggy
38 Merit, and we used a method that's called AHP, or
39 analytical hierarchial process. But basically that's
40 just a fancy word for a methodology where you take all
41 these various component parts and you -- I liken it to
42 sort of like peeling an onion. You're kind of peeling
43 the onion down to get, you know, right down to the base
44 of the thing. And what you basically do is you take
45 every one of these, like the three goals, you look at one
46 versus two, one versus three, and two versus three, and
47 you're rating them all. And the group basically openly
48 voted. They were given a scale, and given some objective
49 criteria to address. And so what we did basically is we
50 would rank these in relation to each other. But then --

1 I mean, sometimes the group would independently, you
2 know, come up with very similar scores. And in that
3 case, what you had is the entire group has seen a
4 particular question in the same way.

5
6 But a lot of times there would be
7 divergent scores, and so we used that as the basis for
8 then debating or discussing amongst the group. And
9 usually what would happen, you know, let's say, you know,
10 Gloria had a score at one end, and I had a score at the
11 other end, or somebody else. So then they'd be invited
12 to say, well, you know, why -- you know, tell the group
13 why you did that. You know, what were you looking at
14 that somebody else wasn't. And the whole idea was to see
15 if the group could learn from the experiences and
16 knowledge of the other participants.

17
18 And Gloria or any of the work group
19 members can correct me if I'm wrong. I would say in the
20 vast majority of the time, after the discussion, the
21 group might start apart like this, but would tend to come
22 more towards the middle. Not completely, and not in all
23 cases, but I think there was a lot of learning going on
24 within the group. Somebody would come in with a
25 particular viewpoint, and then they'd listen to somebody
26 else, and go, okay, well, I hadn't considered that. And
27 so they would tend to meet in a more common place.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, I was curious, how
30 did you meet at a certain -- how did you meet at a
31 certain number score, because then you ended up using
32 your number score for ranking them in -- and I guess
33 where this carries over in my mind, I can see how you
34 could do this on the -- how you did that on the Copper
35 River salmon, and you have a graph that lists them from
36 priority down. But now what happens when you throw the
37 other five in and they've got to go into that same graph
38 someplace, because while this might be the highest need
39 for Copper River salmon, how do you decide that for Delta
40 salmon, their priority need isn't higher than the
41 priority need, you know -- I mean, so you're going to
42 have to then go back and somehow either have a ranking
43 that goes for all of these that they can all be put down
44 on a graph, because -- or you're going to have to look at
45 them as individual units, and just decide that we need to
46 work on each unit, and we'll start with highest priority
47 in each unit and work our way down. But this unit down
48 here is -- how do you decide it's not as high a priority
49 as this unit over here.

50

1 MR. McBRIDE: Well, Mr. Chairman, we're
2 going to do the latter of what you just described. what
3 we'll end up with is a graph that looks like this for
4 each fishery unit.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right.

7
8 MR. McBRIDE: But we're not going to try
9 to then take each of the component parts, say, for Copper
10 River salmon, and mix those in and compare those to say
11 the similar component parts for Prince William Sound
12 salmon. They will be separate and distinct, but we will
13 also have up front, if you look at Page 2, there's a
14 graph that then relates those fishery units in relation
15 to each other. So, I mean, we're going to know, unless
16 there's changes, but I doubt that it will, the Copper
17 River salmon is vastly more important, let's say, than
18 Copper River eulachon or something like that. But we're
19 not going to try to have one giant graph that covers all
20 fishing, so there will be a separate one for each fishery
21 unit, and then we'll do just what you described.

22
23 I mean, in some places you're just got to
24 use some suggestive judgment and say, well, you know,
25 maybe in this year we're going to address a high priority
26 information need for a fishery unit, say, like, you know,
27 Copper River steelhead, like this year. You know,
28 there's an opportunity to do that in a very cost-
29 effective manner. Within Copper River steelhead, it's
30 clearly the next most important thing to do, and we have
31 the ability and wherewithal to do it. That's how we deal
32 with it.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So units have that basic
35 ranking against each other, but when it comes to picking
36 projects, it's not like you're going to stop at the --
37 start at the top rank and work your way down for each
38 project valued against each other project in different
39 units. It's basically you're recognizing that these are
40 the issues in all of these different units. Now how can
41 we address them most effectively.

42
43 MR. McBRIDE: Yes, that's correct.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Because I was
46 look -- the reason I was asking that, I was sort of
47 looking at you had under objectives you also had ranking
48 right there.

49
50 MR. McBRIDE: Right.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And I thought maybe that
2 you then going to do that on all the other objectives,
3 and, you know, instead of just under information needs
4 and then go through the whole thing. I'm thinking that
5 would be.....

6
7 MR. McBRIDE: Pretty onerous, yeah.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You'd spend the next
10 three years ranking numbers to it.

11
12 MR. McBRIDE: No. No.

13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. But otherwise,
15 there's a lot of work there, and I don't see how anybody
16 that wasn't part of it could add much to it, other than
17 things like -- I'll go along with Tom there, you know, to
18 me probably the Delta salmon has a bigger effect on
19 people's -- if you're going to take the subsistence user
20 in the Cordova area, I'll guarantee you that there's a
21 lot more silver salmon put in the freezers in Cordova,
22 and freshwater fish put in the freezers in Cordova, than
23 there is eulachon, you know. I mean, it's -- when it
24 comes to feeding the people down in Cordova, you'll find
25 that we do eat eulachon, but there's a lot more salmon
26 goes into the freezer. Okay.

27
28 MS. DOWNING: Mr. Chair, before we go on
29 to the next subject, let me see if I can correct that
30 hum.

31
32 (Off record)

33
34 (On record)

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If I understand right,
37 your meeting is November 8th and 9th, is that what you
38 said?

39
40 MR. McBRIDE: That's correct. November
41 8th and 9th in Anchorage.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: November 8th and 9th in
44 Anchorage. And we need somebody to be on that committee
45 in case can't make it then as an alternative. And you're
46 dealing mostly with the -- it looks to me like you'll be
47 dealing mostly with Copper River/Prince William Sound in
48 that meeting there. It will be to finish up this project
49 that you're working on right here, right?

50

1 MR. McBRIDE: Correct.
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So that would probably
4 leave Dean or Tom or myself.
5
6 MR. WILSON: I think I'm on shift.
7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You're on shift.
9
10 MR. CARPENTER: What day is the 8th and
11 9th?
12
13 MS. DOWNING: Microphone.
14
15 MR. McBRIDE: Monday, Tuesday.
16
17 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chair, I am sure I
18 could probably make it, you know, as long as I got a
19 couple days head's up if Bob wasn't going to be there.
20 So, you know, three or four days or so, I could probably
21 make it up there for that.
22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If you're willing to do
24 that, I'll appoint you, and that way I don't have to go.
25
26 (Laughter)
27
28 MR. McBRIDE: That would be great.
29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.
31
32 MR. CARPENTER: That's fine.
33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If that's okay with the
35 rest of the Council. Okay. Tom, then if Bob -- we'll
36 find out if Bob can make it down, and if he can't, then
37 we'll let Tom go. Thank you.
38
39 Thank you, Tom. Sue.
40
41 MS. WELLS: I was just wondering if it --
42 since these issues are regarding the Prince William
43 Sound, it would seem to me that having people that are
44 from that area would be the ones that should have the
45 input, but.....
46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's why we -- that's
48 why I thought, you know, Dean lives on the Copper River,
49 Tom lives on the Copper River/Prince William Sound.
50

1 MS. WELLS: Yeah.
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And I do. So I thought
4 one of us three should probably take. Oh, instead of Bob
5 Churchill you mean?
6
7 MS. WELLS: Right.
8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, that's probably
10 true. We can contact Bob's and if he's -- if Tom's
11 willing to do it, we'll just let Tom go, and since Bob
12 didn't make the last one, and he sat in the evaluation,
13 Bob hasn't even done that yet, so.....
14
15 MR. CARPENTER: That's fine with me.
16 Whatever the wish of.....
17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If that would be okay,
19 then we'll just count on you going.
20
21 MS. WELLS: Appreciate it, Tom. I mean,
22 Chair.
23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Susan. That
25 was a good idea.
26
27 Okay. Now we've got Partners for
28 Fisheries Monitoring.
29
30 MR. KLEIN: Mr. Chair, Council members,
31 I'm Steve Klein. I'm the Chief of Fisheries Information
32 Services that provides oversight for both the monitoring
33 program and the partners program.
34
35 First, while we're still on the
36 monitoring program, I did want to -- for the monitoring
37 program, we're blending both the biological sciences and
38 the social sciences. We had Doug here presenting all the
39 monitoring program material.
40
41 For the Southcentral Council, we also
42 have Dr. Polly Wheeler who's you're anthropologist for
43 the monitoring program. And she couldn't make it here.
44 She sends her regards. But I wanted to assure you she's
45 very much a part of the strategic planning effort that we
46 just covered. She's co-chairing it with Doug. And she's
47 also leading the harvest monitoring and traditional
48 ecological knowledge component of the monitoring program,
49 so, sorry Polly couldn't be here. She's in Anvik and
50 Bethel this week.

1 In terms of the Partners for Fisheries
2 Monitoring Program, we just have a short briefing.
3 There's a written briefing on Page 107 of your book.
4 This is just for information only. There's no
5 recommendations or decisions we need from the Council at
6 this time.

7
8 But I wanted to update you on the
9 Partners Program. And the Partners for Fisheries
10 Monitoring Program, it's really the Federal Subsistence
11 Board's commitment to capacity building both with tribal
12 organizations and in rural communities. So it's very
13 important to the Board. I think it's important to the
14 Councils and the Office of Subsistence Management as
15 well.

16
17 And what we're trying to do is strengthen
18 Alaska Native and rural involvement in the monitoring
19 program. So when we created the monitoring program, it
20 wasn't just to funnel money to State and Federal
21 agencies. They wanted partnerships where we've got
22 State, Federal, tribal and rural all working together to
23 implement the necessary monitoring projects within each
24 of the regions.

25
26 So to implement the program, the Board
27 directed us within FIS to go out and have a competitive
28 process where we fund positions in Alaska Native and
29 rural organizations. And for the Southcentral Region,
30 the Native Village of Eyak successfully competed for one
31 of the positions, and they hired an anthropologist to
32 represent the Southcentral region. And that's Erica
33 McCall-Valentine who also can't be here. She just had a
34 baby and is tied up with that right now. But she sends
35 her regards as well.

36
37 Erica I think is representing your region
38 very well. Actually we use her very much as a prime
39 example of what we're trying to do with the Partners
40 Program.

41
42 In terms of the strategic planning that
43 we just covered, Erica is an active participant. She's
44 on that team of 18 people working with Gloria and Doug
45 and 11 others behind me to identify those priority
46 information needs, and for these Partners positions, I
47 think that's very critical. And Erica is doing an
48 outstanding job there.

49
50 Secondly we have a Technical Review

1 Committee that Erica just completed a two-year term on
2 where she's working with FIS, with the Staff, and the
3 Technical Review Committee to help with the project
4 selection process to bring you a scientifically sound
5 monitoring plan the past two years. So those three
6 projects you reviewed yesterday afternoon, Erica served
7 on the Technical Review Committee to evaluate those and
8 move those forward to you for your consideration.

9
10 And then finally as -- for the monitoring
11 program projects, again the Southcentral region, I think
12 you're one of the stellar examples. All of your projects
13 have tribal or rural involvement. There's many partners
14 implementing every one of these studies. And the Native
15 Village of Eyak I think is a prime example of what we're
16 trying to accomplish with partnerships.

17
18 So in the Southcentral Region I think the
19 Partners Program is working very, very well. And there's
20 kind of a summary of some of the accomplishments on Page
21 107. You also have a table, Table 1 in your books, on
22 Page 87, and that lists all the different organizations.
23 And when you look at it, I mean, you see a lot of tribal
24 organizations. Native Village of Eyak, Mentasta Tribal
25 Council, Copper River Watershed Project, Chitina Village
26 Council. So really you're doing a stellar example, and I
27 think the Partners program is very successful in this
28 region.

29
30 Beth Spangler coordinates the program for
31 FIS. You can always call her. You can call me. Or
32 touch base with Erica on some of the accomplishments we
33 have with the program.

34
35 So that's a quick update on what we're
36 doing with the Partners Program, and I would be pleased
37 to entertain any questions.

38
39 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Anybody have
42 any questions.

43
44 (No comments)

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. I think the
47 fact there's no questions shows that it's probably
48 working.

49
50 Okay. We have now proposed wildlife

1 resource monitoring program in the National Forest.
2 Steve Kessler.

3
4 MR. KESSLER: Good morning, Mr. Chair and
5 Council.

6
7 Yesterday Donald handed out late in the
8 afternoon this handout. I don't know if everybody got a
9 chance to take a look at it. If you did, I won't go over
10 it in detail. but if you didn't, I'll go over it in a
11 little bit extra detail. Just sort of a -- did people
12 get a chance to read this last night or -- I'll go over
13 it in more detail.

14
15 Also for the audience, for the people
16 behind me, there are copies of it over on the table also.

17
18 The Forest Service has an opportunity
19 this year based on what apparently is going to be an
20 increase in funding for our subsistence program. We
21 don't have a final appropriations act from Congress at
22 this point, but assuming that the appropriations act
23 passes that went through the House and the Senate
24 Appropriations Committee, we're going to see
25 approximately a \$500,000 increase in our funds in this
26 year.

27
28 After quite a bit of discussion on what
29 would be the most effective way to use those dollars, we
30 determined that we would like to begin a program that
31 complements the Fisheries Information Services program,
32 the monitoring program, and do the same thing for
33 wildlife. That seems to be an area that has been weaken
34 both on the Tongass and the Chugach National Forest since
35 the inception of this program in the early 1990s. So
36 actually the fisheries programs been around just for the
37 last, oh, approximately five years, and although we've
38 been -- and the Federal program's in the wildlife
39 business since the early 90s, we haven't had a similar
40 program.

41
42 Now, what I'd like to do today is I'll go
43 through this handout that we have here. If you have any
44 comments on it, I'd appreciate it at this point, and then
45 I'll also let you know what the Southeast Regional
46 Advisory Council did, and you might want to consider sort
47 of complementing what they did, and taking a similar
48 action to help with the formulation of this program.

49
50 The proposal here is that we would model

1 the Wildlife Information Services after the Fisheries
2 Information Services, developing strategic priorities,
3 requesting proposals for studies associates with those
4 strategic priorities, review of those proposals, further
5 requesting those detailed investigation plans, convening
6 a technical review committee to do a lot of that work,
7 and then also receiving Regional Advisory Council
8 guidance and recommendation.
9

10 Now, in the case of FIS, the final list
11 of projects is approved by the Federal Subsistence Board.
12 In this case that final list of projects would be
13 approved by the Regional Forester, since it would be
14 Forest Service only.
15

16 On Page 2 of the handout, and everyone
17 does have a copy? On Page 2 of the handout you can see
18 that there's sort of five levels of structure that are
19 envisioned here. Program oversight, which would be
20 myself as the Regional Subsistence Program Leader for the
21 Forest Service. Program coordinators, which one of those
22 people would basically manage the program, another one of
23 the coordinators would handle the contracting and some of
24 the administrative aspects of the program. That -- for
25 the Forest Service, Cal Casipit does that right now for
26 the fisheries program, and would continue to do that.
27

28 Having a Technical Review Committee
29 similar to FIS. It says Technical Review Committee, and
30 you can see on that chart short of roughly who we would
31 anticipate being part of that Technical Review Committee.
32

33 Again the Advisory Councils, which would
34 be the Southeast and Southcentral Councils. And approval
35 by the Regional Forester.
36

37
38 If you take a look at Page 3, and some of
39 the guidelines that we -- and this paper by the way is
40 all draft at this point. We haven't completely finalized
41 it. That's why I'm particularly interested in your
42 comments.
43

44 On some of the guidelines, I'll go
45 through not in any particular order. First of all, we
46 would, as we're doing with the FIS program, we would like
47 to enhance capacity building among local rural
48 organizations while minimizing those dollars provided to
49 both Federal and statewide governmental organizations.
50 And we've been very much emphasizing that in the Forest

1 Service with the programs in Southeast and Southcentral,
2 and we'd like to continue to do that.

3
4 One caveat here is that we are doing some
5 of these types of projects right now, which -- and those
6 projects are funding permanent employees, and we would
7 need to continue that if we brought some of those other
8 dollars in. But for the new dollars, we anticipate as
9 much as we can probably close to 100 percent of those
10 dollars would be capacity building types of projects.

11
12 We would want to continue to emphasize
13 partnership funding with other governmental agencies,
14 local organizations, private resources.

15
16 Funds again would be in two categories,
17 traditional ecological knowledge and population status
18 and trend types of studies. Where possible, we would
19 like to see joining of funds between this program and
20 FIS, especially for TEK projects where one can go out and
21 more efficiently and effectively develop information both
22 for fish and wildlife at the same time.

23
24 There would be, at least our current
25 thought is, no specific prioritization of dollars between
26 the Tongass and the Chugach national forests, that a lot
27 of the funding distribution would be based on what the
28 strategic priorities are.

29
30 And just one other note is that for any
31 given year, we may have some other higher priorities for
32 subsistence work that are identified by Forest Service
33 leadership, and so some of the funds may be moved
34 elsewhere.

35
36 Now, as far as the timeline at the bottom
37 of Page 3, I just sort of went over where we are in the
38 appropriations bill. By October 1st, we were supposed to
39 have an appropriations bill. We're now on a so-called
40 continuing resolution, and that continuing resolution
41 goes through mid-November, after the elections. And as
42 part of the continuing resolution, we cannot actually
43 start funding any new programs. So we're in a wait and
44 see operation right now until we know what happens with
45 the appropriations bill.

46
47 There's a timeline on Page 4. For the
48 first year, and we're assuming that this is a permanent
49 increase in dollars that we're going to be seeing, for
50 the first year we would probably not have the advantage

1 of having strategic priorities. That would be probably a
2 half to two-thirds of a year it would take to do the
3 strategic planning, so we would have to fund projects
4 this first year based on some sort of other priorities
5 identified by our Forest Service biologists and
6 anthropologists and consulting with agencies and other
7 agencies and stakeholders. But after that we anticipate
8 that a very similar strategic planning process as Doug
9 just described we would use for wildlife, and start
10 funding as much as we can according to those priorities.

11

12 Are there any questions about this paper.

13

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Basically what we're
16 dealing with then is either the Chugach and Tongass
17 National Forests, so a lot of Southcentral isn't in that.
18 Does the Chugach National Forest extend down on the
19 Kenai?

20

21 MR. KESSLER: Yes, essentially the whole
22 eastern side of the Chugach -- of the Kenai is Chugach
23 National Forest.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The eastern side, on the
26 Prince William there. I mean around towards Seward
27 and.....

28

29 MR. KESSLER: Correct. From Seward all
30 the way around to Cordova and east. Actually the Chugach
31 is our second biggest national forest in the country
32 after the Tongass.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions, any
35 comments.

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 MR. KESSLER: Mr. Chairman, let me just
40 tell you what the Southeast RAC did. And by the way, for
41 the Tongass National Forest and Southeast, essentially
42 all of Southeast is Tongass National Forest, so the
43 influence of this program on what would occur on the
44 Tongass in Southeast is in fact probably quite a bit
45 greater than what would happen in the Southcentral
46 Region.

47

48 The Southeast Regional Advisory Committee
49 supported the objectives of the Wildlife Information
50 Services that was presented. They agreed to have three

1 members, Dr. Garza, Mr. Kitka and Mr. Kookesh, offered to
2 assist with the wildlife information planning. So if we
3 take a look at what we propose here, there are a number
4 of steps that need to occur over this next year, and we
5 can't match those up with just one more Regional Advisory
6 Council meeting. So what they said is, well, we'll have
7 three people work with you to not only sort of finalize
8 what these guidelines would be, but also to help
9 prioritize this years spending of money and participate
10 in strategic planning.

11
12 There were some FACA concerns that were
13 raised, and to fulfill those FACA concerns, while
14 ensuring that the Council could participate in both in
15 the Wildlife Information Services and the Fisheries
16 Information Services, the Council passed a resolution
17 requesting that the Federal Subsistence Board take some
18 action to actually form subcommittees of the Council to
19 assist with this whole process so that we don't get into
20 any of the FACA concerns associated with committees that
21 haven't been authorized.

22
23 So their resolution that they came up
24 with, and this is close to the exact words, it hasn't
25 been quite finalized, are that:

26
27 The Council is aware that the Federal
28 Advisory Committee Act directs how participation by
29 Council and other private citizens and groups that meet
30 to advise the Federal Government may take place. WIS or
31 FIS planning groups may be subject to these FACA
32 considerations. We believe that Council members and
33 perhaps other non-government private citizens need to be
34 closely involved in any planning that may develop plans
35 for WIS or FIS studies in the Southeast Region.

36
37 The Southeast Regional Advisory Council
38 resolves and recommends that these two planning efforts
39 take place as subcommittees of the council. We request
40 the Federal Subsistence Board to authorize these two
41 subcommittees. This approach will allow these planning
42 activities to proceed with needed council and public
43 input, that the Council will work with Staff to ensure
44 that the objectives for WIS and FIS planning are met.

45
46 So that's the actions that the Southeast
47 Regional Advisory Council took. And they were very
48 supportive of the program. Mr. Chair.

49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Steve. Any

1 comments from anybody on the Council.

2

3 I know that in Southeast this would be
4 even a bigger issue than here, simply because I was just
5 looking around the table, and how many of our Council
6 people here actually live in the national forest. One.
7 And that, you know, makes it a little bit harder to be
8 quite the same way involved, because there -- most of the
9 Council is not directly affected by what happens in the
10 national forest.

11

12 So they asked the -- they asked the
13 Office of Subsistence Management to form a separate
14 subcommittee for themselves so that it would be under
15 FACA so that it be -- so that it would work under FACA?

16

17 MR. KESSLER: Mr. Chair, later on you're
18 going to see in some of the reports that OSM will be
19 providing that are in your book, and you'll see that
20 there's been some concern about Council members
21 participating in different groups associated with our
22 Memorandum of Agreement with the State and others. And
23 so the Southeast Council is very concerned that they will
24 start being cut out of participating in these different
25 working groups that affect what happens in Southeast.
26 And so I guess as a precautionary move, they said, well,
27 let's just -- we ought to be formulating this as a
28 subcommittee of the Council, because subcommittees of the
29 councils are perfectly legitimate. They just formed one
30 for Unit 2 deer planning primarily on Prince of Wales
31 Island. And it was authorized through the Federal
32 Subsistence Board. It's not actually OSM that does that.
33 It would be the Federal Subsistence Board.

34

35 So they were concerned that if they
36 didn't do that, they might be left out. And they very
37 much wanted to be part of these planning processes. Mr.
38 Chair.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'm just wondering if
41 our Council has the same concern. Susan.

42

43 MS. WELLS: Well, the Chugach does take
44 up quite a bit of our Kenai Peninsula area, and I don't
45 live in it, but every time I drive to Anchorage I go
46 through it, or to Seward. So we do have a vested
47 interest in it and that process.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, would you feel
50 that as a Council we would want to take the same action

1 that Southeastern took.

2

3 MS. WELLS: Well, I don't know if we need
4 a subcommittee, but we would need -- if it was -- if the
5 strategic planning was in the same order that we just
6 heard from the other group, then I would want us to have
7 people present there for that. But I don't know that we
8 would need to have a subcommittee of this Council.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, if I understand
11 right, then the strategic planning in Southeastern would
12 take place as part of the subcommittee of the Regional
13 Council, right? I mean, the Regional Council didn't ask
14 to have a subcommittee formed so that they could sit on
15 the strategic planning, but they asked that the strategic
16 planning take place as part of a subcommittee of the
17 Council, right?

18

19 MR. KESSLER: That's correct. That's how
20 they requested it to occur. I'm not saying at this point
21 that that's what's going to happen, but that is what they
22 requested.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.

25

26 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah. I guess my only
27 comment would be, you know, I guess I am the only one
28 that lives in the national forest on the Council. Sylvia
29 does, but she's not here either. I mean, I think this is
30 important, that this Council consider these kind of
31 funds, and I think we should be included, because I
32 think, you know, we do have a couple of subsistence hunts
33 on the books in the Chugach near Cordova, and even if it
34 has to do with population status and trends and things
35 like that, information gathered in regards to that, I
36 think it's important that we give the local managers the
37 ability and the tools necessary to conduct that work.

38

39 I'm not sure exactly if we need to go to
40 the extent that the Southeast RAC did, but I think that
41 it would be very important if it came time to, you know,
42 be involved with the strategic plan as we have with the
43 fisheries program, that at least one of us from the RAC
44 be included in that discussion. That would be my point.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Steve, now with the
47 fisheries monitor plan, on the strategic planning, we
48 just have a couple Council members that are part of the
49 strategic planning process. We don't have a subcommittee
50 there. They're just part of the process. Would that be

1 applicable in this case here for the amount of interest
2 that we have as a Council in what goes on in Chugach
3 National Forest? I mean, what you're going to be doing
4 is taking part in the same process that Doug has just
5 taken part in right here. Would it be possible that we
6 could have somebody sit in on that just like we have in
7 that one without forming a subcommittee? I mean, to that
8 extent.

9
10 I'm like Tom. You know, we'd like to
11 keep track of what's going on, and maybe have some input,
12 but I really don't see this council at this point in time
13 wanting to form a subcommittee to at this point in time
14 anyhow to do the strategic planning for the national
15 forest when most of the Council doesn't live or do
16 anything in the national forest, you know. Would that
17 kind of process work? Can we do the same thing as what
18 we did with Doug's? Can we just have a couple people
19 appointed to attend the meetings and participate in the
20 meetings, or is that something that's outside of FACA.
21 Steve.

22
23 MR. KESSLER: I guess what I -- Mr.
24 Chair, maybe Steve Klein could come up here and talk
25 about whether he feels that this sub -- that the
26 strategic planning process is going to run into problems
27 because of -- or Doug, because of FACA concerns or not.
28 I can just tell you that the Southeast was very concerned
29 that the FACA problems would extend to the strategic
30 planning, and were concerned that members from the
31 Southeast might not be involved with strategic planning.
32 Their strategic planning I think is two years off still,
33 so -- go ahead, Doug.

34
35 MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, yeah, we
36 looked into the whole FACA consideration on these kinds
37 of exercises, and you have to kind of look -- there's
38 sort of two classes as we understand it when we talked to
39 our Solicitor's Office. In the case of the strategic
40 planning that we just described for FIS, what we're --
41 the way we have portrayed this is we are holding a
42 workshop, and we have a work group, and that's what
43 Gloria was on, that's what I was on, when everybody stood
44 up yesterday. It's a workshop. And basically if it's a
45 relatively short-lived group in a workshop type setting,
46 then FACA doesn't enter into it. And so that's what
47 we're doing. Now, in the case of a long-standing
48 committee, say like the Technical Review Committee that
49 we use, or the Technical Review Committee that Steve has
50 described from WIS where they are repeatedly over a

1 relatively long period of time advising the Federal
2 Government on how to conduct business on some subject,
3 then you have the FACA considerations.

4
5 So the sort answer is for the strategic
6 planning, as long as what we're doing is holding a
7 workshop, we're okay. We can have Council membership.
8 We don't need the subcommittees. If it's the Technical
9 Review Committee where it's a long-standing committee,
10 then you get those concerns, Mr. Chairman.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Doug. That's
13 kind of what I was thinking, because I look at -- you
14 know, in April 2005 a strategic plan is presented to the
15 RACs for comment. So the strategic plan comes back to
16 the RACs, and what we're looking at is we're not making
17 regulations. We're identifying priorities is all we're
18 doing in the strategic planning, and so you're making a
19 workshop to identify priorities. You're not making
20 regulations, you're not proposing projects, you're not
21 spending money. All you're doing is you're having a
22 workshop to identify what are the priorities that we have
23 in the area right here.

24
25 MR. McBRIDE: Yes.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And from that
28 standpoint, I wouldn't see where we as a Council would
29 need to do this as part of a subcommittee. More -- what
30 we probably more want is to be able to have somebody
31 attend this workshop to put the kind of input in that's
32 happened in strategic planning. And if that would be
33 okay, then I know we -- like Tom was saying, we have two
34 members who live in the national forest and maybe
35 somebody else that would be interested who lives on the
36 border of it. And I'm sure we could come up with a
37 couple of members who would be more than willing to
38 attend a strategic planning, you know, workshop, even if
39 it had to be a couple of them.

40
41 But I can't see us as a Council -- I
42 mean, I can't -- unless somebody else on the Council can,
43 and that's up to the council, forming a standing
44 subcommittee that we would be taking that kind of action
45 on it.

46
47 And if anybody in the Council disagrees
48 with me, I'd sure like to hear that.

49
50 Would that -- do you think that that

1 would meet your needs?

2

3 MR. KESSLER: Mr. Chairman, I think it
4 would. The way I understand FACA is when there are final
5 rec -- what's so-called recommendations being made to
6 deciding body, that in that situation that's where the
7 FACA rules really kick in. And so I think as far as
8 strategic planning, I'd agree with Doug, that the FACA
9 rules shouldn't kick in. I just want to just let you know
10 that the Southeast RAC was concerned that somebody might
11 interpret that they do, and therefore they recommended
12 that a subcommittee be formed. They're finding -- the
13 subcommittee that they have for Unit 2 deer, they don't
14 find that that's a problem, at least not yet. And so
15 they see this as a way around some of the potential FACA
16 problems.

17

18 So I think that what you're proposing
19 would work just fine. I guess my recommendation would be
20 that you had at least one person from the Cordova area
21 and one person from the Kenai Peninsula. There is a lot
22 of national forest lands, fewer concerns, but that would
23 be my recommendation to you.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, when are you
26 looking at meeting for the first time?

27

28 MR. KESSLER: Well, that's a good
29 question, because we, first of all, don't know when the
30 appropriations bill's going to get through.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right.

33

34 MR. KESSLER: And we've been on
35 continuing resolutions in the past for months and months
36 and months. And this program can't start until we have a
37 final appropriations.

38

39 At that time we plan to hire somebody
40 from -- probably from within the Forest Service to run
41 this program, to develop a revised timeline, figure out
42 when it's all going to occur. I'd like to say that it
43 would be, you know, kicking off in the first part of next
44 year, but I don't know for sure.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: With the Council's
47 permission, if it happens prior to our next meeting, if
48 you would contact me, and I will poll my Council members
49 and find somebody from each area who would be willing to
50 sit on it, if that's okay with the rest of the Council.

1 And then if it hasn't kicked in by the time we have our
2 next meeting, and you have a better idea of the timeline,
3 then we could take action on it then. And if that's
4 agreeable to everybody else, we can jut leave it like
5 that. Susan.

6
7 MS. WELLS: Just a little input. I know
8 that, James, as you served on the Kenaitze Indian Tribal
9 Council for many years, that you did have contact with
10 the Chugach National forest through tribal partnerships.
11 I don't know if that's called a partnership or not, but
12 you have been involved with the Chugach at least on the
13 periphery, so you might consider representing us on that.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, so it probably
16 would be, if it would be okay with everybody, it would
17 probably be either James and Sylvia or James and Tom.
18 Unless one of you would like to learn about the Chugach
19 National Forest intimately.

20
21 Okay. But at this point in time why
22 don't we leave it at that, Steve, and if it happens to be
23 -- if it happens in a hurry prior to our next meeting,
24 we'll make sure we have somebody that can sit in on, you
25 know, your first session, and probably they'll be the
26 person that will stay there for a while. If it doesn't,
27 we'll take this back up at our next meeting if you have a
28 better timeline.

29
30 MR. KESSLER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Steve. Any
33 other questions for Steve. Anybody else have any
34 comments or questions.

35
36 (No comments)

37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Steve.

39
40 Okay. At this point we put a call out
41 for proposals to change Federal subsistence wildlife
42 regulations. Does anybody have a proposal that they
43 would like -- as part of the Council have a proposal that
44 they'd like to submit to change subsistence wildlife
45 regulations that they'd like us to consider as a Council
46 to submit.

47
48 (No comments)

49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anybody in the audience.

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none, we'll go
4 on to agency organiza -- oops.

5

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll just raise my
7 hand. Tom, have you submitted yours yet?

8

9 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman, being with
10 -- I guess I'd speak as representing the Copper River
11 Advisory Committee. We submitted a proposal to change
12 game regulation that will be at our next meeting in March
13 of '05. And what it has to do with, it has to do with
14 the Federal moose hunt on the Chugach National Forest.
15 It's a drawing hunt for residents of the Cordova area.
16 And basically what it would do is we had a small problem
17 this year in regards to managing the hunt. What it had
18 to do with was there was no age limit for having a moose
19 drawing tag in your name, and it all ended up working
20 fine in the long run, but it became complicated, and
21 almost to the point where it was heated between the
22 manager and the individual's father that was drawn.

23

24 So basically what we did is we had a
25 meeting a couple weeks ago, and we had the Federal
26 managers, the State managers and people from the public
27 along with the advisory committee, and we came to a
28 community decision that we basically mirrored what the
29 State has in its regulation in regard to a big game
30 permit, and what the proposal says is that you cannot
31 have a harvest ticket in your name until you're of the
32 age of 10. But you could participate in a hunt with a
33 person that was over the age of 18, like your father,
34 your brother, if they had a big game permit in their
35 name, if they were lucky enough to be the one that drew
36 the tag, they could take you hunting. You could harvest
37 the animal, but it would have to be on their tag.

38

39

40 So basically it's just basically a --
41 it's a housekeeping issue. That's the way we look at it.
42 It takes the onus off the Federal manager in having to
43 make decisions to age. You know, what's too young,
44 what's old enough, and I think it will make things a
45 little bit more manageable in the future. So that's just
46 one thing I can bring to your attention.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom, that was in regard
49 to the eight-year-old that got drawn?

50

1 MR. CARPENTER: That's right. I believe
2 he was seven or eight years old, and he got drawn for a
3 moose on the Copper River Delta, and it ended up working
4 fine in the long run, but the Federal managers had to go
5 -- basically they had to go out, they took him to the
6 range several times. They had to go over general
7 information. The father was -- you know, it ended up
8 working out fine. The animal was harvested, but we think
9 that there's got to be a minimum age that an individual
10 can have a tag in his name, and we felt that basically
11 following kind of what the State did over the last five
12 years in coming up with that determination, that the age
13 of 10 is about the appropriate age, and it also gives the
14 family the ability to take a child hunting, and harvest
15 -- you know, use the adult's tag to actually, you know,
16 tag the animal with, if they felt that that was what they
17 wanted to do, so.....

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you for that
20 information, but I think that that's nothing that we have
21 to take part in as a Council. That will come before us.
22 So if there are no other audience or Council members that
23 have a proposal that they'd like to submit at this time,
24 we'll then go on to the agency reports.

25
26 And I had a request from Hollis that he
27 has to catch a plane right after lunch, and so he'd like
28 to make sure and go before noon. So if all of the rest
29 of you can hurry until it's time for him.....

30
31 (Laughter)

32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, Hollis, we'll make
34 sure that you get -- if they all are -- if they're too
35 long winded or I'm too long winded, we'll make sure that
36 you still get done before lunch.

37
38 Let's go on to the NGOs, Native Village
39 of Eyak, fisheries research project. Do we have a
40 representative here for that?

41
42 MR. VAN DEN BROEK: I'll probably need
43 five or 10 minutes to set up a PowerPoint presentation if
44 you wanted to call a short recess maybe.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: A short recess.

47
48 (Off record)

49
50 (On record)

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With that we'll
2 go on to the Native Village of Eyak fisheries research
3 project.

4
5 MR. VAN DEN BROEK: Mr. Chairman.
6 Members of the Board. I'm Keith van den Broek from the
7 Native Village of Eyak. I'm here today to talk about our
8 chinook salmon escapement monitoring program on the
9 Copper River.

10
11 As was discussed yesterday, this project
12 is funded through the Fisheries Resource Monitoring
13 Program by USDA Forest Service and managed by OSM. This
14 is the first year in the new funding cycle as an actual
15 monitoring program. It's been running since 2001 as a
16 feasibility study. And this is also my first year
17 working on the project.

18
19 So maybe get some lights off.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: There we go.

22
23 MR. VAN DEN BROEK: This is an outline of
24 what I'll be talking about today. Keep in mind all the
25 results that I present today are preliminary. We haven't
26 completed our data analysis yet.

27
28 Overall project objectives. We're
29 estimating the annual system-wide escapement of Chinook
30 salmon to the Copper River using mark/recapture
31 techniques. And we hope to develop a long-term
32 monitoring program operated by the Native Village of Eyak
33 to estimate chinook salmon escapement on the Copper
34 River.

35
36 And specific objectives in 2004 were to
37 generate the system-wide escapement estimate and to
38 continue to improve upon the quality and effectiveness of
39 the sampling methods that we've established over the
40 previous three years.

41
42 We've got two sampling stations. The
43 first sample event is at Baird Canyon. We've got two
44 fish wheels operating there in 2004. And this is where
45 the tags are applied. And the second sample event is at
46 Canyon Creek just south of Chitina. In 2004 we only had
47 one fish wheel operating there. I'll talk about that a
48 bit more later. And this is where the fish are examined
49 for marks.

50

1 This year as you can see we had a lot of
2 snow during mobilization. The crew had to be dropped off
3 over the course of two days by helicopter and ski plane.
4 There was still considerable river ice, so we couldn't
5 land a float plane, and considerable snow cover.

6
7 Mobilization is probably the most
8 unpredictable part of this study. You can see that in
9 2002 there was moderate snow cover. In 2003 there was no
10 snow cover at all. And that really affects how we can
11 get in there and the cost of mobilization, and how long
12 everything takes. To put it into better perspective,
13 this is the field cabin at Baird, and during 2003
14 mobilization they were able to get the fish wheels in the
15 water and fishing in two days I believe. And this was
16 the cabin in 2004.

17
18 Like I said, we had to go in with a
19 helicopter. We sling loaded in most of our equipment,
20 and that's a considerable expense, going in with a
21 helicopter. We were able to bring most of the
22 technicians in by ski plane, but we couldn't get anything
23 in larger than a Super Cub because the snow was just a
24 bit too soft.

25
26 So once we got in there, there was a lot
27 of digging involved. It took six technicians 12 days to
28 get the first wheel fishing. The camp was not well
29 prepared for this. We had equipment scattered
30 everywhere, so it wasn't just the fish wheels that we had
31 to dig out. The baskets were buried and completely
32 crushed, so we had to get an emergency shipment of
33 aluminum tubing up from Seattle to completely rebuild the
34 baskets. And pretty much everything we needed required
35 six hours of digging to get. It was a big chore.

36
37 Once we did get the fish wheels in the
38 water, we ran fish wheel 1 on the east bank and fish
39 wheel 2 on the west bank. You may notice that we were
40 only running the wheels for a month at Baird Canyon this
41 year as opposed to two months in previous years. This
42 was as a result of high water. With the heat wave that
43 hit the area this summer, the glaciers were melting off
44 really fast, and we experienced higher water than we ever
45 have in the past. And it became unmanageable to running
46 the wheels. The catch rates dropped down to zero, and
47 the wheels were incurring damage every single day from
48 large debris. Ice bergs.

49
50 A nice little photo of our technicians

1 sampling. We applied a yellow spaghetti tag and a right
2 operculum punch. And also we applied 500 radio tags, and
3 with these used a gray spaghetti tag in conjunction.
4 That was part of the radio telemetry study which ended
5 this year, that was run with ADF&G.

6
7 Up at Canyon Creek you can see where our
8 field camp is there. That island nearly went under water
9 this year. It was a real concern.

10
11 Mobilizing Canyon Creek was a lot easier.
12 There was no snow cover on the ground, but we had to do a
13 considerable amount of repairs to the wheel. You see
14 there fish wheel 4, which is a hybridized subsistence
15 style wheel with our research wheel. It can fish a lot
16 shallower banks than the large wheels at Baird. At the
17 end of 2003 season, they got tangled up pretty badly with
18 a tree that had floated down the river, and from what I
19 understand, they had to demobilize with a chain saw. So
20 we spent a lot of time and effort repairing the baskets
21 on that.

22
23 The other thing we did was attach the
24 live tanks a bit differently. Last year, which was the
25 first year fish wheel 4 was used, the live tanks were
26 just attached with a hinge assembly on the side there,
27 and that left them pretty wide open to any damage from
28 debris, and one of them was actually completely destroyed
29 and had to be sent back to Cordova to be rewelded. So
30 this year we built new decks, which as you can see
31 overhung the pontoon assembly, and protected the live
32 tanks a lot better, and the wheel stayed in perfect
33 condition all year.

34
35 This just shows how we moved the fish
36 wheels. Driving them right up the river. We've now got
37 two outboard motors on the back of every wheel. In the
38 past we've had to move the motors around, and it was
39 pretty risky for the crew members, and we've actually
40 dropped one outboard into the river and lost it. So that
41 problem will be avoided in the future. We'll be able to
42 move the wheels a lot easier. If the water level does
43 come up again like we experienced this year, we'll be
44 able to move the wheels a lot more quickly and easily.

45
46 And this just shows how the fish wheels
47 work. I'm sure everyone's seen it before.

48
49 Fish wheel 4 stayed on the west bank near
50 Canyon Creek from the 28th of May to the 22nd of June,

1 and then with the rising water, it was moved to the east
2 bank right next to the camp. And you can see how the
3 water level is. It was literally right next to the camp.
4 And that water actually got higher than it is in this
5 photo.

6
7 At fish wheel 4 at Canyon Creek they
8 inspected for tags and put a left operculum punch on the
9 fish. That's basically so if it's recaptured again by
10 that wheel, they know that they've already sampled it and
11 they can ignore it.

12
13 I mentioned before that we only used one
14 wheel at Canyon Creek. We were modifying fish wheel 3
15 and it took a lot longer than expected. The baskets were
16 cut down so that they can fish shallower banks like fish
17 wheel 4 and hopefully catch more fish in the future. The
18 years that that wheel has been used at Canyon Creek, it
19 hasn't been nearly as effective as fish wheel 4. There's
20 just no deep channels there which the fish utilize. So
21 that's completed and stored, and we should be able to use
22 it in 2005.

23
24 You can see that we caught a lot more
25 fish this year than we have in the past. I think that
26 was mainly due to ideal water conditions early on in the
27 season. For that month that we were able to run the
28 wheels at Baird Canyon they were getting catches in
29 excess of 100 fish a day. It doesn't seem to -- from
30 preliminary analysis, it doesn't seem to be a higher
31 escapement level than in previous years. I think it was
32 just ideal fishing conditions, and we're starting to
33 understand the system better, and be able to catch fish
34 more effectively.

35
36 You can see the tags that were applied at
37 Baird Canyon. The largest catch we had in a day was 172
38 fish, which is about 70 fish higher than in any previous
39 years. We had a very burned out crew from digging snow.
40 Got onto the wheels and immediately got even more burned
41 out from catching a lot of fish every day. And it was an
42 interesting season for them.

43
44 these are the tag examinations at Canyon
45 Creek. You can see that even with one wheel operating,
46 they were still getting pretty considerable catches. And
47 we had 187 total recaptures at Canyon Creek.

48
49 So this shows the capture history. We
50 captured 2,756 fish at Baird Canyon, and tagged 2,516 of

1 them. We haven't had a chance to do any censures yet,
2 and we haven't received any data yet on the radio tag
3 failures. So for preliminary analyses we just looked at
4 the 2,516 available for recapture, and that number will
5 go down once we've got the rest of the information.

6
7 And captured again at Canyon Creek, 3,339
8 fish, of which 3,101 were examined, and 187 recaptures.

9
10 So a very preliminary abundance estimate
11 of 41,532 escapement. Take this number lightly. We have
12 not tested the model assumptions yet, and have not
13 censured the samples, and the radio tag failures are an
14 unknown. So this is just a simple Peterson estimate, and
15 that number will change, although we don't expect it to
16 change too dramatically. So we think around 40,000
17 escapement for this year.

18
19 You can see the travel time as compared
20 to 2003. The fish seemed to move up the river a lot
21 faster. I think what happened there is they knew that
22 the water was going to be coming up, and they made use of
23 the river while they could, and they got up there quick.
24 And you can see there were some stragglers. We had
25 shorter travel times and longer travel times than in
26 previous years, but you can really see where that pulse
27 went through.

28
29 And I think this validates our decision
30 pretty well to shut down the wheels early at Baird
31 Canyon. I honestly don't think that we missed too many
32 fish there by doing that. They did seem to move up the
33 river a lot faster this year.

34
35 So again with the abundance estimate that
36 I presented to you, don't take that number too seriously.

37
38 Mobilizing in the snow, I think we
39 learned a lot of lessons this year. We winterized the
40 cabin a lot better. We've stored a lot more fuel and
41 supplies up there so that if there is considerable snow
42 again, we won't have to do so many sling loads. It's
43 going to reduce costs. And we've also stored the wheels
44 a lot better. And everything is consolidated into one
45 area, so it's -- we're not going to be having to send
46 technicians all over the place with polls trying to find
47 equipment to dig for. It's all right there. We can see
48 it.

49
50 And we considered a lot of different

1 options. Putting master heaters in and heat tape, and
2 just decided that digging effort's going to be a lot
3 easier and a lot cheaper than doing anything like that.
4 And as long as the camp is set up well for it, I don't
5 think it's going to be quite the problem that it was this
6 year.

7
8 The baskets are all broken down and
9 stored indoors, so there's no risk of damage on them this
10 year.

11
12 Obviously we had a problem with high
13 water. In past years we've seen that the catchability
14 dramatically decreases when the water level comes up. So
15 I think in the future we need to look at more sites. I
16 think this year, if we had known the water was coming up
17 when it was, we could have moved the fish wheels upriver
18 a bit sooner and put them adjacent to the cabin up there
19 at Canyon, and we would have continued to possibly catch
20 some fish. But it's really impossible to say what would
21 have happened.

22
23 We are definitely going to have to keep
24 the wheels running longer if we're doing the sockeye
25 study at Baird Canyon. That's going to add an extra
26 month and a half, so it will be interesting to see if the
27 water level does come up, if we're continuing to catch
28 kings through that time. So, yeah, lesson learned, but
29 that's all we can really say about it.

30
31 On 2005, status quo at both camps. And
32 we've written new protocols to deal with the heavy snow,
33 and what to do if the water level comes up again like it
34 did.

35
36 And, you know, as discussed yesterday,
37 we've got the sockeye, steelhead projects approved for
38 funding. If the final funding comes through on that,
39 that's going to add a whole new element to the project
40 with running the wheels a lot longer.

41
42 You can imagine just simple logistics of
43 the additional technician labor that's needed. Just for
44 the short season that we run now, we already run into
45 problems with technicians burning out and quitting before
46 the end of the season. I think we're going to experience
47 that ten-fold if they've got to stay out there for an
48 additional month and a half. We've also got several of
49 our technicians in the past have been college students,
50 and they've got to return to college before the end of

1 the season. So hopefully we'll be able to find a lot
2 more local hire that will be able to stay on for the long
3 term.

4 And, you know, and then you've got other
5 things that we don't really think about like right now
6 when we pull the wheels out of the water at Baird Canyon,
7 the water level's up pretty high, and it's not too
8 difficult a chore. By this time of the year, the water
9 level's dropped considerably, and you've got an extra 300
10 meters to drag those wheels up a really steep bank.
11 We're going to have to look into alternative means of
12 pulling those wheels out of the water. Right now we're
13 just using a chain hoist. We're going to have to look at
14 trying to set up a 15,000 pound winch or something at the
15 camp.

16
17 And that's all I've got. I'll open it up
18 for questions.

19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions.

21
22 (No comments)

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Thank you
25 muchly.

26
27 MR. VAN DEN BROEK: Thank you.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thanks for the work you
30 did, too.

31
32 Okay. Alaska Department of Fish and
33 Game. Do we have a report, Tom.

34
35 MR. TAUBE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
36 Well, actually I have two reports. Following my
37 fisheries report, Becky Kellyhouse will be giving a
38 wildlife report for Units 11 and 13.

39
40 For the record, my name is Tom Taube.
41 I'm the area fish biologist with the Alaska Department of
42 Fish and Game in Glennallen. My responsibilities include
43 management of the sport, personal use and subsistence
44 fisheries of the Upper Copper River.

45
46 I've provided you with a handout here.
47 It should have a Fish and Game logo on. Since the last
48 time this fisheries RAC meeting was held you've basically
49 doubled the size of the RAC, so this is something that
50 the long-term RAC members have seen before. It's just an

1 updated version, kind of a summary of the way the State
2 personal use and subsistence fisheries are managed. And
3 so I won't go through all the detail of that. I'll let
4 you read it on your own, but it describes the management
5 plans that, you know, dictate the numbers for escapement
6 for the Copper River, and how those are related to
7 management of the personal use and subsistence fisheries
8 in the Chitina and Glennallen Subdistricts.

9
10 This year the -- it looked like it was a
11 pretty strong sockeye run on the Copper River early on.
12 A lot of fish had passed the sonar earlier. Overall the
13 escapement goal when the sonar was pulled out at the end
14 of July was for 540,000, and the actual number of salmon
15 that passed was 670,000. Throughout the season the
16 escapement for the given week was met in eight of the 11
17 weeks the sonar was operating. As a result, the Chitina
18 personal use fishery was opened on June 3rd, and remained
19 open for the entire season, until it closes on September
20 30th.

21
22 The second week of the season, we had a
23 supplemental period which under State management plan, if
24 there's a surplus of 50,000 salmon or greater above what
25 is projected at the sonar, a supplemental permit for 10
26 additional sockeye salmon can be harvested by anyone who
27 has a personal use dip net. So that happened for the
28 week of June 7th through 13th.

29
30 The Glennallen Subdistrict opened on June
31 1st by regulation and remained open through September
32 30th, so that basically just opens and closes.

33
34 This year the Glennallen Subdistrict
35 participation if you want to refer to Table 2, the
36 participation had declined slightly from the previous
37 couple of years. We issued 958 permits. The harvest
38 information on here is very preliminary. that's based
39 upon less than 50 percent of the permits received, but it
40 looks like the over-all harvest is similar to what it has
41 been the last few years. Total harvest will probably be
42 around 60 to 65,000 salmon.

43
44 The make up of the permit distribution in
45 Table 3 is similar to what we've had the last three years
46 since the Federal permit system was put in place, where
47 approximately 25 percent of the permit holders are Copper
48 River Basin residents.

49
50 In the Chitina Subdistrict it remains

1 relatively a non-rural fishery. Only one percent are
2 local residents that participate in that.

3

4 Why the participation declined in
5 Glennallen, I'm not quite certain. We did have a lot of
6 high water, and so a lot of fishing success did decline
7 at times. But overall I think the harvests were fairly
8 good this year. You know, 50 or so permits is pretty
9 inconsequential. That could just be some variation,
10 natural variation from year to year.

11

12 With the Chitina Subdistrict, this is the
13 first year there was no permit fee associated with the
14 fishery. And as a result, our permits increased. This
15 is on Table 1. To date we've issued 7300 permits. That
16 number's still climbing. They're still doing data entry
17 with the permit entry. That's why there's not harvest.
18 We haven't even gotten to the harvest component of our
19 permit returns yet. I expect that it will probably -- I
20 talked with our Staff in Anchorage who are doing the data
21 entry. These permits are issued from 40 different
22 vendors throughout the Southcentral area in addition to
23 five Fish and Game offices, while the Glennallen
24 Subdistrict subsistence permits are issued strictly from
25 the five Fish and Game offices in the Central
26 Southcentral region. So we're trying to collect these
27 permits from the vendors, and see what ones they didn't
28 issue, and waiting for the other portion saying who
29 issued -- they're supposed to turn their permits in on a
30 monthly basis, and there's a little lag time from some
31 vendors, license vendors.

32

33 So the participation will probably end
34 up, or at least the permits issued will end up around
35 8,000. My suspicions are that we will see a higher
36 percentage of people that got a permit and did not fish
37 compared to previous years, so actual harvest
38 participation of people that actually fished will
39 probably be similar to what we've seen.

40

41 There were some issues this year
42 regarding access at O'Brian Creek that probably caused a
43 few people not to come once they got their permit.
44 Again, with the high water fishing was kind of slow
45 throughout the season, and so that may have reduced it,
46 too. But I expect that our harvest will probably be
47 similar or slightly below what we've seen in the past.
48 Probably around 70,000 fish.

49

50 I had asked for a summary of commercial

1 harvests from our Comm Fish Division in Anchorage, but I
2 didn't receive anything before the meeting. For Copper
3 River I just have some preliminary numbers. There were
4 35,000 -- that would be for the Copper River District.
5 There were 35,000 kings that were harvested.
6 Approximately 990,000 sockeye, and 400,000 coho.

7
8 And to keep things short, I guess I'll
9 just end with that, and just as I guess a reminder, for
10 what is going through the State process, next year 2005
11 is the Copper River/Prince William Sound Board of
12 Fisheries meeting. And proposals for that State meeting
13 are due April 10th.

14
15 And with that I'll accept any questions
16 that you have.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Tom.

19
20 I've just got two short ones real quick.
21 That 10 additional fish was only available during that
22 one week. They had to take it during that -- that was
23 for that time period, not for the rest of the season,
24 right?

25
26 MR. TAUBE: Right. It's specific to the
27 time period the fish will be available in the fishery,
28 and in order for them to take those 10 fish, they've
29 already had to have harvested their 15 if they were an
30 individual, or 30 if they were a household of 2 or more.
31 So there's a short window of time that they can harvest
32 those additional fish.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. And, you know, we
35 just had the presentation by the Native Village of Eyak
36 on, you know, their, oh, rough figures for king
37 escapement. Do you feel that that pretty much mirrored
38 what you saw on the streams? Do you feel like you got
39 sufficient king escapement most places this year?

40
41 MR. TAUBE: Yes, at least in the upper
42 Copper. The middle Copper, there's some information
43 that, you know, form anecdotal and when I flew my aerial
44 surveys, the upper Copper, mainly like upstream Gakona,
45 the Chistochina had a real strong return. Some of the
46 other tributaries, there was some genetics work that was
47 going on, and they were able to get samples from Bone
48 Creek and Indian Creek and some of the rivers up above
49 Gakona. We have been operating a counting tower on the
50 Gulkana River now for the last three years. Initially it

1 was really strong on the Gulkana, and whether it was a
2 factor of low water, we had extremely low water on the
3 river, and I had flown my aerial survey at the end of
4 July. There's a two-week window I try to fly in to match
5 with historical record. And I'd seen enough to make our
6 escapement objective, but a lot of those fish were down
7 in the Lowe River, and by the time we had pulled the
8 counting tower, I saw about 1,000 below my count area,
9 and only about 400 had passed. So it was a higher
10 percentage of fish that actually probably spawned in the
11 Lowe River. And whether that because of low amounts,
12 there's some question there, but our actual count passed
13 the tower was not as high as we expected at the start of
14 the season.

15
16 But the Tonsina had reports of a real
17 strong return. We had a lot of radio tags from there and
18 the Klutina was probably average or slightly below
19 average. But overall our escapements were met for king
20 salmon for the upper Copper.

21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. I'll share a
23 piece of anecdotal information with you. We have
24 absolute proof now that king salmon spawn in the Lakina
25 River. We had a spawned out kill wash up against the --
26 right below the cabin, wash up against the trees, so
27 about a 25, 27-pound fish that had spawned out, so at
28 least one of them's spawned up the Lakina River.

29
30 MR. TAUBE: Yeah, a lot of it for -- I
31 had done some genetics, reconnaissance for our genetics
32 crew, flying up the Chitina drainage, and unfortunately
33 due to the high water, a lot of the streams that he were
34 able to see in were pretty glacial, glacially occluded,
35 so there was some difficulty in seeing, in those systems.

36
37 I guess one other thing I'd like to add
38 is that we've had a report this year of a northern pike
39 being caught in a fish wheel by Copper Center. And it
40 was verified, and so pike are not native to the upper
41 Copper River drainage. There's been one other report
42 which I haven't been able to verified, because it
43 happened in 1964 that was caught down in this general
44 same area. But I just -- a lot of these people here are
45 using the Copper River, so if you happen to see any
46 northern pike or hear of anything, get the word out that
47 we'd like to see a specimen actually brought to our
48 office so we can actually verify it. Yeah.

49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: How close at the upper

1 Copper with the Tanana and the Copper watersheds come
2 awful close up there, don't they? I mean, if we had high
3 water, is there any of the swamps that join and go in
4 both directions?

5
6 MR. TAUBE: That's one of the
7 possibilities how that fish could have got into the
8 system. It was a 29-inch fish and it weighed about five
9 pounds. It was a pretty robust fish.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It should have been well
12 fed.

13
14 MR. TAUBE: Yeah. So obviously it was
15 eating lots of stuff in the river. The one that was
16 caught in the 60s was pretty scrawny and even though it
17 was 36-inch fish, it only weighed five pounds, so it was
18 really scrawny.

19
20 That's one of the possibilities, high
21 water. Again there's a lot of sometimes bucket biology
22 that goes on. Someone happens to -- you know, there
23 isn't that much difference between the upper Tanana and
24 the upper Copper. Someone may have just thought they
25 were doing the right thing and wanted some pike fishing,
26 which we hope isn't the case.

27
28 I guess my feeling is that a lot -- there
29 isn't really a lot of prime habitat in the Copper. There
30 is some, but in the upper Copper -- a lot of the issues
31 in the Susitna drainage that have come from pike have
32 been impacts on coho stocks, and rainbow trout, and
33 grayling. Well, we've got the rainbow trout and
34 grayling, but in the upper Copper we don't have that much
35 for coho spawning area. So it may not be as much of an
36 impact on the Copper River system as it is on the Susitna
37 system, but it's something we'd like to keep track of and
38 monitor.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So what you'd like, you
41 know, to put the word out that if you catch northern
42 pike, let Fish and Game know.

43
44 MR. TAUBE: And bring it in if possible.
45 It's -- basically when we issue fish wheel permits now,
46 there's been a big push for the Atlantic salmon
47 identification program, and when we give people the cards
48 for the Atlantic salmon, we're going to mention the
49 northern pike issue, and ask people that they, you know,
50 return specimens of both if they do catch them.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Have you had any
2 specimens of Atlantic salmon come back yet?
3
4 MR. TAUBE: Not in the upper river yet.
5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: In the Chitina
7 Subdistrict?
8
9 MR. TAUBE: Nothing yet.
10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Nothing.
12
13 MR. TAUBE: Yeah.
14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
16 Tom.
17
18 (No comments)
19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.
21
22 MR. TAUBE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
23
24 MS. KELLYHOUSE: Mr. Chair, Council
25 members, I'd like to switch gears a little bit. My name
26 is Rebecca Kellyhouse. I'm the assistant area wildlife
27 biologist for the Glennallen area with the Department of
28 Fish and Game. We manage GMU 11, which is east of the
29 Copper River, and GMU 13 which is west of the Copper
30 River.
31
32 For those of you that might be a little
33 unfamiliar with this area, GMU 13 only has a small amount
34 of Federal subsistence hunting area, however, this is the
35 unit that we have the most biological information for,
36 and it's mostly due to the accessibility of the unit.
37
38 GMU 11 on the other hand is almost
39 entirely covered by the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park
40 and Preserve. Though due to its remoteness, a lot less
41 is known about biological information for this unit.
42
43 I would like to just start off by
44 commending the Forest Service for bringing and helping to
45 develop this new Wildlife Information Services program.
46 If it's funded, it will be a huge boost to wildlife
47 managers across Southeast and Southcentral, given the
48 small budgets that they generally have to work with.
49
50 I'm just going to go over a few recent

1 topics I guess in GMU 11 and 13. Some of the questions
2 maybe you guys have, issues that have come up over the
3 last year, and things we're planning on doing.

4
5 Moose surveys, unfortunately, for this
6 meeting don't get flown until late October, early
7 November, so I don't have any new numbers for you guys
8 for this year. But we do have a pretty good idea that we
9 had good production this spring. I did some twinning
10 surveys this spring, and we found 32 to 33 percent
11 twinning rate across 13(A) and (B), which are excellent
12 numbers. And the sample sizes were very good. While
13 calf mortality from bears was likely similar to previous
14 years. Wolf numbers across these subunits were reduced
15 dramatically over the last couple years, so mortality
16 from wolves as least should be down. And if thing go
17 well, we should be higher numbers of calves going into
18 this winter.

19
20 Our research staff will continue to
21 monitor collared cows and their calves in 13(A) west as a
22 continuation of the preliminary calf mortality study that
23 was started last year. They plan to collar 25 new calves
24 this coming next spring to determine the causes of
25 mortality in the area, which a lot of people have
26 discussed recently. And while they're still being
27 discussed from the preliminary two years of data, the
28 over-all mortality was very high on calves. And this
29 spring it was ironically extremely high on the collared
30 cows. The calves from the collared cows. We don't know
31 why.

32
33 On the bright side, the Alphabet Hills
34 burn, the prescribed burn that some of you may have heard
35 about, was considered a success by DNR and Fish and Game.
36 They burned a total of 33,000 acres in the western
37 Alphabet Hills, and while the burn wasn't as deep and
38 continuous as we would have liked, it was a good start to
39 habitat regeneration in Unit 13. The second stage of the
40 burn is scheduled to be carried out next season, or
41 whenever the conditions allow.

42
43 Another habitat project that's on the
44 horizon in our area, it hasn't been finalized, but it's
45 in the preliminary stages. It's fairly interesting.
46 We've been working with the Alaska Moose Federation and
47 Wilder Construction, in addition to Wilson Justin with
48 the Mount Sanford Tribal Consortium, and we're looking to
49 start a browse crushing project on the lower Chistochina
50 River and the Copper River right there in the area. The

1 willow in the area has grown out of the reach of moose,
2 and this long-needed crushing project would be very
3 useful to rejuvenate the river bars, so that in the year
4 of deep snowfall when winter pile -- in the winter if
5 moose pile in there from Units 11 and 13, they will have
6 an adequate food source.

7
8 This fall we began thinking about how to
9 assess antler changes in our area, mostly Unit 13, to try
10 to assess antler regulations that have been in place over
11 the past 20 years for moose. We wanted to compare the
12 age and antler size configuration data to data that was
13 collected back in 1984, so it's a good 20-year gap.
14 While it was only a voluntary program this year, we only
15 got 15 jaws turned in, but next year we're hoping to make
16 it a mandatory data collection program for both the State
17 Tier II moose hunt in Unit 13, which generally accounts
18 for about 50 bulls, and with any luck maybe the Federal
19 program as well, which usually accounts for about 50
20 bulls in Unit 13. So with about 100 bulls, we ought to
21 have a pretty decent sample size to try to make some
22 determinations.

23
24 Moose surveys are done on a much smaller
25 scale in GMU 11 on the east side of the Copper River, but
26 the moose population there has been at a stable low
27 equilibrium there for many years. Unlike the heavily
28 hunted areas our count in GMU shows more bulls than cows.
29 The reason for the stability there is due to heavy
30 predation, and, for example, the fall calf to cow ratio
31 is consistently moderate to low, and it ranges from about
32 8 to 24 calves per 100 cows in the fall. So nothing
33 there has changed dramatically.

34
35 Wolves have probably received the most
36 attention in GMU 13 in the last couple of years. Last
37 winter we did have a land and shoot wolf control program
38 for the first time in over 10 years. The final land and
39 shoot harvest was 127 wolves. If you include the
40 trappers and other hunters, the total wolf harvest last
41 year was 241. Over the entire unit, 50 percent of the
42 fall population was harvested. If you look at the
43 control area, that percentage was closer to about 73
44 percent harvest. The program will continue this winter,
45 although we expect pilots will have to work harder this
46 winter to accomplish the same reduction.

47
48 I don't have much to report on brown
49 bears for this year yet, because the harvest numbers are
50 pretty preliminary, but for the '03/'04 season in Unit

1 13, we had a harvest of 117 brown bears. And this number
2 is down from 132 that was seen the year before, in 2002,
3 but it's similar to the previous year, in 2001. So
4 unitwide the brown bear harvest seems to have followed
5 the bear seasons, basically whether they've been
6 conservative or liberal, the harvest goes up or down.

7
8 The fall numbers, the fall harvest
9 numbers, also track the number of moose hunters in the
10 area. So during the late 1990s there were nearly 6,000
11 moose hunters in Unit 13 under the State general seasons,
12 and the annual harvest of brown bears were a little
13 higher, 140 to 145 bears. And more recently we've had
14 about 2,000 moose hunters in the area, so the brown
15 harvest has dropped a little bit. So we're not sure if
16 the lower harvest has to do with population numbers or
17 the incidental take by moose hunters.

18
19 The Nelchina Caribou Herd is doing pretty
20 well in terms of population size, but the final numbers
21 from this year's census aren't yet done. The final
22 estimate should be available pretty soon when we get the
23 photos counted. From the initial count, we believe the
24 herd is near the 35,000 minimum population objective, and
25 it's probably slightly higher than that. While we
26 initially felt that caribou body condition would be poor
27 this fall due to the really dry summer conditions that
28 were seen across most of the Interior and some of
29 Southcentral, the weights from our capture operation last
30 week were much higher than average. So go figure.
31 Basically it turns out to be great news considering the
32 winter range condition which some of you may have been
33 thinking about.

34
35 The Taylor Highway fire complex burned
36 over a million acres this summer, and it's ironically one
37 year after the end of a five-year caribou/fire
38 interaction study. So this has prompted a multi-agency
39 response to scrape together enough money to continue
40 monitoring the collared animals throughout this following
41 winter, and with any luck for the next three years.
42 Caribou will be monitored this winter for survival and
43 next year for body condition to assess the impacts of the
44 fire.

45
46 I would like to stress that it was the
47 hard work of the Glennallen BLM staff that made this
48 winter's work possible on such short notice.

49
50 Moving on to sheep, they've been a

1 concern for us over the past several years in these
2 areas. For the most part GMU 11 is where I'll focus with
3 our sheep concerns. It's in the Wrangell-St. Elias.
4 Survey funds are very thin and we have a very large area
5 to cover.

6
7 Sheep hunting in GMU 11 has been fairly
8 popular and harvest numbers have been fairly constant.
9 One main area that consistently gets hit hard by
10 subsistence sheep hunters is in the northern Wrangells,
11 just south of the Nebesna Road. While this areas hasn't
12 been surveyed in many years, hunters seem satisfied with
13 the number of sheep available in the area. The majority
14 of sheep hunters spend only two to three days there, and
15 many of them come back successful. So in my mind, this
16 indicates an abundance of sheep. However, I've heard
17 that potentially NPS may have some funding this next
18 summer, and that would be the priority area to get
19 surveyed if the funds come through.

20
21 While the regulation is any sheep in the
22 park portion of Unit 11, the majority of hunters do
23 harvest rams, and this has helped to conserve the
24 population.

25
26 Hunting in the southern Wrangells is
27 dominated by the general season sheep hunters in the
28 preserve. Hunting pressure has been consistently high,
29 although it is a fly-in area. There are 13 count areas
30 in this vicinity, so it's a very large area. The overall
31 numbers of sheep have dropped dramatically over the past
32 decade. And although hunting is probably not to blame.
33 Ewes are the largest demographic group to decline, and in
34 some areas the decline has been as large as 50 to 75
35 percent in less than 10 years.

36
37 Even with the three-quarter curl
38 regulation in the preserve, the number of rams should be
39 adequate compared to the number of ewes, as suggested by
40 the 30 to 50 rams per 100 ewes ratio that we still have
41 this.

42
43 This decline in ewe numbers is dramatic.
44 If lamb production and ram numbers were low, we could
45 suggest some sort of nutritional deficiency or other
46 physiological problem, but considering ram numbers have
47 been steady and the lamb ratios have been between 20 and
48 40 lambs per 100 ewes, this is unlikely. Given the wide
49 range of lamb numbers year-to-year and between count
50 areas, predation from wolves, coyotes and eagles is

1 likely the culprit. My hope is that with rebounding
2 small game populations, the lamb survival will surge
3 enough to put a stop to the declining sheep numbers.

4
5 That about covers it for the large
6 topics. For small game in our area, just because I
7 touched on it, may be coming -- the drought in small game
8 for the area might be coming to a end. While the more
9 interior units are seeing large increases in rough grouse
10 numbers, the Copper River Basin is more known for spruce
11 grouse and for sharp tails. And hunters are reporting
12 more sightings and better hunting this year than in many
13 previous years.

14
15 Ptarmigan numbers are also on the rise in
16 the high country. Surveys last winter showed a pulse in
17 willow ptarmigan numbers, though rock ptarmigan numbers
18 are still pretty low. We should have some larger flocks
19 this winter.

20
21 I guess basically what we can -- the only
22 other small game of any concern is hares, and still
23 haven't seen very many, but we all know it can't stay low
24 forever.

25
26 That should about do it for the Unit 11
27 and 13 review. I did want to mention that for anyone who
28 is interested in putting in any Board of Game proposals
29 for our upcoming Southcentral meeting, our proposal
30 deadline is December 10th. That's when you have to get
31 in your proposals. And then the comment deadline for all
32 the proposals will be February 18th, so we appreciate any
33 comments the RAC might have, or other members of the
34 public here.

35
36 The Southcentral Board of Game meeting
37 will be held in Anchorage in March. I believe the
38 tentative dates right now are the 4th through the 13th at
39 the Coast International in Anchorage.

40
41 So if you have any questions, I'd be
42 happy to answer them.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions. Doug.

45
46 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chair. Do you harvest
47 black bear in those two units, too?

48
49 MS. KELLYHOUSE: Yeah. Mr. Chair, the
50 black bear harvests have actually -- are very low in Unit

1 11 on the east side of he river, just cause the
2 accessibility is so limited. It's been very constant. I
3 believe the harvest is less than 15 bears per year for
4 black bears, and then Unit.....
5
6 MR. BLOSSOM: Fifteen bears?
7
8 MS. KELLYHOUSE: In Unit 11.
9
10 MR. BLOSSOM: How about 13?
11
12 MS. KELLYHOUSE: The harvest for Unit 13
13 is quite a bit higher, but it's still less than 100 bears
14 annually. It hasn't fluctuated much at all. The
15 pressure has been just fairly constant over the past
16 several years, so.....
17
18 MR. BLOSSOM: Okay. Thank you.
19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We have too many of the
21 other kind, Doug. They happen to eat the black bears.
22
23 MR. BLOSSOM: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, the
24 reason I asked is in Units 7 and 15 we harvest 300 and
25 some black bear a year consistently. We harvest zero
26 brown bear. And something's out of proportion in our
27 schematic here.
28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, it's just the
30 fact. I mean, we just -- we see a lot more brown bears,
31 a lot more grizzlies than we see black bears.
32
33 MR. BLOSSOM: We do, too.
34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But you -- oh, but you
36 don't.....
37
38 MR. BLOSSOM: We see all brown bear and
39 no black bear.
40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But you harvest black.
42
43 MR. BLOSSOM: And we harvest 300.
44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Okay. I had
46 something written down. So you were saying that in Unit
47 11 the ram survival is good, but the ewe survival is
48 what's hitting us more than anything else.
49
50 MS. KELLYHOUSE: Well, you know,

1 obviously I don't have first-hand evidence that they're
2 dying, but they're.....

3

4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: They're not there.

5

6 MS. KELLYHOUSE: They're not there any
7 longer, so, yeah, the survival has definitely taken a
8 nose dive. And the fact that the ram harvest has been
9 consistent, the success rate has been consistent for
10 hunters. We feel that the ram population is not facing
11 the same sort of mortality that the ewe population is.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No comment, other than
14 we do have a lot of a midsize predator up in Unit 11 that
15 it would be much easier to take a ewe than to take a ram.
16 The coyote population is way up.

17

18 MS. KELLYHOUSE: Seasons are longer now.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Yeah. Anyhow,
21 any other comments, questions.

22

23 (No comments)

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

26

27 MS. KELLYHOUSE: Thank you.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Forest Service.

30

31 (Pause)

32

33 MR. JOYCE: Sorry for the delay, Mr.

34 Chairman.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's what happens when
37 you use those time-saving devices called computers.

38

39 (Pause)

40

41 MR. JOYCE: Mr. Chairman. Members of the
42 Regional Advisory Council. My name is Tim Joyce. I'm
43 the Federal subsistence fisheries biologist on the
44 Chugach National Forest, stationed in Cordova. And I'm
45 going to give you a short presentation of some of the
46 projects and some of the things that we're in the Prince
47 William Sound and in the Cordova area.

48

49 You heard earlier about some of the
50 projects that the Native Village of Eyak is doing on some

1 of the subsistence fisheries within the Copper River. I
2 want to talk about a few of the projects that are going
3 on with -- that are funded through the Forest Service
4 that are not related to subsistence funding at all, but
5 some of the information that we gleaned from that can be
6 use for subsistence purposes. And then towards the end
7 I'll also go through some other issues that are
8 developing within the subsistence fisheries program that
9 you may want to address.

10

11 As you heard earlier, you know, the
12 Native Village of Eyak is doing the chinook escapement
13 monitoring project, and you got a lot of information from
14 that presentation. They also do a lower river sockeye
15 escapement project, and that's using sonar to get kind of
16 an early handle on how many sockeye salmon are entering
17 the river and heading up towards the sonar site.

18

19 One of the projects that the Forest
20 Service is doing is, or we have done actually in the last
21 -- it was completed this last spring, was a population
22 study on some of the lakes within Prince William Sound
23 area, in particular the Copper River Delta. We looked at
24 two lakes in particular, Eyak Lake, which is located
25 right near the City of Cordova, and another lake called
26 McKinley Lake, which is located on the Copper River
27 Delta. And in those two lakes we were looking at
28 populations of trout, and whatever other species might be
29 in them.

30

31 And in this case we found that in
32 McKinley lake there was a population of whitefish, and we
33 had a population estimate of around 2,000 whitefish for
34 that lake.

35

36 We also found that there were cutthroat
37 trout in that lake, and the population estimate there was
38 around 115 cutthroat trout. Now, again, with that
39 cutthroat trout population, it's something you want to
40 take lightly, because they are migratory. We have a sea-
41 run population that moves in and out of that system, so
42 at different times of the year there may be different
43 populations numbers of cutthroat trout within that
44 system.

45

46 In Eyak Lake we did not find but one
47 whitefish. We only caught one whitefish in Eyak Lake.

48

49 We caught over 300 Dolly Varden, and we
50 marked those. And we only recaptured three. So we

1 didn't do a population study because of the small number
2 of recaptures, but it does indicate that there's a pretty
3 healthy population of Dolly Varden.

4
5 We only captured eight cutthroat trout in
6 Eyak Lake. And we did not get any recaptures. So again
7 we couldn't do a population estimate, but from the amount
8 of effort that we put into it, and the number of fish we
9 captured, it's a pretty small population.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: One question.

12
13 MR. JOYCE: Sure.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Did you get any burbot
16 in either one of the two lakes?

17
18 MR. JOYCE: We did not catch any burbot.
19 And we were using a gill net sampling method, so if there
20 were burbot in there, we should have captured some. But
21 we did not catch any.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

24
25 MR. JOYCE: Another project that we're
26 doing, this was done in 2002, and also this year in 2004,
27 and it was a little bit different in 2004 than in 2002.
28 2002 was kind of a preliminary year just to check the
29 feasibility. We were interviewing people that were
30 passing through the Cordova airport that appeared to have
31 been fishing, and asking them questions on where they
32 fished and what species they were targeting, and how many
33 fish they caught, and how many fish they kept. Again,
34 this had more to do within the district of seeing where
35 effort was, and how much that habitat might have been
36 being utilized or impacted from visitors.

37
38 But one of the side pieces of information
39 that we gleaned from that was some of the effort and some
40 of the harvest. Again, most of these people that were
41 passing through the airport were non-rural persons. They
42 were visitors. And in a period from August 19th to
43 September 29th in 2002, we had about 1300 people that we
44 interviewed passing through the airport. And on average
45 that was about 31 sport anglers per day.

46
47 And out of those 1300 sport anglers, we
48 estimate there was almost 43,000 silver salmon that were
49 caught, but out of that there was just over 10,000 that
50 were kept. So they kept about one-quarter of those that

1 they caught. And that was just from people that were
2 passing through the airport.

3
4 In 2004, we expanded that survey to
5 include not only the airport, but also the marine highway
6 system, the ferry that departs from Cordova. And we were
7 also going to mail out a survey to the local residents so
8 that we can get some idea of the effort, total effort
9 within the Copper River Delta on the different species
10 that are being harvested or fished. But we don't have
11 that data yet. That's just been completed, but it will
12 probably be available sometime this winter, and if I'm
13 not able to get it to you by your March meeting, then I
14 will certainly have it for you next year, to give you an
15 idea of what we're catching or seeing that are being
16 caught.

17
18 The idea of this study is to get some
19 baseline information to see what the effort is now, and
20 maybe in five or 10 years we'll come back and do it again
21 and see that effort is going to be at that time.
22 Cordova, of course, is expecting to see the new fast
23 ferry that's going to be put on line by the Marine
24 Highway System, and as a result of that, we do anticipate
25 more visitors and more people are going to be utilizing
26 these resources. And that's another reason for this
27 particular study.

28
29 And another thing that has come up in
30 Cordova here lately has been some of our fishing issues
31 of the Federal subsistence program. As you know the
32 Federal subsistence fishing program's been around for
33 about five years now. People are beginning to get more
34 familiar with the program. They're starting to see the
35 opportunities that are available to them, and they're
36 starting to utilize that program more than what they had
37 in the past. Prior to that time, of course, they had the
38 State system.

39
40 The Federal program is for primarily,
41 obviously, on the forest is for the freshwaters. We
42 don't operate in the marine waters. We don't control any
43 of the marine waters subsistence fisheries. It's all
44 just in freshwaters. And there's some things that are
45 starting to happen now that this Regional Advisory
46 Council should be aware of and may want to take some
47 actions on here in the near future.

48
49 For example, in the Prince William Sound
50 area, which includes Prince William Sound, the Copper

1 River Delta, and the lower Copper River from Haley Creek
2 down to the mouth, current regulations fall under the
3 general provisions. And for those of you that are
4 familiar with the general provisions, I'll just give you
5 -- this will be kind of a review for you, but those of
6 you who are not, it will be something you might want to
7 be interested in.

8
9 For example, in the general provisions
10 there's a section called methods, means and general
11 restrictions. And a lot of these things were adopted
12 from the State regulations when the subsistence program
13 was formed. They just adopted a lot of those
14 regulations, and then as things have matured, those
15 things have been modified or removed or added to. And in
16 this case, you can see from the allowed gear, you know,
17 there's marine related gear, there's a variety of
18 different things in there. There are some areas within
19 the State that still have marine waters -- or that do
20 have management of marine waters. And so that is why
21 those gear types are still in there.

22
23 But you can see from some of the
24 freshwater types of gears, you know, there's set nets,
25 drift nets, seines, beach seines, fish wheels, fyke nets,
26 dip nets, et cetera. You know, there's quite a variety
27 of different gear types that are available to you.

28
29 Some of the other restrictions that apply
30 under the general provisions are that gill nets can't be
31 more than 50 fathoms in length. Again, that's one of the
32 hold-overs that came down from the State restrictions.
33 That's generally what the State has for their subsistence
34 gill nets is 50 fathoms. Most of that is again, around
35 the Cordova area, is still in affect in the marine
36 waters. In this case, there's no more than one-half the
37 width of any stream can be obstructed by this gear,
38 whatever the gear type that it is that you're using, such
39 as a fyke trap or a gill net.

40
41 And, of course, you can't use explosives
42 or chemicals. You cannot fish within 300 feet of a dam
43 or fish ladder or weir, culvert, and sometimes these
44 other artificial obstructions that might be indicated.

45
46 And then you may take fish at any time
47 unless you're restricted by a permit or regulation. So
48 there's basically no closed season when you're working
49 under the general provisions unless you are somehow
50 restricted by that.

1 In the general provisions, also it does
2 say that you do need to have a permit if you're going to
3 subsistence fish for salmon, unless it's specifically not
4 required. So if you're just going out to go fishing for
5 salmon somewhere, you would need to get a permit. Within
6 that, it says that you cannot take more fish than what's
7 allowed by that permit, and that you must obtain that
8 permit before you go fishing, and that you must have that
9 permit in your possession while you are fishing, or while
10 you're transporting fish.

11
12 Okay. Those are the general provisions.
13 That applies to pretty much anybody statewide where there
14 are not other regulations that go beyond this.

15
16 Now, within the Prince William Sound area
17 we have some special provisions. And there's actually
18 four of them, but one of them applies to the upper Copper
19 River District from Haley Creek north, and so I left that
20 one off. I'm just going to be talking about the area
21 down below Haley Creek.

22
23 And in this case a subsistence fishing
24 permit is required, the same as the general provisions,
25 except that in this case it's required for all species
26 except for eulachon. So if you're going to go fish
27 whitefish or Dolly Varden or cutthroat trout, you would
28 need to have a permit as well.

29
30 The gear may be restricted by this
31 permit. That is, if there is some reason for some
32 particular gear type to not be allowed, that it could be
33 restricted on the permit.

34
35 And the final one is one that was kind of
36 an adoption from the State methods, too, or the State
37 regulations, which says that if you are taking a
38 steelhead, you can take a steelhead or rainbow trout for
39 subsistence, if it's taken incidental to a fish fishery.
40 So if you're somehow fishing a gill net or something
41 along those lines, and you capture a steelhead or a
42 rainbow trout, you can keep it, but you cannot go out and
43 target that species.

44
45 What we have then in a situation now in
46 Prince William Sound, as I said earlier, now where people
47 are beginning to realize some of the opportunities that
48 are available, is that we're finding that we have almost
49 like three distinct areas. We have Prince William Sound
50 itself. We have the Copper River Delta, and then we have

1 the lower Copper River from Haley Creek down to the
2 mouth. Each of these areas, if you will, or systems,
3 these stream systems or areas, area unique in that they
4 have different species in them. They have different
5 habitats, and they have different user groups. And as
6 such, not all of the general provisions are good for the
7 regulatory process, or the regulations that we have in
8 effect, because of the things that could happen in those
9 different areas by different users.

10

11 And, for example, someone could take a
12 gill net in Eyak River, which is -- drains the Eyak Lake
13 out of town, and in this particular situation, the river
14 is maybe 100 feet wide in most cases, and maybe a little
15 bit bigger in some areas. But it's a very winding river.
16 It has a narrow channel to it, and there's a lot of boat
17 traffic on this river that ranges from canoes and skiffs
18 up to 30-foot gillnetters. And if somebody was to take a
19 gill net and fish on that river, they could be drifting
20 down the middle of the channel when a boat would come
21 around the corner and not see that net and it would be
22 too late for them to stop or if they did, were able to
23 stop, you know, they would have their gear down onto the
24 bottom at that point, their out-drive would then hit the
25 bottom, because they're up on step. Or they would go
26 over the net and tangle the net in their prop, and
27 certainly have damage to both the net and the boat.

28

29 So that's the kind of situation where
30 some things you might want to look at addressing in the
31 future as to how you want to prosecute the subsistence
32 fishery, so that you don't have situations that can
33 endanger both the persons and their equipment, and/or at
34 the same time you don't want to have a situation where
35 you're going to put in jeopardy the actual existence of a
36 stock. As I said earlier, you know, we have some
37 cutthroat trout stocks that are small, and that would be
38 quite vulnerable. There's no closed season, for example,
39 in the Federal subsistence regulations whereas in sport
40 regulations there is a closed season from April 15th to
41 June 15th, during the spawning period when these fish are
42 all in the freshwaters, they're all up very small creeks,
43 and they could become very vulnerable to harvest.

44

45 So with that, I wanted to bring that to
46 your attention so that if this Advisory Council would
47 like to look at some of these general provisions or to
48 maybe have a workshop considering some of these things
49 that could generate some proposals for the Prince William
50 Sound area to address some of these things and some of

1 these issues, now would be a good time to do that,
2 because I think the regulatory process for proposals will
3 be starting in March and so anybody that would need to
4 submit a proposal, would probably need to be starting to
5 put those together now so that they could be submitted in
6 March.

7
8 And with that, I guess I'm here to ask
9 the Advisory Council for some sort of direction as to how
10 they want to go with the proposal process, or do they
11 want to at this point just leave it alone and wait for
12 things to develop. But I think that might be a risky
13 thing to do at this point in time.

14
15 So with that, I'll stop and answer any
16 questions.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.

19
20 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah, Mr. Chairman.
21 Yeah, Tim, thanks for your presentation. It seems like
22 there's some concerns that maybe we potentially need to
23 deal with here. Some of that information that you just
24 presented is kind of undaunting, especially when you take
25 a town the size of Cordova that has a couple thousand
26 people, and in a couple week period your angler survey is
27 almost three-quarters of the population of the town. It
28 seems to me like we need to look at some of the means and
29 methods in the area.

30
31 And I know it's of great concern to me
32 and several other people that I've talked to in town in
33 regards to some of these general provisions. And I guess
34 my idea would be that I would propose that the OSM staff
35 research some of the concerns that our Federal fishery
36 manager has in Cordova in regards to the means, methods
37 and bag limits of the fisheries from Haley Creek south,
38 and report back to this Regional Council in March with
39 some language that potentially we can adopt to bring the
40 Federal subsistence regulations more in line with not
41 only State regulations, but to keep it more in line with
42 -- to keep some of these small stocks of vulnerable
43 species protected a little bit better.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tom. Anybody
46 else have any comments on it. I know Doug and I were
47 talking before about as a Council we've been pretty
48 hesitant to be proactive and come up with suggestions
49 ourselves on things like this. We'd actually like them
50 to come from some of the user groups and the management

1 areas so that we can deal with them without feeling like
2 we're prejudiced because these are the ones that we've
3 presented.

4
5 And I like Tom's idea, that if you're --
6 you know, if the different area managers see problems in
7 this area, and want to have a workshop, I'm sure we can
8 have somebody from the Council sit in as a participant in
9 a workshop.

10
11 But I would like -- if there's going to
12 be any proposals on it, I would like to have the
13 proposals come from people who recognize what the problem
14 is or from the people who are the users rather than from
15 us. And again, what we're dealing with here, we're
16 dealing with a situation that it basically is affecting
17 our national forest down at that end, and a lot of us
18 don't have direct contact with it. So from that
19 standpoint, if -- you know, I can see what Tom's talking
20 about. We've got vulnerable small populations of fish
21 that have no regulations on them at all under Forest
22 Service law. You could definitely have a problem in a
23 real quick hurry.

24
25 But my question is, if there is a
26 conservation concern, and if there is an emergency type
27 situation, how strong can you act? I notice that a
28 permit has to be issued. How strong does the
29 conservation concern have to be prior to limiting that
30 permit to the point where you don't have to -- where it
31 doesn't have a drastic effect?

32
33 MR. JOYCE: One of the problems that I'm
34 faced with, of course, is simply the lack of information.
35 As I said, we had two lakes that we surveyed out of I
36 don't know how many hundreds of lakes that are probably
37 around in the area. I have very little information, and
38 I don't believe the State has much more information
39 regarding population sizes in these other systems.

40
41 If, for example, someone came into my
42 office and asked for a permit to go harvest trout,
43 cutthroat trout, for example, and they wanted to harvest
44 10 trout, that seems like a reasonable number that I
45 would probably say, okay, well, that's a reasonable
46 number. But then the next person that came in and said,
47 well, I want to go to the same place, and I want to
48 harvest 10 trout. It's probably still a reasonable
49 number, but I don't know how many trout are in there.
50 Maybe they have -- by taking 20 trout they may have taken

1 half the population out. So I'm put in a very difficult
2 position of trying to manage something that I have very
3 little information on. And at that point I would be hard
4 pressed to determine what is a reasonable amount.

5
6 And I guess that's where I was looking
7 for guidance is, how do I come up with that kind of a
8 solution without information, and be able to justify it,
9 to say I have a conservation concern when I really don't
10 know what that concern is, because I don't know what the
11 population is. And that's why I think that if I had some
12 standards to go by, maybe there is a limited number that
13 you would want to set, to say, okay, harvest should not
14 be more than two cutthroat trout at a time or per day or
15 something along those lines. That's a standard that I
16 could use. But to allow someone to come in and take a
17 fixed number, and then allow another person to take a
18 fixed number which might be beyond the capacity of that
19 system, I would have a conservation concern, but I
20 wouldn't know how to express that, if you know what I'm
21 saying. I wouldn't know how to put that down on a permit
22 and justify it.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I see what you mean.
25 And I was just trying to think if there were any other
26 areas in the State that had unlimited access and
27 unlimited bag limits and unlimited seasons, and I can't
28 come up with any. I can't come up with any other
29 subsistence -- almost all other subsistence take operates
30 under some kind of bag limits, some kind of gear
31 restriction, and some kind of a season.

32
33 And I mean like when we started dealing
34 with freshwater fish on the Kenai, just as a conservative
35 measure, we went to the State bag limits and seasons,
36 simply to keep it within reach.

37
38 So basically what you're saying is
39 there's no bag limit, no season, no gear restrictions?

40
41 MR. JOYCE: That's correct. The gear
42 that you saw that I listed before are the allowable gear
43 types, unless it's restricted by the permit. And there
44 is no closed season, and there is no bag limit.

45
46 There is -- the only thing that there is
47 in the regulations for Prince William Sound, and actually
48 in the freshwaters of Prince William Sound itself, not on
49 the Copper River Delta, but in certain areas of Prince
50 William Sound, there is a fishery that is allowed for dip

1 netting pink salmon out of the freshwaters. It's open I
2 believe, I'd have to look at the exact dates, May 15th
3 through September I think it is, that basically has an
4 unlimited harvest seven days a week, 24 hours a day.
5 Whenever pink salmon are there, you can go dip out a pink
6 salmon, if you live in the Tatitlek or the Chenega area.

7
8

9 That's the only regulations we have in
10 Prince William Sound. Other than that, everything else
11 falls in the general provisions.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fred.

14

15 MR. ELVSAAS: Thank you. Well, a couple
16 of things. First of all, why isn't a permit required for
17 eulachon?

18

19 MR. JOYCE: I believe the reason that
20 there was no permit required for eulachon is the State
21 doesn't require a permit for eulachon either, and it.....

22

23 MR. ELVSAAS: Okay.

24

25 MR. JOYCE:would make no sense to
26 have a Federal requirement that goes beyond what the
27 State requires.

28

29 Now, the State does require permits for
30 other species, you know, if they're going to go for
31 freshwater species, the State does require a permit, and
32 I think that's the reason for that. So we are not being
33 more restrictive than what the state would be.

34

35 MR. ELVSAAS: Well, I would be uneasy
36 trying to set bag limits on something we don't know
37 anything about. If you don't know about it, we sure
38 don't know about it. And if you gave a permit for 10
39 fish to one person and 10 to another, as long as
40 everybody's getting 10 fish, it seems to me there's
41 sufficient amount. If the catch drops, you know, then
42 the concern would arise. But setting bag limits just
43 because we need one.

44

45 When we started the king crab fishery,
46 the State wanted a pot limit. We were fishing, we didn't
47 know about it. But the only person that testified and
48 set a pot limit was a man that wanted 15 pots in Kachemak
49 Bay, because that's all he had. The rest of us were
50 fishing 30, 40 pots. And the regulation came in. And

1 that was in the early days of fishing when there was a
2 lot of crab. And it took years to get that changed.

3
4 So, you know, to just artificially set a
5 limit, a bag limit on something without any real
6 knowledge would be pretty difficult.

7
8 Thank you.

9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Doug.

11
12 MR. BLOSSOM: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, my
13 question is, I live in Cordova. I want to come to you
14 and I want to catch 10,000 Dolly Varden trout. Can you
15 turn me down?

16
17 MR. JOYCE: Mr. Chairman and Doug, if you
18 wanted to catch 10,000 Dolly Varden trout, I think that
19 that would be difficult, an I'd probably certainly want
20 to know what you were going to do with 10,000 Dolly
21 Varden trout, but.....

22
23 MR. BLOSSOM: But could you stop me, or
24 would you not issue a permit, or.....

25
26 MR. JOYCE: Once again, I don't have the
27 information available that would provide for a
28 conservation concern, but that would probably raise my
29 eyebrows a little bit, and I would probably suggest a
30 lower amount. I'm not sure that I could stop you,
31 because I don't have any regulations that would say that
32 there's a reason to stop you, unless I had a conservation
33 concern.

34
35 MR. BLOSSOM: Okay. Well, that would be
36 my worry, that maybe we should have some limit somewhere.
37 I mean, as I understand it, you probably couldn't stop me
38 from doing it.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.

41
42 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah, I'm glad you
43 brought that up, Doug. That's one of the concerns that
44 we have down in Cordova is that, you know, like Tim
45 talked about earlier, there's some of these real small
46 populations let's say of cutthroat trout where, you know,
47 between the Department of Fish and Game and the Forest
48 Service who's done stream surveys, there might be a
49 population of say a couple hundred cutthroat trout in one
50 given drainage. Well, if a couple people go in and

1 request even 10, 20, 30 cutthroat trout, that's not an
2 unreasonable number of trout. But you're talking about
3 taking about 40 percent of the population from that one
4 area, and we're concerned that ultimately that is just
5 going to lead to conservation concerns that will have a
6 dramatic impact on not only the subsistence resource, but
7 the entire way of living in Cordova for a lot of people.

8
9

10 And I guess that's why I brought it up
11 earlier, that I think it would be important that this
12 Council support the OSM staff along with, you know,
13 possibly somebody from this RAC in the next three or four
14 months before our next meeting looking at the concerns
15 that the Federal fishery biologist has for this area in
16 regard to these very wide open general provisions, and
17 that they come back to us with some kind of language that
18 they think would be appropriate. And then we ultimately
19 will have the final say, you know, in taking our
20 recommendations to the Federal Subsistence Board. This
21 is going to basically keep the abuse from taking place in
22 the short term, but it's also going to allow the general
23 public to come to this Regional Council if they think
24 that the bag limits are out of line.

25

26 I know, for example, when the Federal --
27 you know, when there became a dual management system,
28 that a lot of the provisions that are in the subsistence
29 regulation manual basically were just mirrored from State
30 law and bag limits just to put something on the books
31 that the Regional Councils had to start from in regards
32 to amending and changing the regulations.

33

34 So I would hope that the rest of the
35 Council would see the concerns that we have down in
36 Cordova and on the Federal lands in the Chugach, and that
37 you would support the idea of allowing Staff to possibly
38 have some kind of a workshop in the next couple months.
39 You know, I'd be more than willing to volunteer, you
40 know, to sit in on that. It's an important issue, and I
41 think we need to deal with it.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tim.

44

45 MR. JOYCE: Mr. Chairman, and along with
46 what Mr. Carpenter was saying, whatever proposals are
47 generated would be just exactly that. They would be
48 proposals, and the Regional Advisory Council would have
49 to deal with those as proposals. And they would have a
50 Staff analysis done. They would be just like every other

1 proposal that you get. If there's anything that would be
2 presented, then you would then deliberate upon them and
3 take your actions, and you could decide to accept,
4 reject, modify, however you wanted to approach this
5 thing.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tim. I just
8 had a question in my own mind. I was just wondering,
9 under the general provisions they listed all of those
10 different gear types, because those different gear types
11 are traditional in one area or another. They're the gear
12 types that have been used in the past. You know, they
13 fish blackfish with a fyke net, they fish coho out on the
14 Peninsula with a beach seine, that type of thing. And
15 those provisions didn't apply all over. I mean, like
16 when we looked at the upper Copper, and we looked, a dip
17 net and a fish wheel was traditional up there. We didn't
18 automatically say when subsistence came, you can use a
19 beach seine, a gill net, a purse seine, fyke net and
20 everything for salmon.

21
22 So do you have -- I mean, is there -- if
23 the general provisions are there, any of those gear types
24 can be used if nothing has specifically been said to
25 limit it to a certain gear type?

26
27 MR. JOYCE: Those gear types are all
28 legal gear types under the general provisions. The
29 permit that's issued can restrict gear. I would then be
30 -- of course, I would have to have a justification of why
31 I would want to restrict gear, such as, you know, as an
32 example, I laid out a few -- a gill net in Eyak River
33 could become a very dangerous situation if a boat is
34 traversing the river. Or it could also be used in the
35 Copper River, it could be a very dangerous situation if
36 somebody is laying out a gill net and they have it
37 attached to their boat, or while they're laying it out,
38 because the lower Copper River is full of snags. And
39 with the current that's going by, if somebody snagged
40 their net on that snag, it would do one of two things.
41 One is it would release itself from the skiff, or it
42 would sink the skiff. And if it did that, then, of
43 course, the occupants are in the water.

44
45 But undoubtedly -- I have no doubt in my
46 mind that that gear would snag on something eventually
47 and it would continue fishing in the river until it
48 either wrapped up tore loose or got buried in the sand.
49 And at that point it's still catching fish for however
50 long it's going to be in that river.

1 And so there's an issue there that I
2 guess I would have a concern with about issuing that type
3 of a permit. But, again, I would be needing to be able
4 to justify any kind of a restriction.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So the fact that a gear
7 was not traditional in an area would not be a reason to
8 restrict it. It would have to be -- there would have to
9 be a better reason than that then.

10
11 MR. JOYCE: I think that would be
12 something that the Regional Advisory Council could
13 certainly take up and deliberate if they wanted to do
14 that, to restrict gear, but I believe that's your role,
15 and it would be -- I would be stretching my
16 responsibilities to go that far. That would be your
17 role.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It would be interesting
20 to me to see how the different gear restrictions came
21 about in different areas to start off with. How did, you
22 know -- what process did it go through -- what process
23 did it go through to limit gear on the upper Copper River
24 to dip nets and fish wheels, for example. I know that
25 we've gone through other processes to add gear, like rod
26 and reel.

27
28 MR. JOYCE: Uh-huh.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And things like that.
31 Well, I would hope that if you have -- if this is a
32 concern, that you do form a committee to look at it, but
33 I would more hope that the user groups down in the
34 Cordova area would address it and put some proposals on
35 the table before us so that we'd have something to work
36 on. I would hate to have us sit down as a Council and
37 decide what we should put on the table for an area that
38 we don't all deal with, you know.

39
40 MR. JOYCE: Uh-huh.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And is that kind of the
43 feeling of the rest of the Council on that? Fred.

44
45 MR. ELVSAAS: Yeah, I was just trying to
46 follow up on looking at our duties, and I don't see,
47 excuse me, in the duties of the Council that we make
48 proposals.

49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

1 MR. ELVSAAS: So that's where I was,
2 thanks.

3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do you feel that
5 possibly a working group will be organized to look at
6 this sometime in the next year that a Council member
7 could sit in on?

8
9 MR. JOYCE: Yes. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom, either you or
12 Sylvia from down that way could sit in on it. Maybe both
13 of you.

14
15 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman, yeah, that
16 would be fine. I wouldn't have a problem with that at
17 all.

18
19 I would also like to, you know, get back
20 to what Fred was saying. I agree with him that we
21 shouldn't be drafting things. And I'm quite confident
22 that there will be a couple proposals that will come
23 before the Council from the general public in the Cordova
24 area.

25
26 But I'd be more than happy to participate
27 in a working group.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tom. Tim,
30 have you got anything further for us.

31
32 MS. WELLS: Mr. Chair.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Susan.

35
36 MS. WELLS: I was just wondering if
37 there's any provisions anywhere and I couldn't find them
38 in a quick scan for allowing for conservation concerns
39 where there's any -- are there any regulations that if
40 there is the conservation concern that you have that
41 gives you some -- or that gives management some control
42 or -- for reducing bag limits or anything like that.

43
44 MR. JOYCE: We do have that ability. If
45 there is one -- one of the primary responsibilities, of
46 course, of the Regional Advisory Council and the Federal
47 Board is to look at regulation proposals as to how they
48 will affect -- or how will they address the principles of
49 fisheries and wildlife conservation. And so any proposal
50 that is approached, you have to look at that, and to see

1 if it is going to create a conservation concern, or if
2 it's going to affect other users in a way that will
3 create a conservation concern. Other subsistence users.
4 And so in that regard we do need to look at that. And as
5 per my example of somebody coming in and wanting a 10
6 cutthroat trout harvest, that's probably fine if that was
7 the only person that was going to do that. But if I knew
8 that there was going to be five people that wanted to
9 harvest cutthroat, how do I divvy up an amount of
10 cutthroat when I know that there's not a very large
11 population. Then I have a conservation concern, and I
12 can address that. but it's only in those situations I
13 guess where I know that there's a small population that I
14 could deal with. So I can address some issues. Other
15 issues I can't, because I don't know.

16

17 MS. WELLS: I have a follow up.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Uh-huh.

20

21 MS. WELLS: So in your example, there's
22 really nothing you can do unless you go through the
23 process of the proposals before this Council and the
24 Board. So there's nothing you can really do prior?

25

26 MR. JOYCE: I mean, yes, I can, if I have
27 a known situation, 10,000 Dolly Varden, I might be a
28 little bit skeptical about the ability to harvest that
29 kind of numbers of fish. And that might create a
30 conservation concern for me. Some cutthroat populations
31 I would have a concern, depending on where they wanted to
32 go. So, yes, in some instances I would probably be -- I
33 could restrict it on a permit, but in other instances I
34 probably -- in salmon, for example, I probably would not
35 restrict salmon. If somebody wanted to go catch 150
36 salmon, I probably could not restrict that, because
37 there's no real conservation concern there. Or if
38 somebody wanted to catch 1,000 salmon, I probably would
39 not have the ability to restrict that.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Dean.

42

43 MR. WILSON: Yeah. I'm not really that
44 familiar with the Forest Service regulations. I am
45 somewhat familiar with the Park Service regulations,
46 which I'm sure to some extent they mirror them. And I'm
47 really surprised that you wouldn't -- I would be really
48 surprised if you don't have some kind of conservation
49 regulations that would allow you to have more control
50 over that, because they have that up in the Park Service

1 as far as all the wildlife and the -- any management that
2 they have up there that allow them to shut down any hunt
3 at any time up in that area based on conservation
4 concerns. So I think that there's probably something in
5 there that allows you guys to shut that down or control
6 it better than just allowing somebody to come in and take
7 10,000 at a time, or whatever, and not having a better
8 handle on it.

9
10 MR. JOYCE: Mr. Chairman, could I let --
11 Eric Veach maybe.....

12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Sure.

14
15 MR. JOYCE:can address that better
16 than I.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Eric.

19
20 MR. VEACH: For the record, Eric Veach
21 with Wrangell-St. Elias National Park. The Park Service
22 regs are -- I think that we do have a little more leeway
23 for management than you might see in the Forest Service
24 regulations. You know, and a great example is last
25 winter we had a request for burbot permits for lakes
26 along the McCarthy Road. And originally the folks that
27 requested a permit had requested to use set lines to
28 harvest burbot, which is a legal gear type under the
29 general provisions. And it's a very similar situation to
30 what Tim's looking at. But because at least some of the
31 waters that were requested for harvest occur within the
32 park, the Park Service regulations, it's very similar to
33 the situation we have where it's dual management between
34 the Federal program and the State program on the main
35 Copper River. We have Park Service regs that are also
36 specific to those waters in addition to the Federal
37 subsistence regulations. And the Park Service specific
38 regs prohibits set lines, and so we didn't issue any
39 permits for set lines, but we did issue them for hoop
40 traps which traps are a legal gear type under the Park
41 Service regulations. And I think that because we have a
42 little stricter regulations, that we do have a little
43 more leeway to work with these situations than Tim may
44 have down there.

45
46 One thing I might just mention, too, is
47 there was a question about responding to a conservation
48 concern. And I think, you know, with the freshwater fish
49 species we've been fairly successful at taking a look at
50 that. You know, again with burbot we kind of worked

1 through that last winter. It was the first time we'd
2 issued any freshwater fish subsistence permits. And, you
3 know, what I did, is I worked really closely with Tom
4 Taube out of our Glennallen ADF&G office to set some very
5 conservative harvest limits, and see how folks -- how
6 successful they were in harvesting fish under those regs.
7 So we set a 15-fish limit for burbot per household.
8 Yeah, I think that's probably a reasonable approach, I
9 mean, a fairly safe approach with freshwater fish.

10

11 But I think like Tim mentioned, I think
12 working with salmon is probably a more challenging issue,
13 and I think that's where we as managers start to get more
14 concerned. And obviously it's -- I think it's an issue
15 that's facing Tim a little more than it is us, just
16 because it's difficult to access the river downstream of
17 Haley Creek, or maybe a little more difficult to access
18 the river downstream of Haley Creek on the upper end of
19 the lower Copper River, but it's an issue that we could
20 see there, too, that we could have folks requesting a
21 permit to use a gill net to take salmon immediately
22 downstream of Haley Creek.

23

24 And you know, as a manager we get a
25 little more squeamish I think about setting restrictions
26 for a fishery like that where we have a very substantial
27 personal use fishery occurring immediately upstream. And
28 we have some ideas about how we might approach that if
29 someone did come and ask us for a permit, but it puts a
30 lot more of a burden on the manager, too, to deal with
31 that versus a situation like the Upper Copper River
32 District where we have specific regulations that guide
33 how we issue permits.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
36 Tim.

37

38 (No comments)

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tim, I see that this
41 probably is an issue that's going to generate some work
42 on it, so we'll probably expect something in the future,
43 and if we can get help from Council members to work on
44 it, if you have a work group. I don't know how else to
45 do it. If anybody else has a suggestion, we'll go from
46 there. I don't think we'd want to form a subcommittee or
47 anything like that from the Council to work on it at this
48 point in time. It may become an issue in the future. It
49 may definitely become an issue in the future. At this
50 point in time I think that the fact that we're aware of

1 it, and that other people are aware of it, it's not going
2 to stay the way it is.

3

4 So with that, I think we'll just thank
5 you for your report on it, and thank you for the heads
6 up. And this is something that's being considered
7 probably in a wider circle than just the Forest Service,
8 isn't it?

9

10 MR. JOYCE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I've been
11 talking to Eric about this, too, you know, and it's --
12 yes, it's going to include at least the Park Service and
13 the Forest Service in this area.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

16

17 MR. JOYCE: And, of course, that's
18 another issue. You know, Eric will have the in-season
19 management authority on the Copper River. As I said,
20 these are kind of little distinct areas. He has the
21 authority on the Copper River, yet our ranger has the
22 authority for the Copper River Delta. So even though we
23 have this little ribbon that cuts through the forest that
24 Eric has management authority over, so we deal directly
25 with each other.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Uh-huh. Uh-huh. Well,
28 thank you muchly.

29

30 MR. JOYCE: Okay. Also, there's one more
31 short presentation that Steve has for you.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Steve. I think we've
34 got -- Hollis, how long is yours?

35

36 MR. TWITCHELL: I'll take whatever time
37 is left.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Steve, would you mind?
40 Are you going to be here this afternoon?

41

42 MR. ZEMKE: Yes.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Would you mind if we
45 just let Hollis go first and then if he takes too much
46 time, you don't have to do it until after lunch?

47

48 MR. ZEMKE: Okay.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hollis.

1 MR. TWITCHELL: Hollis Twitchell. I'm
2 the cultural subsistence manager for Denali National
3 Park.

4
5 First of all, thank you for letting me
6 approach earlier. I appreciate that.

7
8 Denali doesn't have a lot of fisheries
9 resources on the southside of the Alaska Range. There's
10 only two main drainages that have topography low enough
11 out of the Alaska Range that are in fisheries streams.
12 And that's the Yentna and the Tokositna River. Other
13 than that, most of our habitat is in the uplands above
14 the spawning areas.

15
16 We do -- have not issued any subsistence
17 permits this year on the southside. In 2003 there was
18 one subsistence permit issued in the Yentna River
19 drainage. So we haven't had much activity from that
20 sense.

21
22 Since this is the fisheries cycle, I will
23 mention briefly that on the north side of the Alaska
24 range we are involved with ADF&G, Comm Fish Division on
25 the fall chum salmon stock assessment for the Kantishna
26 River drainage, in which case we operate through a local
27 -- a contract with a local resident. There are two
28 recapture wheels on the upper Kantishna. The State
29 operates two recapture wheels in the upper Toklat, which
30 is a tributary to the Kantishna.

31
32 This year's run estimate was
33 approximately 66,000 fall chum, which is a little bit
34 below last years run of about 87,000. The run this year
35 came in quite a bit faster due to significantly low water
36 tables, four and a half days to move from the confluence
37 of the Kantishna and Tanana up into the recapture wheels
38 where last year's high water was eight and a half days.
39 So a much quicker movement up due to the very low water
40 tables. In which case the Kantishna component hasn't
41 reached it's biological escapement goals for quite a
42 number of years. Last year's, 2003, run was the highest
43 recorded run in the Kantishna drainage since this
44 capture, mark, recapture projects began, and that was the
45 87,000 fish. So last year and this year's are optimistic
46 looking at the last nine years that this project has been
47 under way.

48
49 I'll shift over to a couple other issues
50 then, which are wildlife driven, if there isn't any

1 questions.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Just one. What is the
4 escapement goal for the Kantishna?

5

6 MR. TWITCHELL: The Kantishna component,
7 I don't have that number right here in front of me now,
8 so I don't have that number to give you, I'm sorry. But
9 in speaking with the State and with our fisheries
10 biologists on the north side, the unit hasn't received
11 its escapement goals since this project began. That was
12 one of the reasons it was instigated about nine years
13 ago. I can get that information to you at the next
14 meeting.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, I was just
17 wondering, you know, how close it was. You know, you
18 said it's improved over the nine years, and last year and
19 this year were the biggest years. are you getting close
20 to it, are you still a long ways off, or.....

21

22 MR. TWITCHELL: Last year was the closest
23 that it's come to it. This is a little bit dropped from
24 last year, but the wheel stopped turning the 5th of
25 October, so we don't have the complete data now. The
26 preliminary information, they're estimating about 66,000
27 into the system for Kantishna.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Uh-huh.

30

31 MR. TWITCHELL: I'll move over to a
32 couple of other items. What I handed out just a couple
33 minutes ago was some correspondence that came from the
34 Denali Subsistence Resource Commission.

35

36 The first one I'll refer to was a request
37 from the Commission as a formal hunting plan
38 recommendation for a continuation of the predator/prey
39 research study at Denali with a focus to use some of that
40 data that's been collected over the years to look at
41 natural and healthy management regimes for park areas.
42 ANILCA directs that parks and monuments are to manage for
43 the natural and healthy standard, yet ANILCA doesn't
44 define what that is. The Commission wanted to use the
45 fairly extensive data base that's out there and the
46 predator/prey research that's been done, to use that as a
47 model to look at those populations, and to give us some
48 guidance as to what the natural and healthy regime would
49 look like from a management standpoint.

50

1 That proposal, of course, came through
2 your Regional Council about a year ago. The Commission
3 just finished up their consultation process and finalized
4 this proposal, and it was advanced to the Secretary and
5 the Governor of Alaska as all hunting plan
6 recommendations need to do. So it's advanced on to this
7 point up to the Secretary for a response.

8
9 NPS positions on this, the predator/prey
10 research study was the highest priority for funding for
11 the Park this last year. So it is likely to receive some
12 funding from the Park Service for its continuation.

13
14 In addition, Denali also submitted
15 another proposal, which was to focus in a workshop
16 conference with managers in the agency as well as
17 outside, as well as local knowledgeable individuals to
18 look at the data with a particular focus towards seeing
19 how these particular species, caribou in particular,
20 would be looked at for management guidance for natural
21 and healthy, with the intent of looking at the Denali
22 Caribou Herd and the Mentasta Caribou Herd from Wrangells
23 as a key population for discussion. That proposal was
24 advanced last year and didn't get funded through our NPS
25 funding sources. We will again submit that proposal
26 again this year.

27
28 The second letter from the Commission
29 came to the superintendent of Denali. It came as a
30 result of -- from a meeting that was held in Kantishna
31 with the Subsistence Resource Commission in which
32 questions were asked in terms of the harvest data for
33 moose in that particular area, the Kantishna Hills. That
34 data wasn't available to me at that time, and so their
35 question then came about how can we go about getting more
36 timely data back in terms of harvest and hunting
37 activities in the Kantishna Hills. And so the Commission
38 passed a motion asking the Park Service to orchestrate
39 some method that would be not an inconvenience to local
40 subsistence users that could provide more timely
41 capturing of the information.

42
43 As a result from this recommendation, we
44 did create a monitoring form for hunting and harvest in
45 the Kantishna Hills, and distributed it with individuals
46 who came in to hunt in the Kantishna Hills with a request
47 that it be filled out and dropped off before they leave
48 the area. So that was instigated this year.

49
50 The focus here was the data that we get

1 from the State's harvest records is often not timely for
2 us to get back to the agency, and also the areas that are
3 recorded in the State's harvest information extends well
4 out beyond the Kantishna Hills and well out beyond the
5 Park boundaries. So when we get that data, we have no
6 way of tracking whether the harvest actually occurred up
7 in park lands and specific to this area in the Kantishna
8 Hills or not, short of calling up all the individuals and
9 talking to them directly over the phone.

10

11 So this process was set up and is in
12 place now. And the reason I bring this to you is because
13 the Cantwell community has been in the most recent years
14 the largest user group going into the Kantishna Hills
15 area. So it is pertinent to this particular region.

16

17 At that region there was a private
18 biologist for some other organizations, not the agency,
19 and subsequent to the meeting a request came in that the
20 Park Service do an emergency closure to the harvest of
21 moose, subsistence moose in the Kantishna Hills. The
22 Park Service response to that was that the number of
23 hunters and the harvest in the Kantishna Hills was fairly
24 light, and the biological information available from
25 surveys done through the 90s and including last year's
26 survey, that the moose population was relatively stable
27 and there was no reason for an emergency or a temporary
28 closure for subsistence harvest in the Kantishna Hills.

29

30 I mention this to you, because I would
31 expect at the next cycle that you will probably see some
32 proposals advanced asking for some reduction or closure
33 in terms of hunting in that area. So just a head up that
34 it probably will be coming around.

35

36 For our purposes here today, I did run
37 the five-year history of harvest and numbers of hunters
38 in this area. To give you an indication at this point,
39 we had two hunters travelled out in 2000, five in 2001,
40 seven in 2002, five in 2003, and one in 2004. That's an
41 average for the last five years of only four hunters
42 hunting in this particular area. Harvest for those
43 particular hunters, again this is from the harvest
44 records, we had two moose in 2000 that were harvested,
45 five moose in 2001, four moose in 2002, and three moose
46 in 2003 for an average harvest of -- and no moose in
47 2004, for an average harvest of 2.8 moose per year from
48 this particular area.

49

50 And it's on those grounds as well as the

1 biological survey information for this area that the
2 petition for emergency closure by the superintendent was
3 denied.

4
5 Any questions on those two Subsistence
6 Resource Commission letters.

7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Did you say that the
9 petition came from the superintendent, or came to the
10 superintendent?

11
12 MR. TWITCHELL: Came to the
13 superintendent.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

16
17 MR. TWITCHELL: The superintendent has
18 the ability to close an area either under emergency or
19 temporary closure, if there is an emergency situation
20 that exists and that extraordinary measures must be taken
21 for public safety or to assure the continued viability of
22 a particular fish or wildlife population. Based on the
23 low harvest numbers and the number of hunters in the
24 area, and the biological surveys, the superintendent
25 declined that request.

26
27 If there are no further questions, I'll
28 move over to a much more contentious issue.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Dean.

31
32 MR. WILSON: I've got a question for you
33 on the Kantishna area, I'm not that familiar with it.
34 What's the access like in that area? Do they fly into
35 that area? Is that their primary method of getting in?
36 Or are they getting in by some other way?

37
38 MR. TWITCHELL: They're getting in
39 through access through the park road. So they would
40 enter the park on the east end. They would stop and get
41 a travel permit to go out the park road that goes through
42 the old park area, to access the Kantishna Hills, which
43 is in the new park area, and hunt in that area. Cantwell
44 has C&T for use of moose in Unit 20(A). Correction, I
45 mean 20(C), which is on the north side of the Alaska
46 Range. That's why Cantwell, which is in Southcentral
47 area goes up and hunts into the Kantishna Hills.

48
49 MR. CARPENTER: I have a question, too.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.
2
3 MR. CARPENTER: You said that there was a
4 biologist that was hired that presented the report to the
5 park superintendent to ask for closure. Who hired this
6 biologist to come up with this information?
7
8 MR. TWITCHELL: Gordon Haber is the
9 biologist, and works for a number of conservation groups.
10 He's an independent biologist.
11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Can I ask one question
13 more? So the hunter travels completely through the old
14 park on the regular highway to the Kantishna Hills. Is
15 there -- as part of your permit, do you have anything in
16 there on, you know, hunter etiquette that, you know, it
17 would be nice that when you travel back through the park
18 amongst all these people that you kind of don't display
19 your moose on our fender or something like that? I mean
20 -- you know, I mean recognizing the fact that you are
21 driving through a hard park and everything like that, is
22 there anything in there on, you know, hunter etiquette
23 that it would be nice to recognize other people's
24 sensibilities and.....
25
26 MR. TWITCHELL: As you can imagine, since
27 this is a park area with a lot of visibility, they get a
28 lot of information in the information sheet.....
29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.
31
32 MR. TWITCHELL:about camping, about
33 sanitation, about protection of food and resources from
34 bears and, yes, they're asked not to display the rack on
35 the top of the vehicle, or across the hood. And they
36 just are asked to cover it up, just to acknowledge to the
37 ranger when they're transporting legally subsistence
38 taken wildlife through the old park to the east end. So
39 they get a fairly lengthy sheet as well as information of
40 private in-holdings. Since the Federal program doesn't
41 apply on private in-holdings, they need to know where
42 those are, and there are some other access issues on the
43 old mining roads in the area. So they get quite a bit of
44 information.
45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And I know I think it
47 was two years ago or was it last year that you presented
48 some problems with off road -- off road problems in that
49 area. Has that been solved or addressed?
50

1 MR. TWITCHELL: That's the next issue
2 that I would like to speak on.

3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, okay.
5

6 MR. TWITCHELL: At the Kantishna meeting
7 -- from the Subsistence Resource Commission in Kantishna,
8 there were a number of individuals from Cantwell who came
9 in and testified at the meeting that they wanted to have
10 the issue of whether ORVs are a traditional means of
11 subsistence access revisited for the park. And to bring
12 you up to date, the Park Service through the general
13 management plan process back in 1986 reviewed information
14 in terms of ORV use, and a decision was made at that time
15 that ORV use was not a traditional means of access in the
16 Denali for subsistence. And that's been standing since
17 that date.

18
19 Subsequently, in the 90s there was a
20 group of individuals from Cantwell asked the
21 superintendent to revisit that determination and consider
22 for the Cantwell that there was a traditional means of
23 ORVs for subsistence. The Park Service was involved in
24 going through evaluation of that information, and
25 preparing an environmental assessment, and then in doing
26 so we had worked with the Subsistence Resource
27 Commission, meeting with them, travelling some routes in
28 the Cantwell area, and had come to a not official
29 authorization, but a recognition that there was some use
30 of ORVs of going on in the area. And while we were
31 coming through this process, that we would not prohibit
32 and restrict the use on two particular trails in the
33 Cantwell area, old winter trails that were mining trails
34 that eventually utilized for other purposes.

35
36 And for the most part Cantwell people
37 were staying within those confines over the last several
38 years until last summer things got a bit out of hand
39 nowhere near these particular routes. A group of
40 individuals went in about five miles into a new area and
41 did substantial damage to resources in that process.
42 They were cited for damage and destruction to park
43 resources, vegetation and soils, and that case is still
44 pending.

45
46 The other individual in the Kantishna
47 Hills who drove about 100 yards off of an old mining road
48 to cross country with a four-wheel drive pickup until it
49 got buried in the tundra, that individual was cited and
50 subsequently paid his fine for that. So that situation

1 is done.

2

3 As a result of those sorts of incursions
4 occurring last year, the superintendent directed me not
5 to authorize any ATV use even on the routes down in
6 Cantwell. And that particular action caused a lot of
7 consternation to Cantwell, and that's why the individuals
8 came into the meeting in Kantishna, saying, you know,
9 that they really want to see this issue answered in time
10 for next years hunting season, so subsequently the park
11 has gone back and met in Cantwell with the local
12 community, acquired some additional names who hadn't been
13 advance before in terms of their use of ORVs pre-ANILCA
14 in the area. So we will be going back into the
15 community, talking with those individuals, and gathering
16 up that additional information as well.

17

18 And the superintendent has agreed that we
19 will come to closure on this issue, analyzing the
20 information that's presented, and make a determination
21 before next hunting season so that they will have a
22 definitive answer by that time. So that's where we are
23 in the process with the ATV issue.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So then if I understand
26 right, there never was any ATV authorization in the
27 Kantishna area then. It was all on the other two trails.

28

29 MR. TWITCHELL: That's correct. And the
30 GNP finding still stands that ORVs have not been a
31 traditional means of access for subsistence. That again
32 was made in 1986 at the time of the general management
33 plan, and had undergone through full review, NEPA review,
34 and comments as all those management plans do. So it's a
35 more recent issue that needs to be resolved.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Hollis
38 on this.

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Did you have
43 more for us?

44

45 MR. TWITCHELL: The last one. It seems
46 like Cantwell has been going through a lot of growing
47 pains. The population in 1980 was 89, the population in
48 1990 was 147, the population in 2000 was 212. So you've
49 heard a number of proposals that have come forward from
50 the Denali Subsistence Resource Commission dealing with

1 new users coming into the area and competing for
2 resources in areas from long-time traditional users. The
3 durational residency in the roster reg proposals is such.
4

5
6 The SRC asked me last year in terms of
7 the three-mile boundary which defines the Cantwell
8 resident zone community about a new subdivision that's
9 just been developed just outside of that boundary over
10 the last several years, and whether that was within the
11 three-mile boundary for the Cantwell community. We went
12 down and verified that through GPS and topographical
13 maps, and indeed this new subdivision has about 10
14 residents, or 10 homes in it now, is clearly outside of
15 the boundary, about a mile and a half outside of the
16 boundary for Cantwell.

17
18 Subsequently I notified the individuals
19 in that community that they were beyond the boundary and
20 wouldn't be considered subsistence users for Denali as
21 such.

22
23 The Park Service also an alternate
24 methods of determining eligibility, and that's the
25 individual permits, the 1344 subsistence use permits.
26 Subsequently there was on individual in that community
27 who could qualify of those, an individual permit as a
28 long-time traditional user, and he's been issued a permit
29 for his use. The other members in this new subdivision
30 area are fair recent, some just a couple years, one or
31 two four-years, and another individual about six years.
32 So they're relatively new users into the area.
33

34 So that's the second issue that is quite
35 contentious for the Cantwell community. Individuals
36 testified to the SRC that they felt that this boundary
37 was decisive and had asked the SRC to consider changing
38 that boundary. The SRC has been on record over the last
39 14 years, has been pretty adamantly supporting that
40 three-mile boundary. So they took no action to expand
41 the three-mile boundary. They are feeling pretty
42 comfortable with it at this point. It's been out for
43 public review, probably four times since it was
44 established. That boundary was established in 1981,
45 confirmed by the SRC in '84, again in '86, again I think
46 in '89 through various reviews.
47

48 So Cantwell is experiencing a number of
49 issues, growth in the community and new users coming in,
50 competition for a limited amount of resources, and

1 certainly access is a big issue to them.

2

3 With that, I'll try to answer any
4 questions.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for
7 Hollis. James.

8

9 MR. SHOWALTER: Yes, James Showalter.
10 You said these individuals outside the three-mile limit I
11 believe is what you said, they are the new people moved
12 into the community area, so they are not local people?

13

14 MR. TWITCHELL: Well, the Cantwell
15 community considers them local people. Several of these
16 individuals had lived in the Cantwell resident zone
17 before moving out there. But there are several people
18 who have just moved directly into this new subdivision
19 that have never spent any time within the Cantwell
20 community. So it's a mixture of both. Only one
21 individual there is really a long-time user, having been
22 in the Cantwell area since 1980, and we consider him a
23 long-time user, and as such he's been issued an
24 individual permit.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Dean.

27

28 MR. WILSON: The remainder of the ones
29 that were in that area that was outside of the three-mile
30 limit, were any of them descendants of folks that use the
31 area, or were they not related to anybody that used to
32 use the area?

33

34 MR. TWITCHELL: Not related from anyone
35 who used the area. When we look for traditional use, we
36 base it not only upon the individuals use, but of other
37 family members. So, you know, they in terms of the
38 information that they present, if they do show that they
39 are descendants of a family that were traditional users
40 that would qualify for them. So it's not solely based on
41 their own personal use, but also on their family's
42 traditional use.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anybody else have
45 questions for Hollis.

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Hollis. Have
50 a safe trip home.

1 MR. TWITCHELL: Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Let's go back to
4 the Forest Service. Steve.

5

6 MR. ZEMKE: Mr. Chair, Council members,
7 Steve Zemke, the Chugach National Forest subsistence
8 coordinator. I'll be very short here also.

9

10 Obviously this is again a question about
11 most the Council members don't probably have much
12 interest in the actual land management planning
13 activities on the Chugach National Forest, and that they
14 may not have much knowledge or have direct association
15 with the forest.

16

17 But I handed out late yesterday what's
18 called our schedule of proposed actions. It's a big
19 chart, about 18 pages. And what it is, is kind of the
20 schedule of proposed land management activities, specific
21 projects that would occur on the Chugach National Forest
22 on the three ranger districts, the Cordova District, the
23 Seward Ranger District, and the Glacier Ranger District,
24 foreseeable in the next reasonable future. And so again
25 there's 70 projects listed there. And they're actually
26 in kind of four broad categories. One is vegetation
27 treatment, and most of those are some type of wildlife
28 habitat improvement or fuels reduction programs.

29

30 We don't have -- normally when the Forest
31 Service vegetation treatment is kind of a code word for
32 timber management or timber harvest, but on the Chugach
33 we don't have any allowable forest quantity harvest, so
34 we don't actually have a timber cut. But there is I
35 think in the past for Council members that have been
36 around for a while and discussed the spruce bark beetle
37 program, or the infestation that is occurring on the
38 Kenai Peninsula, and there's a fair amount of habitat
39 that's been impacted by that. And so I know that today
40 the Council had brought up, well, what do you do about
41 say fish habitat, and, you know, you need to have the
42 fish habitat to have the fish. And with the Forest
43 Service I guess we need to have a wildlife habitat to
44 have the wildlife.

45

46 And on the Kenai Peninsula particularly
47 with the spruce bark beetle infestation, there's -- the
48 program looks as primarily two factors. One is reducing
49 fuels adjacent to communities, and that's a major issue
50 about, you know, trying to reduce the fuels adjacent to,

1 say, for subsistence communities, it would be Cooper
2 Landing and Hope, and try to reduce the burnability of
3 those communities in case there was a large wildfire.

4
5 But then there's also another program,
6 kind of the prescribed burning program that normally
7 isn't going to be right adjacent to the communities, but
8 would provide additional wildlife habitat, particularly
9 for moose browse within the Kenai. And right now there's
10 kind of prescribed burns planned for around Hope, and
11 then also around Cooper Landing in Juneau Creek for those
12 that know about that area, and then also on Ptarmigan
13 area, which is kind of over by Moose Pass.

14
15 But then one of the other, this is kind
16 of the second general category is fish habitat, or
17 aquatic habitat improvements, and there's several
18 projects related to that. A lot of those are out on the
19 Cordova District. Tim Carpenter particularly will
20 probably be interested in those.

21
22 And the third category we have is kind of
23 what I call recreation enhancement, and a lot of that has
24 to do with access development, which may potentially
25 impact either negatively or positively subsistence users
26 by either providing them more access to an area they need
27 for hunting and fishing, or possibly creating
28 displacement by providing access for more recreational
29 users which actually might displace traditional
30 subsistence users.

31
32 And finally there's kind of outfitter
33 guide proposals, and some of these actually have already
34 gone through out in Cordova. There was kind of
35 additional capacity -- or a proposal for additional
36 capacities, primarily for bear hunters. For brown bear
37 it's not a problem, since there isn't a Federal
38 subsistence season in Unit 6 for brown bears, but for
39 black bears it may be an emerging issue. I think
40 probably 10 years ago nobody would have said that there's
41 any problem with the number of bears out there versus the
42 hunters, but with the Whittier road, the fast ferry,
43 there's probably some emerging issue out there about the
44 number of bears, particularly black bears, available for
45 hunters and maybe displacement of traditional subsistence
46 hunting areas, particularly in the springtime.

47
48 So that may be -- right here there's
49 probably not a significant issue, but in the future there
50 maybe be some issues that the Council might look at

1 specifically.

2

3

4 So those are kind of the general areas.
5 I realize with 70 projects you don't really have any time
6 -- you probably haven't looked at this yet, but certainly
7 what the SOPA, or schedule of proposed actions, our
8 acronym for it, includes is kind of a listing of those
9 projects. It has the project name, the project purpose,
10 kind of a general -- and it's usually pretty general,
11 like recreation management, but also a lot of times it
12 has a little -- along with that has a description of the
13 project and where it's located. Planning status, that
14 means kind of where the decision document -- usually
15 there's some type of NEPA, National Environmental Policy
16 Act, document. And these are usually small scale, so
17 they're not going to be an EA. Usually not going to be
18 an EA or particularly not an EIS, but there could be a
19 decision document, and so at that time the Regional
20 Council could either -- if they have enough concern,
21 could directly be involved in that process or be able to
22 provide the ranger district manager their concerns. And
23 with that in mind then, you can take a look at the
24 decision date, that's kind of the expected time on when
25 that decision would be made about whether to go -- what
26 option would be selected for the project development, and
27 whether or not it should go forward. And then we have
28 this next column, is expected implementation. So it's
29 what year, kind of what month and what year we're
30 expecting to do it. And then probably a really important
31 column is the project contact, would be actually the
32 person that you should talk to directly on the ranger
33 district that would have the specific information about
34 that project. And you have a phone numbers and those
35 with e-mail, electronic access, there's an electronic e-
36 mail address for those.

36

37

38 And so with that, basically if you have
39 any specific questions, I'll certainly try to answer
40 those right now, and again you may have some time to
41 peruse and if you have more specific question than you
42 can't formulate right now, certainly we could try to
43 answer those by the next meeting.

43

44

45 There's also a mailing for the scheduled
46 of proposed actions, and I think, Ralph, you as the
47 Council Chair are already on that, and anybody else that
48 wants to be included in that mailing list, I can get you
49 included and so you could actually have this mailed
50 directly to your door by snail mail, and probably also
51 get it to you e-mail if you'd prefer it that methodology.

1
2 So with that, if nobody -- I would
3 certainly be willing to answer any questions.
4
5 MR. CARPENTER: I just have one
6 questions.
7
8 MR. ZEMKE: Certainly.
9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.
11
12 MR. CARPENTER: Just one question, and
13 this really isn't on anything here, but at what point is
14 the Forest Service going to look at, when it issues these
15 permits for big game guides on Federal lands, when's it
16 going to look at -- you know, I know it reviews the
17 carrying capacity, about how many big game guides that a
18 general area will hold? When are they going to start
19 considering the impact of additional permits are
20 potentially going to be having on the subsistence hunter
21 in the Chugach.
22
23 MR. ZEMKE: Mr. Chair and Mr. Carpenter,
24 hopefully they should be doing that right now, and that
25 if there is a significant concern, and then that would
26 actually create a significant restriction to subsistence
27 opportunities, that should be directly addressed in the
28 environmental analysis for that. So if you don't feel
29 that -- you know, hopefully that's one of the ideas that
30 we're trying to bring forth to the Regional Advisory
31 Council, which is one of the major organizations that
32 should be providing information to the Federal agencies,
33 and at least to the Forest Service to be able to try to
34 answer some of the questions. So hopefully we'll be able
35 to get to you early enough so that you can address some
36 of those concerns. And certainly if you have concerns
37 about the Cordova area and what's coming up, you should,
38 you know, feel free to either talk to me, or go directly
39 to the ranger district office and talk to the district
40 ranger, which is, you know Becky Nuris right now, or you
41 talk with Milo Birchum, who's kind of the subsistence
42 wildlife coordinator there, and certainly we'd really
43 appreciate being able to get your concerns in early
44 enough to be able to influence the decision, you know, in
45 a knowledgeable way at that time. Or if you're not
46 getting that happening, then we certainly want to know
47 that so that doesn't happen in the future.
48
49 MR. CARPENTER: Well, just to follow up,
50 I guess it seems peculiar to me that in the last year or

1 two that the amount of permitted big game guides in the
2 Cordova area, Prince William Sound/Copper River Delta has
3 increased dramatically, and I'm not necessarily sure it's
4 a good thing, I'm not necessarily sure it's a bad thing.
5 I'm just curious, you know, how -- when does it come to
6 the point to where -- I mean, obviously at one time you
7 had developed a carrying capacity for the number of
8 guides that Unit 6 could hold, you know, given the, you
9 know, general species involved, but it just seems to me
10 like they've been getting handed out left and right
11 without, you know, any real consideration for the
12 species.

13
14 And the reason I say that is, you look at
15 Unit 6 in the Sound, for example. The black bear harvest
16 in Unit 6 has gone from about 140 bears a year to about
17 450 bears a year in the last five years. And the amount
18 of permits for big game guides that have been given out
19 has doubled in the last five years. So, you know, and
20 I've talked to the people in Cordova about this, but I
21 just want to put it on the record that it seems a little
22 peculiar that they'd be handing out more permits when the
23 harvest of black bears has gone up that much in such a
24 short period of time.

25
26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tom. I think
27 that's what Steve's actually asking for, and that's what
28 -- and that's I think where the position comes when this
29 comes out to us. We have a place on our other business
30 called topics and issues, and I think that if any Council
31 member has an objection on one of these projects he
32 wishes to bring to the other Council members for
33 consideration, that it should be done. Or even at a time
34 like when Steve is presenting it.

35
36 The other thing is that we have this, I
37 would imagine that if nobody objects, they have no reason
38 to not issue the permit. I mean, they put notices out
39 that these are projects that are on the scale. Somebody
40 has to tell them that this is -- you know, that we see a
41 problem with it. If they don't hear a problem from
42 anybody, they don't have a problem, and I think that's
43 going to be the duty of the subsistence users, the local
44 users to say enough is enough, and to tell them. Am I
45 correct on that, Steve?

46
47 MR. ZEMKE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Obviously
48 we would generate internal issues also. Hopefully it
49 would pick up some of those, but certainly other outside
50 members in scoping, particularly Regional Advisory

1 Council members would certainly carry extra weight in
2 that regard.

3
4 One of the things to remember in the
5 outfitter/guides permitting process, there's actually the
6 permit that they would get from the Alaska Department of
7 Fish and Game as a guide that would determine more the
8 number of actual animals that they could harvest, or the
9 number of hunters that they have. The Forest Service
10 permit is actually a special use permit, and it's only
11 for a disposition on the land. So if the guide has to
12 put in a platform, tent platforms, or actually influences
13 the land in some way, then that's when the Forest Service
14 would issue the permit. We don't actually issue permits
15 for the taking of the animal.

16
17 MR. CARPENTER: Right.

18
19 MR. ZEMKE: That's under the auspices of
20 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Steve, if all a guide is
23 using is the land to shoot the bear on, then does he have
24 to have a Forest Service permit? I mean, if he's using a
25 boat to go out there, and he's not camping on Forest
26 Service land or anything like that, does he still need a
27 Forest Service permit to take an animal on Forest Service
28 Land.

29
30 MR. ZEMKE: If there's commercial
31 enterprise occurring on it, then they do need a Forest
32 special use permit.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right.

35
36 MR. ZEMKE: Yeah. But in that regard,
37 I'd say one of the situations that comes, say, sort of
38 like the transporter. There's a fine line about when the
39 people are being brought in and actually being outfitted
40 and guided or they're just being transported in. And on
41 the transporters we don't have any, even though it's a
42 commercial enterprise, it's considered somewhat probably
43 similar to taxi service, so we don't really regulate in
44 any manner what the numbers that could come in are. I
45 guess what I'd say is that you can't regulate -- we don't
46 currently regulate that actual numbers of trips in an
47 area.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. I was just
50 wondering whether there was any information available as

1 to what the increase in bears, whether they were taken by
2 local residents, by people who were transported, by
3 Alaska residents, or by guided hunters, whether -- what
4 has increased the take of bears so much. Do you have any
5 idea on that one, Steve?

6
7 MR. ZEMKE: Obviously one of the things
8 is the Whittier tunnel. It provides opportunity for
9 people to get out in small boats and be able to cruise
10 the general area, and they may not be hunting
11 specifically for black bears, but they're out in an area,
12 especially in the springtime, when the bears are down in
13 the intertidal areas and they're vulnerable. So that
14 provides an opportunity that way. Maybe some of the
15 displacement. People have been hunting in other areas.
16 The growth of Anchorage is another example, or the
17 Matanuska Valley area. You know, the growth in the Kenai
18 Peninsula, all those areas. There's many more potential
19 hunters out there using those opportunities.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, that's what I was
22 wondering, whether it was more an increase in Alaska
23 residents, or an increase in guided hunts, and it sounds
24 to me like it's probably just easier access for Alaska
25 residents, and growth in Alaskans.

26
27 MR. ZEMKE: We don't, I don't think, have
28 specific information on that, but, you know, with the use
29 of internet and other opportunities, you know, there's
30 much more opportunity to present their services out in
31 the general area, too, so it could be a combination of
32 all those as, you know, people have more disposable
33 income and they look at a variety of various recreational
34 opportunities.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any other
37 comments. Tom.

38
39 MR. CARPENTER: I guess just to be fair
40 to Steve, you know, I do agree with you that the tunnel
41 has had the biggest impact on the western Sound.

42
43 I guess the point that I was trying to
44 make is, you know, just in the future I would hope that
45 consideration would be greatly given to the impact, you
46 know, that the -- about the population -- or the harvest
47 increases.

48
49 What I think to be the greatest problem
50 is, I believe it's an enforcement problem. And what I

1 believe to be going on is I believe that a lot of these
2 people that have State permits to use Unit 6, Prince
3 William Sound, as their guide area, I think they aren't
4 going to the Forest Service and necessarily getting a
5 permit to conduct commercial activity. I think they're
6 using the mean high waterline, and I think they're using
7 it to their great advantage. And so a lot of it is being
8 conducted on a Forest Service land without a permit. You
9 see what I'm saying? I think that's the biggest problem
10 we've got going on right now.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Milo.

13

14 MR. BIRCHUM: I'm Milo Birchum, I'm the
15 subsistence biologist on the Cordova District. And I'm
16 still not the very best one to answer this question.
17 Permitting is done in a different department than
18 wildlife.

19

20 But where we are right now is we're
21 operating under an older outfitter/guide carrying
22 capacity model, and I don't know the date on that. It
23 was '83 or '93, but it's old. And what they've
24 determined to be the maximum number of people on the land
25 at one time where, you know, they set a goal. Let's say
26 it's 100. I don't know what it is. We're way under that
27 now, and so when someone comes to us and asks for a
28 permit, we can't very easily deny it, because we're way
29 under our carrying capacity that was determined quite a
30 while back.

31

32 We have acknowledged that that carrying
33 capacity needs to be revised, and until it does, we're
34 conservatively issuing new permits, but kind of leaving,
35 you know, some wiggle room in there so when we do revise
36 it, we don't have to, you know, throw people out. But in
37 the near future there will be a revision of that carrying
38 capacity, and we need public involvement like from you
39 and other people with those concerns in the community.
40 And that's why I tell you to come to the office, you
41 know, like when we've talked before, talk to Bob
42 Behrends, talk to Bruce Campbell and Becky Nuris about
43 your concerns that way, because they will go into the
44 development of that new carrying capacity model.

45

46 MR. CARPENTER: I guess that's why I'm
47 bringing it up now is that I know you guys are revising
48 this, and I want these concerns to be on the record when
49 you do come up with this new number. These concerns I
50 want, you know, to be deeply considered when revising it,

1 coming up with a new number. So, thanks.

2

3 MR. BIRCHUM: Good.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any more for Steve.

6

7 MR. ZEMKE: As long as there's no other
8 questions, I'm done.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Susan.

11

12 MS. WELLS: I was just looking at your
13 projects, and I noted that, I think it's on Page 16 and
14 17, there's the Russian River access trail, and that's
15 expected to be implemented in June 2006 where the river's
16 angler trail, you know, that tram and that access I think
17 it is. But anyway, so then I go down to the next one,
18 which is the riverbank restoration. You know, that river
19 is getting -- not only is it getting press and
20 advertising about these fish that are getting up there,
21 you know, it's opened up for larger, double escapement or
22 fishing. You know, you can get more fish. Why is that
23 on hold? Because that area, those banks are just getting
24 decimated by the numbers of people that are coming into
25 that area. It seems like the health of the Russian is
26 pretty important.

27

28 MR. ZEMKE: Certainly. I think one of
29 the things this is actually instituting or implementing,
30 the angler trail, getting in there before we actually do
31 the bank restoration, and so without controlling the
32 access first, trying to restore the bank is nearly
33 impossible, because with, you know tens of thousands of
34 anglers moving up and down the river system, if you've
35 been down in this -- on the lower river lately, that
36 actually where the angler trail is and the bank
37 restoration has occurred, it's been very successful. But
38 other areas where there isn't adequate angler herding or,
39 you know, being able to control the access into specific
40 points, then the bank restoration hasn't been that
41 successful, because you -- it's kind of like the off road
42 vehicle. Until you can actually establish those
43 corridors and keep the people on them, it's hard to
44 prevent damage. And so I think that the reason why it's
45 on hold, that portion's on hold is to be able to finish
46 the angler access, and then aggressively go in and
47 restore the rest of the banks within that area.

48

49 The other portion I think that was on
50 hold was kind of the tramway, was trying -- the tram was

1 an idea about being able to get disabled access down, to
2 get people, you know, with impaired mobility to be able
3 to get them down along the river banks. And I think that
4 was being rethought.

5
6 And then some of the other areas, it's
7 just trying to take a look at overall bear management
8 within the area also, and trying to deal with that. The
9 situation that occurred a couple of years -- or last
10 year.

11
12 MS. WELLS: Uh-huh. Last year. So this
13 restoration is kind of like phase 2 of a different
14 project.

15
16 MR. ZEMKE: The Forest Service has been
17 in -- it's like probably phase 23. You know, we've had
18 probably 10, 15 years of restoration activities on there,
19 and I think the idea is to get a better integrated plan,
20 get the access controlled, and deal with it that way
21 rather than in more of a just little piecemeal process.

22
23 MS. WELLS: Twenty-three years and every
24 year we have probably double the numbers that are combat
25 fishing there.

26
27 MR. ZEMKE: Yes. And you look at the
28 infrastructure that's being in place there, you know. It
29 used to be you throw a little gravel down and a couple
30 fences. Now it's kind of like penetrating boardwalk, and
31 you basically control access through 90 percent of the
32 bank, and then allow access to the river at only
33 controlled points. It's almost like a cattle lot in some
34 ways in that you fence off the river banks, and then just
35 allow access to a few points to where the river can allow
36 the access in and out.

37
38 I guess the other point is the national
39 forest system land is actually just on the east bank, or
40 kind of the northeast side, kind of towards Seward, and
41 then on the other side is national forest -- or it's Fish
42 and Wildlife Service refuge lands, Kenai Refuge. And so
43 it's kind of dual management. We've kind of got two
44 different philosophies. And the management on the Forest
45 Service side, primarily maybe because of the campgrounds
46 there and that has been much more aggressive in being
47 able to control access, developing the trail, and
48 controlling the bank access, where on the Fish and
49 Wildlife side it's pretty much -- in some ways, I don't
50 know if it's uncontrolled, but it's more of in a natural

1 state. And so, you know, there's kind of a difference in
2 management there, style if you will.

3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions,
5 Susan?

6
7 MS. WELLS: No.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Dean.

10
11 MR. WILSON: Just curiosity mostly.
12 What's going on with the Wood bison project that's on
13 here. Is that going to be for wildlife viewing like the
14 one at the pass with the portage or whatever, or is this
15 going to be for eating?

16
17 MR. ZEMKE: It's wildlife viewing. I
18 don't know if you've been by the kind of Wildlife of
19 Alaska there at Portage.

20
21 MR. WILSON: Yeah.

22
23 MR. ZEMKE: They got caribou and moose
24 and that, and you'd probably need to talk to the district
25 on the specifics and that, but, yeah, I don't think
26 there's any near term project about releasing woodland
27 bison into the national forest system lands or refuge
28 lands. I don't know, I guess potentially it could be
29 used as genetic kind of stock to do, you know, if there
30 was some future management, but certainly there'd have to
31 be much more planning before anything like that would be
32 done.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions.

35
36 (No comments)

37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Steve.

39
40 MR. ZEMKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Council
41 members.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, we're five minutes
44 after noon, so I think we're going to take a break right
45 now. What's the druthers of the Council. Shall we just
46 take a break until 1:15 or should we make it 1:30? 1:15,
47 does that sound good for everybody? It gives you an hour
48 for lunch.

49
50 MR. ELVSAAS: 1:15 will be 1:30.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, this morning it
2 was 8:30 was 8:30. We'll try to make it 1:15, recess
3 until.

4
5 (Off record)

6
7 (On record)

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'd like to call this
10 fall session of the Southcentral Subsistence Regional
11 Advisory Council back in session. We're going on to
12 Office of Subsistence Management reports. And the only
13 person that's not gagged is the person that's speaking up
14 there, right? No. No, we can ask all the questions you
15 guys have.

16
17 MR. JENNINGS: Okay. Mr. Chair, Ken
18 Jennings with the Office of Subsistence Management.

19
20 You can see from your agenda that there
21 are several briefings here in your book that we have as
22 written briefings. What I will do is cover a brief
23 summary of them as the Chair has requested, and then see
24 if you have any questions or clarifications that you
25 would like, and we'll address those. So the briefings
26 start on Page 108 in your book.

27
28 I would also note, Mr. Chair, that these
29 are all informational in nature. There's no action
30 required by the Council at this time on any of the items
31 that we'll cover.

32
33 The first item there is on Page 108.
34 It's the predator management policy. For those of you
35 that have been on the Council for a couple years, and for
36 background information for those of you that are new,
37 this issue of what kind of authority does the Federal
38 program, and specifically the Federal Subsistence Board
39 have in regards to predator control, has been around for
40 a couple years. And the Board decided that they really
41 needed to lay out the policy in a clear written format so
42 that we'd all have an understanding of what the
43 limitations and authorities were.

44
45 So the last couple of years there's been
46 several briefings that we've had at Council meetings and
47 draft policies have come before you. And the Federal
48 Subsistence Board in May of 2004 recently passed this
49 policy as a final policy. So this briefing is here,
50 informational for you to let you know what the Board

1 finally concluded on predator management and predator
2 control.

3

4 On Page 108, you'll see in that fourth
5 paragraph down the Board's role in management of
6 predators is similar to other management actions for
7 other wildlife species, establishing seasons and harvest
8 limits, dates, methods and means, and that sort of thing.
9 Customary and traditional use determinations.

10

11 The Board recognizes in this policy that
12 it does not have the authority to take actions to control
13 predators for the beneficial harvest of desired prey
14 species. And they've also stated in the policy that it's
15 the responsibility of the Federal land management agency
16 in conjunction with the State of Alaska to take any
17 appropriate predator control actions.

18

19 And so that's an overview of the Board's
20 policy. On 109 is the policy itself.

21

22 And I'll stop, Mr. Chair, and see if
23 there's any questions on this first item.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tim. Any
26 questions for Tim on the predator control management
27 policy.

28

29 (No comments)

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's pretty clearly
32 spelled out. It's worth reading. It's on Page 109 like
33 he said. It gives you an idea what kind of proposals can
34 be put in, and what kind of proposals we can deal with.

35

36 Okay. Tim, do you want to go on to the
37 next one.

38

39 MR. JENNINGS: Yes. The second briefing
40 is on 110 in your book. This regards Council
41 correspondence. There's a briefing here on 110, 111 and
42 on the next two pages, 112 and 113, we've developed some
43 questions and answers regarding the policy.

44

45 In short, the Board recognizes and
46 promotes that the Councils must interact with fish and
47 wildlife resource agencies, organizations, and other
48 members of the public as part of your official capacity
49 as Regional Advisory Council, and under Title VIII of
50 ANILCA. And that this interaction is really an important

1 and vital piece of your responsibilities.

2

3 We've had an informal unwritten
4 correspondence policy for several years. It's worked
5 quite well, with a couple of limited exceptions where
6 there were concerns that some of the correspondence had
7 gone over the line, and as a Federally-chartered group,
8 there's provisions about not lobbying members of Congress
9 as a Federal entity. And so the Board felt like there
10 was a need to formalize correspondence policy and
11 actually did so at the request of one of the other
12 Councils, the Southeast Council.

13

14 And so the intent of this written policy
15 on correspondence is to ensure that Councils still have
16 the full capacity and appropriate capability to
17 correspond. And as Staff to this Council, Donald, who
18 works for me, and other Staff, and myself help with that
19 correspondence when it comes in to our office. We
20 actually draft it for the Council, and send it back to
21 the Chair for ultimate signing.

22

23 So this lays out on Page 110 and 111
24 generally how correspondence is done. Some of it doesn't
25 require that it come in for a more higher level policy
26 review. The Board has delegated kind of the policy
27 review to our Office of Subsistence Management on the
28 Board's behalf.

29

30 And basically that policy review is just
31 to keep us in the sideboards of what's appropriate, or
32 maybe more importantly what's not appropriate. The main
33 thing that would concern the Department was the
34 possibility of lobbying elected officials.

35

36 So I'll stop there, Mr. Chair, and see if
37 you have questions. The policy there is written 1
38 through 10. And if there's any questions, I'd be happy
39 to answer them.

40

41 I must might note that for Southcentral
42 Council, this informal policy mirrors what we now have in
43 writing. It's worked quite well over the years. I don't
44 know of any issues we've had with Southcentral Council.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions.

47

48 (No comments)

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I have a comment on it,

1 Tim. And I'm breaking my own law about not keeping my
2 mouth shut. But I think it's well worthwhile for
3 everybody to read number 10. This does not limit your
4 right to correspond, to lobby or anything else as an
5 individual. I would suggest that if you do that, you
6 don't use as part of your title that you're a member of
7 the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council. And if you
8 do that, you'll be very clear that you're just going as
9 an individual citizen. All it limits is we can't do it
10 as part of a Council, or saying that we are presenting
11 the Council. We just need to do it as individuals.
12 Okay. Tim.

13
14 MR. JENNINGS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
15 That's excellent clarification. Yeah, it's not meant to
16 in any way limit your ability as a private individual to
17 express your own private views to whomever. So I
18 appreciate that.

19
20 And as I mentioned, on Page 112, 113
21 there are some additional Q's and A's that may help
22 clarify matters that we thought might come up as
23 frequently asked questions.

24
25 The next briefing is on Page 114, and this is an
26 update informational briefing on the Regional Subsis --
27 well, it's not regional. It's Statewide Subsistence Use
28 Amounts Protocol. there is a working group, State and
29 Federal employees.

30
31 You can see at the top of the page there,
32 there are key terms. In Federal terminology, we use the
33 terms subsistence use amounts. The State terminology is
34 amounts necessary for subsistence.

35
36 There is a work group. You can see the
37 Federal co-chair and the State co-chair listed at the
38 bottom of Page 114. And then there are other inter
39 agency Staff, both State and Federal, on this work group.

40
41 Basically what this work group is doing,
42 it's under the auspices of the interim Memorandum of
43 Agreement that is between the Federal Subsistence Board
44 and agencies and the State regarding subsistence, and
45 it's a protocol working group which is looking at what
46 are the amounts necessary for subsistence or the
47 subsistence use amounts necessary, you know, it depends
48 on which terminology you use.

49
50 We're trying to work together on this.

1 We do have a member of that working group here, Mr. Glenn
2 Chen of BIA. And if there are specific questions about
3 the working group, Glenn can come forward and address
4 those.

5
6 Currently there isn't anything before you
7 today. It's more of an update that work is in progress,
8 and that when we have something drafted, we would bring
9 it to the Council at one of your future meetings in draft
10 form, as well as all the other Councils, and the public
11 and the Councils would be invited to provide input and
12 comment at that time prior to it going up to the Federal
13 Board for decision-making as appropriate.

14
15 So, Mr. Chair, I'll stop and see if there
16 are questions on this one.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have any questions
19 on this protocol working group.

20
21 (No comments)

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No. Tim, do you want to
24 go on. I think the next one applies to some of the
25 things we've discussed today.

26
27 MR. JENNINGS: Yes, Mr. Chair, it does.
28 There was a discussion this morning regarding the Federal
29 Advisory Committee Act, and this is -- the briefing on
30 115 talks about participation on committees and working
31 groups. The Board recognizes how vital it is to have the
32 input from the Councils, and on these working groups and
33 committees. However, recently we've had questions raised
34 and concerns raised about our ability to do that and
35 comply with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, or it's
36 known as FACA, the acronym.

37
38 And basically for the Council, as you'll
39 see in another agenda item, is a chartered group under
40 FACA. So by meeting today, we've public noticed this
41 meeting, and you have a charter that lays out
42 responsibilities and how this Council operates.

43
44 When we have other committees or working
45 groups that are long-standing bodies that involve non-
46 Federal or nongovernmental entities, members of the
47 public like yourself, that are advising the Federal
48 Government, then FACA comes into the equation as
49 applying.

50

1 There was some discussion this morning
2 about FACA. Some clarification from Doug McBride where
3 if it's a limited, short-term duration workshop where
4 other members of the public are invited, it appears that
5 we're not subject to FACA in that regard. And so Doug
6 mentioned that the up-coming meeting on the strategic
7 planning in November for Southcentral will be a workshop.
8 Any members of the public would be invited to that as
9 well. And so by having Gloria and whoever else is from
10 the Council participate in that doesn't trigger FACA
11 requirements.

12
13 These longer-standing committees that go
14 on for several years and are not subject to public
15 notice, and haven't been public noticed are subject to
16 FACA. And so what the Board has decided to do is to, on
17 the working groups under the protocols and other
18 committees that are long-standing committees and working
19 groups, that these groups would continue, but without the
20 direct participation from the Councils in order to comply
21 with FACA. And then that's summarized there on Page 115.

22
23 However, the follow up, the last
24 paragraph, is really quite important. The Board
25 recognizes and knows how critical it is for Council input
26 on the protocols and other matters that these longer-
27 standing committees would recommend to them, and so what
28 the Board is saying to the Councils is anything from
29 these protocol working groups and others that really
30 directly affect how we do our business in subsistence
31 with the Councils, will come to you in draft form at one
32 of your future Council meetings when the topic, when the
33 item is ready for your review, before it comes to the
34 Board for decision.

35
36 So that's -- I'll stop there and see if
37 there's any questions, Mr. Chair. We have had members on
38 some of these -- Council members on some of these
39 protocol committees in the past. I don't know if there's
40 been members from Southcentral or not. I believe there
41 has been. So this is a change in terms of the way we're
42 going to do business, but hopefully we won't suffer too
43 much from that change. We'll come back and have
44 appropriate Council input.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any
47 questions for Tim on this.

48
49 (No comments)
50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tim.

2

3 MR. JENNINGS: Okay. Mr. Chair, the next
4 item is on Page 116. This is informational again as
5 well.

6

7 You may recall last year there was a
8 statewide wildlife proposal to allow the use of brown
9 bear and black bear fur for handicraft, and at the Board
10 meeting -- it ended up at the Board meeting where the
11 Board also included fur and claws. And the sale of
12 handicraft under customary trade to where you could
13 exchange for cash.

14

15 The Board action was limited to Southeast
16 Alaska, to Bristol Bay Region, and to the Eastern
17 Interior.

18

19 At the Board meeting, there was a lot of
20 discussion, and you'll see in some of the documentation
21 here a lot of that is printed in your book.

22

23 What we have before you is that the board
24 passed the regulation effective July 1. And the State of
25 Alaska has requested that the Board reconsider its
26 decision. It's an administrative appeal step that's
27 available in regulation. So this is informational to you
28 to let you know that the Board has received this letter
29 from the State Department of Fish and Game, from
30 Commissioner Duffy, asking the Federal Board to
31 reconsider its decision on the use of -- the sale of bear
32 fur -- or handicrafts made from bear fur and bear claws.

33

34 The Board, if it takes this up, will go
35 through a process, and as you'll see on 116, the letter
36 to the Regional Advisory Council Chairs from Tom Boyd of
37 our office, it will include coming back through the
38 Councils as part of that administrative process before
39 the Board makes a final decision on reconsideration.

40

41 There is a two-step decision-making part
42 of it. First of all, the Board has to decide that the
43 request has met the criteria for an administrative
44 appeal. And if they do that, then they would move
45 forward with an analysis and the reconsideration itself.

46

47 I'll stop there, Mr. Chair, and see if
48 there's questions.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.

1 MS. STICKWAN: Is it all the Councils
2 that this reconsideration will come back to, or just the
3 three.

4
5 MR. JENNINGS: I believe that it would
6 come back to all the Councils.

7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So the process that's in
9 place right now is just to decide whether to reconsider,
10 right?

11
12 MR. JENNINGS: Yes. And the Board will
13 make that decision in the next month or so.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any other
16 questions for Tim on this.

17
18 (No comments)

19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Chisik Island.

21
22 MR. JENNINGS: Okay. You'll see that the
23 letter from the State is quite lengthy and it's included
24 in your book all the way through Page 134. 133, 134.

25
26 The last item is on Page 135 in your
27 book, and it has to do with the Federal jurisdiction
28 around Chisik Island on the west side of Cook Inlet. And
29 I'd like to ask Jerry Berg of my staff to come forward
30 and address this issue. He worked on this closely with
31 other folks in our office, and the Solicitor's Office,
32 and I think he actually has better detail on this than I
33 do. Here's Jerry.

34
35 MR. BERG: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members
36 of the Council. Yeah, this is basically an update to let
37 the Council know, because I know this Council has dealt
38 with proposals that directly affected the areas around
39 Chisik Island. And we were -- well, we have become aware
40 of a letter that was written by the Solicitor's Office
41 for the State of Alaska, basically clarifying what the
42 Fish and Wildlife Service jurisdiction is around Chisik
43 Island.

44
45 Basically when the refuge was first
46 established, there was a dotted line that was drawn
47 around Chisik Island, and our interp -- I don't know who
48 make the first interpretation, but we thought that it
49 included the submerged waters within that dotted line.
50 Well, the Solicitor's Office clarified that, stating that

1 only -- the dotted line was put around there because of
2 some of the rocks and spires that were around the island
3 itself. They did not intend it to include the submerged
4 lands underneath the water. So -- and, of course, there
5 was that shellfish proposal a couple years ago that dealt
6 with that issue. So this would remove the jurisdiction
7 that would apply to the submerged waters, actually where
8 the shellfish are act.

9
10 But the Fish and Wildlife Service and the
11 Federal program still applies to waters above the mean
12 high waterline around Chisik Island. So it's just to let
13 you know that we no longer have jurisdiction on the
14 submerged lands around Chisik Island. I'd be happy to
15 try to answer any questions.

16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So this wasn't an
18 administrative decision or a trade of land or anything.
19 This was just a legal decision?

20
21 MR. BERG: It was a legal clarification,
22 yeah. And I have copies of that letter if council
23 members would like a copy of the actual letter from the
24 Solicitor's Office.

25
26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If there's any council
27 member that would like it, please let Jerry know. Fred
28 and Doug both.

29
30 MR. BLOSSOM: Yeah.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anybody else. Greg and
33 James. In other words, all -- you might as well give it
34 to all of the ones from the Cook Inlet area.

35
36 MR. BERG: Yeah, may as well.

37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Give Susan one, too,
39 while you're at it.

40
41 MR. ELVSAAS: Mr. Chair.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fred.

44
45 MR. ELVSAAS: I think it would be worth
46 while to send that opinion to the tribes of the Cook
47 Inlet area also, because this is a Solicitor's opinion.
48 I don't believe it's law. It's just his opinion. So I
49 think it needs further clarification. The upper part of
50 Tuxedni Bay is Federal waters when there's private lands

1 there. And then when we have Federal lands, Chisik
2 Island, we don't have this. And I think that needs to be
3 clarified to the tribes.

4
5 Thank you.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions
8 for.....

9
10 MS. DOWNING: Your microphone.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
13 Jerry or Tim on any of this stuff that's been brought up.
14 James.

15
16 MR. SHOWALTER: Yes, James Showalter. I
17 don't know if you know it or not, but on Chisik Island
18 there is private holdings.

19
20 MR. BERG: Yeah, I know there's the
21 cannery over there, and I don't know exactly who the
22 private landowners are, but, yeah, I guess those must be
23 withholdings within the refuge. I don't know exactly
24 what the legal ramifications are there, but maybe you can
25 tell us a little bit more about that.

26
27 MR. SHOWALTER: It was Columbia Ward's,
28 and they sold it. But also on the north end of the
29 island there's native allotment lands.

30
31 MR. JENNINGS: Well, Mr. Chair.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tim.

34
35 MR. JENNINGS: We will send a copy
36 through Donald, if we don't have copies with us today of
37 that opinion. We'll get it out to every Council member
38 and also the tribes.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tim. Any
41 other questions for Tim or Jerry.

42
43 (No comments)

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No. Thank you,
46 gentlemen. Okay. With that we'll go back to Wrangell-
47 St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission.

48
49 MS. CELLARIUS: Mr. Chair, members of the
50 Council, my name is Barbara Cellarius. I'm the

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

3

4 At this time we're all set with our
5 appointments to the SRC, so we won't be asking you for
6 any action on that today.

7

8 I do have a couple of brief announcements
9 or information items that I was going to share with you,
10 and then Eric Veach will give you some -- talk about some
11 of the fisheries program.

12

13 Some of you may know that Gary
14 Candalaria, our superintendent, left the Park in June to
15 take up a position at the Harper's Ferry Design Center in
16 West Virginia. And we recently have learned that a new
17 superintendent has been named. He will be joining us in
18 November. His name is Jed Davis. He's been the deputy
19 superintendent at Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve
20 for the last four years, and he comes from a facilities
21 management background. He's worked at a number of parks
22 all around the country, but he does have some Alaska
23 experience, and he'll be joining us in November.

24

25 And our next SRC meeting will be in
26 February, probably in the Chistochina or Gulkana area.
27 I'm putting together a mailing list for sending out
28 announcements about that meeting. I've already talked to
29 Dean, and I've got to put his name on that list. And if
30 anybody else would like to receive announcements about
31 our SRC meetings, just get in touch with me at some
32 point, or let Donald know, and he can let me know or
33 something like that.

34

35 I think at least some of you are aware
36 that for National Park lands, in addition to the rural
37 residency requirement of ANILCA, we have an additional
38 requirement for local residency, and Hollis spoke of the
39 Cantwell boundary that has become an issue for that new
40 subdivision. We recently in 2002 added five of the upper
41 Tanana communities to the park's resident zone. While
42 they're outside of the Southcentral region, they do have
43 C&T for resources in the Southcentral region, and we have
44 established boundaries for those new communities. we
45 don't have boundaries for the communities in the Copper
46 Basin area. It was decided it was just too complicated
47 to figure out where one ended and where one started.

48

49 But for those new communities, we have
50 established boundaries. I did that by going to the

1 villages and getting the recommendations. And we have
2 copies of the maps on file at the park if anybody's
3 interested.

4
5 And just a little bit of information on
6 our wildlife permits. We don't have any harvest data at
7 this point for this year. It's too early for that.

8
9 But we issued 260 moose permits, which is
10 just a little bit more than last year, 39 goat permits,
11 and 19 of the elder sheep permits. Those are in Unit 11.

12
13
14 And then in Unit 12 we had a new hunt
15 this year, which was an elders sheep hunt. You voted to
16 support that proposal at your last meeting. And we've --
17 as of the 20th of September, we'd issued six permits for
18 that hunt. The hunt is still ongoing, so that may not be
19 the final number of permits for that hunt.

20
21 And that concludes my report.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Barbara. Any
24 questions for Barbara.

25
26 (No comments)

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What has been the
29 average success rate on the elders sheep hunt for the
30 preceding years?

31
32 MS. CELLARIUS: I believe that we did
33 have some harvest last year. It wasn't real high. I
34 don't have the exact numbers in front of me.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Was that the first year
37 we had any harvest?

38
39 MS. CELLARIUS: I believe so. I mean,
40 this was -- I believe this year is the third year of the
41 hunt in Unit 11, and I believe Mason will be coming with
42 me to the next SRC meeting, and he can probably -- at
43 that point will probably have the harvest data for this
44 year as well. But it's been fairly low.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. I thought it had
47 been going on longer than that, but I didn't think there
48 had been any take until very recently.

49
50 MS. CELLARIUS: Since I've only actually

1 been here for two years, I don't recall exactly when that
2 regulation was put in place.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Okay.

5

6 MR. VEACH: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair.
7 For the record, my name is Eric Veach with Wrangell-St.
8 Elias National Park and Preserve.

9

10 For those of you who are relatively new
11 to the Council, I thought I might just mention that the
12 Wrangell-St. Elias National Park's superintendent serves
13 as the in-season manager for the Federal fisheries in the
14 Copper River, and so I will be giving you a brief report
15 of our Federal fishery management in the Copper River
16 last summer.

17

18 As Tom Taube mentioned earlier,
19 management of the Chitina Subdistrict was relatively easy
20 this summer. The Federal season in the Chitina
21 Subdistrict mirrors the State season, so when the State
22 personal use fishery is open and closed by emergency
23 order, we open and close the Federal fishery in the
24 Chitina Subdistrict simultaneously with a special action.
25 So the two seasons mirror each other, and this makes it a
26 lot simpler for the users.

27

28 As Tom mentioned, the season opened June
29 3rd, and remained open for the rest of the season. So it
30 was relatively easy to manage this year.

31

32 The Glennallen Subdistrict was maybe a
33 little more challenging than it has been in the past.
34 Let's see, I believe it was 2001 that the Federal Board
35 extended the season in the Glennallen Subdistrict, and
36 the Federal season opens May 15th while the State season
37 opens June 1st.

38

39 This year there was concern raised by the
40 upper river users in Mentasta, Chistochina, and Slana
41 that for the past few years they've been unable to meet
42 their needs with salmon in the Copper River. There
43 haven't been enough fish getting upstream of the Gulkana
44 River, or kind of the Gakona area for the folks that fish
45 upstream there to meet their needs. What they see is
46 kind of a push of fish early in the season, and then they
47 don't get a lot of the later runs that the rest of the
48 river sees. So if they don't get enough fish in that
49 kind of that early push of fish, their needs aren't met
50 for the rest of the season.

1 And so they had approached us, and the
2 original suggestion was that we issue a special action
3 and close the personal use fishery in the Chitina
4 subdistrict for the month of June. And so we hosted a
5 meeting in Glennallen of kind of kind of concerned users
6 and affected individuals, and so we had certainly
7 representation from the villages. Gloria was able to
8 attend. And also some representatives of the Chitina
9 Dipnetters Association, and certainly several agency
10 staff as well.

11
12 And we really talked about a lot of
13 different options to kind of resolve this concern
14 upstream. And really what we came forward with that we
15 felt that we could implement immediately was a special
16 action that would close the Glennallen Subdistrict until
17 June 1st. So they closed it for 16 days. And typically
18 what we've seen in the past, is we estimated there might
19 have been as much as 800 fish harvested in that early
20 portion of the season. This year it actually looks like
21 both -- that there were some fish that came in early, so
22 there probably were quite a few fish in the river, and
23 also the conditions for fishing were good. So
24 potentially that special action did actually preserve a
25 few more fish and get them further upstream to the folks
26 that fish further upriver, upstream of Gakona.

27
28 But we did issue a special action, and
29 closed the season for essentially just a little more than
30 two weeks. And we actually did -- we issued the special
31 action and a news release on May 14th at about noon, so
32 it was only about 12 hours before the season opened, and
33 as we usually do, we put press releases out on the radio,
34 but because we were concerned that folks might be headed
35 down and beginning to fish, we actually called everybody
36 that had requested a permit prior to that point in time
37 by phone and either spoke to them, or left them a message
38 that the season would be closed until June 1st.

39
40 During that period, we had one request
41 for a memorial permit. If you'll remember, too, recently
42 the Board has approved language that allows for a permit
43 to harvest fish for either a memorial service or a
44 funeral out side of the season. And typically that's not
45 been an big issue in the Copper River, because generally
46 the season is open when there's fish in the river. But
47 where we had closed the Glennallen Subdistrict fishery,
48 we did get a request for a permit. We issued a permit to
49 harvest up to 25 fish. And they were successful.
50 Unfortunately, I can't -- I don't think they harvested

1 the full 25, but it was around 20 fish that they
2 harvested, and they were able to get enough fish for the
3 memorial service.

4
5 In 2004 we issued 265 Glennallen
6 Subdistrict permits, and 109 Chitina Subdistrict permits,
7 and then, of course, one permit for the Batzulnetas
8 fishery. That's a few more Glennallen Subdistrict
9 permits than we've issued in the past, but not a lot.
10 Last year -- or the year before we had issued 221
11 Glennallen Subdistrict permits and 100 Chitina
12 Subdistrict permits. So a few more permits, but not a
13 lot.

14
15 We've gotten some permits returned. And
16 actually it looks like the harvest -- based on the number
17 of permits that we've got returned, which individuals
18 have until the end of October to return the permits, so
19 the numbers may change, but we're seeing about 10,383
20 sockeye reported and 394 chinook reported harvested in
21 Glennallen Subdistrict. And that's based on a return of
22 113 permits, so that's a little less than half. So
23 that's not too different than an average year, but it
24 still looks like folks were certainly successful in the
25 Glennallen Subdistrict this year.

26
27 And then for the Chitina Subdistrict,
28 we're actually seeing a little bit of an increase over
29 what has typically been the Federal harvest at least in
30 the Chitina Subdistrict. We've had 36 permits returned,
31 and there's been 962 sockeye reported and three chinook
32 salmon reported harvested on those 36 permits, which is
33 just about a third of the permits that we issued. So
34 that suggests that we may have seen a little higher
35 harvest in the Chitina subdistrict this year. Although
36 one of those permits, an individual had reported actually
37 harvesting I believe over 320 sockeyes using a dip net in
38 the Chitina Subdistrict this year, so that's probably
39 kind of artificially pushed the numbers a little high,
40 and it may not be substantially higher than what we've
41 seen in the past for Chitina Subdistrict harvest.

42
43 I've also mentioned earlier that we
44 issued burbot permits to five households this year. Four
45 were for burbot harvest in lakes along McCarthy Road, and
46 one permit was for burbot harvest in Conference (ph) Nada
47 (ph) lakes. The success rate wasn't real high.
48 Basically to date we've seen one burbot that was reported
49 harvested in Long Lake using a hoop trap.

50

1 And as I mentioned earlier, there was --
2 originally the permits had been requested for a set line,
3 but because this affected waters within the Park, we
4 can't actually issue a permit to harvest fish using a set
5 line in the park. So we went back and looked at the
6 available gear types, and what might be reasonable for
7 these lakes, and technically folks were issued a permit
8 for a fyke net, but a fyke net is very similar to hoop
9 traps.

10
11 And kind of following up on the burbot
12 monitoring, too, I wanted to mention that in cooperation
13 with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, this spring
14 we sampled the burbot population in Long Lake. We set 42
15 traps throughout the lake, left the traps in place for
16 two consecutive nights. They were baited with, oh,
17 probably about a pound of herring each, and in total,
18 with the 42 traps we trapped only seven burbot, so that
19 indicates we probably have a very, very low burbot
20 population in Long Lake.

21
22 For our salmon monitoring efforts this
23 summer, we operated two weirs, one on Tanada Creek again
24 near the Village of Batzulnetas, and then one at the
25 outlet of Long Lake along the McCarthy Road. It was
26 really a good return in both systems. WE had over 18,000
27 sockeye that returned to Tanada Creek, which is the
28 highest that we've seen since I've been here, and that's
29 about the third highest return to Tanada Lake on record,
30 so we were very pleased with the return to Tanada Creek.
31 And we've also seen over 19,000 sockeye salmon as well as
32 nearly 300 silver salmon that have returned to Long Lake
33 this year, and that's probably more of an average run for
34 Long Lake, but it's still a good run, certainly no real
35 reason for concern with that sort of return.

36
37 And then this year for the first time, we
38 successfully implemented a fisheries biotechnician
39 training camp which we held along the Nebesna Road. This
40 was aimed at basically local youth, college-aged students
41 that are interested in entering either fisheries or a
42 natural resources field for a career. And basically the
43 students received three weeks of training in a variety of
44 course work. It was again designed to give folks some
45 skills that they could actually put on a resume, and then
46 compete a little more successfully for a seasonal summer
47 fisheries type job.

48
49 Course work included fish identification,
50 fish habitat surveys, weir operations, minnow trapping,

1 electro-fishing, boat operation, fish hatchery
2 procedures, first aid, CPR, aviation, shotgun and bear
3 safety. The students were exposed to a variety of
4 instructors, a few of which are actually in the room
5 here. And all the students were able to complete the
6 course, and they received a \$500 stipend as well as five
7 college credits. There were actually five 280 level
8 college credits through Prince William Sound Community
9 College.

10

11 And we really considered the camp to be a
12 success. It was based on previous work that was done out
13 at Nondalton by the folks out at Lake Clark, and I think
14 the students considered it a success as well, too..

15

16 I also just want to mention, too, that
17 the BLM provided the weather ports that we used for
18 housing out there, too, which we really appreciated.

19

20 So, Mr. Chairman, that's all I have. I'd
21 be happy to answer any questions.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.

24

25 MS. STICKWAN: This fish, the 18,000
26 chinook, did it come up in June?

27

28 MS. DOWNING: Gloria, could you pull your
29 microphone up closer to you? Thank you.

30

31 MS. STICKWAN: The 18,000 fish that you
32 counted for chinook, was that in the early part of the
33 run, or was it all summer?

34

35 MR. VEACH: I'm sorry. There were
36 sockeyes at Tanada Creek, and that's actually throughout
37 the whole -- the entire season, although we typically
38 think the fish that are headed for Tanada Creek are
39 typically early run fish. So they're in there, they're
40 coming past the Miles Lake sonar early in the season, and
41 then, you know, they progress at different rates up to
42 Tanada Creek. We'll have a little better information on
43 the timing of when those fish actually enter the river as
44 the study that Doug mentioned yesterday, with the radio
45 telemetry work with sockeyes is completed though.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: James.

48

49 MR. SHOWALTER: Yes. James Showalter.
50 You said you closed down the fishery, emergency order,

1 mirroring the State. With closing that down, my
2 question's why was it closed down. And also hasn't
3 subsistence has priority over everything else?
4

5 MR. VEACH: You're certainly correct.
6 The subsistence fishery, the subsistence users do have
7 priority over the personal use fishery that occurs in the
8 Chitina Subdistrict. And when we -- when the Federal
9 fishery was created in, let's see, I believe that fishery
10 was first implemented in 2002, so it would have been at
11 the 2001 Board meeting, one of the big concerns is, is
12 that we have in some years as many as 10,000 households
13 that participate in the personal use fishery. At that
14 time it was a State subsistence fishery under State
15 regulations.
16

17 And if we were to allow Federal users to
18 basically fish continuously in the Chitina Subdistrict as
19 they can in the Glennallen Subdistrict, that that could
20 create a lot of confusion with the folks that fish under
21 State regulations in that same subdistrict. And what we
22 might see is actually increased -- you know, I was going
23 to say increased participation, but really increased
24 harvest, because we would have folks that should be
25 fishing under State regulations fishing more often
26 because they see Federal users down there and they would
27 believe that the season was open if they saw folks that
28 were dip netting.
29

30 Enforcement on the Copper River is
31 extremely thin, and there's really no Federal enforcement
32 that occurs out there. So it would have really created a
33 huge enforcement problem, and we didn't see that it would
34 create -- that allowing Federal users to fish
35 continuously would really increase the opportunity,
36 because Federal users can fish immediately upstream in
37 the Glennallen Subdistrict typically continuously, and
38 they can dip net or they can operate fish wheels. And
39 the folks that are qualified to fish on the Chitina
40 Subdistrict are all qualified to fish in the Glennallen
41 Subdistrict. So it isn't as if they can't fish anywhere
42 when the Chitina Subdistrict is closed. They just have
43 to fish upstream of the Chitina Mccarthy Bridge.
44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.
46

47 MR. CARPENTER: You mentioned that the
48 enforcement on the upper Copper is real thin. Is there a
49 reason why there isn't more Federal enforcement up there?
50 I mean, most of the -- you know, there's a lot of private

1 land there I understand, but there is a lot of Federal
2 land, too, so I mean, is there anything that has been
3 talked about in kind of coordinating the State and
4 Federal enforcement, you know? Because it's only a
5 specific time of the year that we really need to worry
6 about it.

7
8 MR. VEACH: No, those are all good
9 points. And I may have been incorrect when I said
10 there's no Federal enforcement. What I really should say
11 is there extremely little, because the folks that have
12 the jurisdiction or the ability to actually enforce those
13 Federal on the river are the Fish and Wildlife Service
14 special agents, and there's very few of those in the
15 State of Alaska. The park rangers don't actually have
16 any authority once you step outside of the national park
17 boundary, which is the high water mark. So obviously all
18 the fishing that occurs beneath that. And the -- I think
19 that the -- because, you know, there's just so much work
20 out there for the special agents right now, that the
21 Copper isn't as high of a priority, because we don't
22 really have the conservation concern. It's not to say
23 there isn't potentially some violations occurring there.

24
25
26 We're fortunate in that we have enough
27 fish coming upstream that if someone's taking, you know,
28 an extra dozen or an extra couple dozen sockeye salmon,
29 that's probably not a conservation concern versus, you
30 know, in some place like the Yukon River, it very well
31 could be.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
34 Eric. I've got a couple myself.

35
36 First of all, a statement, I sure hope
37 that everybody fishes below the mean high water mark.
38 Otherwise we'd have a different fishery than any place
39 else.

40
41 The -- oh, I don't know what I wrote that
42 one down for. But did that closure have any effect on
43 the people, the subsistence group that was further
44 upriver, getting the fish that they needed early this
45 year? Were they successful or did it have an impact on
46 it in any way?

47
48 MR. VEACH: I'd love to take full credit
49 that they were extremely successful this year, and that
50 that was solely in response to the special action, but

1 it's really hard to measure the effects of that special
2 action. So I don't know that it had any effect per se.
3 I don't know exactly within the Batzulnetas fishery how
4 many fish were harvested, although I've heard that it was
5 a better year than it has been in the past years, but I
6 don't know the exact number that they harvested.

7
8 I did meet with the folks at Chistochina
9 a couple of weeks ago, and they were ecstatic about the
10 number of fish that they harvested this year. They said
11 they had plenty of fish. And it's the first time again
12 in my career with them meeting within -- I've been here
13 nearly five years now. So it's the first time within
14 nearly five years of meeting with those folks that
15 they've actually told me that they had plenty of fish. I
16 mean, they said there was lots of fish, and they were
17 very happy with how many fish they had upstream this
18 year.

19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. It would seem
21 like if you got your biggest escapement in Tanada Creek,
22 you must have had more fish up in that section than you
23 usually have.

24
25 One question. Were there an Federal fish
26 wheel operated in the Chitina Subdistrict this year?

27
28 MR. VEACH: I didn't observe any fish
29 wheels operating downstream of the Chitina McCarthy
30 Bridge this year.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: They can, but there
33 wasn't any?

34
35 MR. VEACH: Right.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All right. And are you
38 going to repeat that fisheries camp in the future?

39
40 MR. VEACH: I would like to. Funding's
41 going to be a little tight for us this year. What I kind
42 of am looking at doing is maybe trying to offer it every
43 other year. I think that would keep participation a
44 little higher that way, too.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any other
47 questions. Dean.

48
49 MR. WILSON: Yeah. Actually I think
50 there was one or one and a half fish wheels below the

1 bridge there. The second one wasn't very good of shape,
2 but.....

3

4 MR. ELVSAAS: One and a half.

5

6 (Laughter)

7

8 MR. WILSON: I'm curious whether or not
9 you guys do any enforcement or any monitoring of the
10 lakes up in the Tebay region, Hanagita region. I was
11 approached by a local this year who's concerned about
12 that. There's a -- I guess they flew over it, and there
13 were a lot of planes on the ground. And I understand
14 there's a lodge up there that works up in that area,
15 primarily sport fishing for trout I understand, is what
16 most of the planes are on the ground for. But I think
17 it's getting hit fairly hard from Valdez residents and
18 Cordova coming up in there. And maybe you can shed some
19 more light on that if you know.

20

21 MR. VEACH: We don't -- I wouldn't say we
22 do any formal monitoring. Our rangers do -- I mean,
23 that's an area that they're flying over, and they're
24 patrolling, and it may be that they are doc --
25 undoubtedly, they probably are documenting the planes
26 that they observe as they fly over. And I don't know
27 that anybody's really tackled doing anything with those
28 numbers, but that's -- I'll ask them. I mean, that's
29 something that if they're collecting that information,
30 and we could get our hands on it, I mean it's something
31 that I might be able to at least summarize.

32

33 Too, I didn't actually get up to that
34 direction at all this summer, but in the past I've
35 certainly noticed that it does seem like there's more and
36 more folks fishing for rainbow trout there. And my
37 experience there has been that those fish, you know, as
38 they stage before they run upstream to spawn, they're
39 extremely vulnerable. I mean, they're really easy to
40 catch. You know, it certainly wouldn't be uncommon for
41 an individual to be able to take, again -- or to, you
42 know, certainly hook and release maybe 30 fish in an
43 afternoon when they're staged, before they run upstream
44 to spawn.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: A question on that,
47 Eric. Is salmon fishing closed in that area? I mean,
48 once you're out of the main stream of the Copper and the
49 Chitina on the tributaries, is salmon fishing closed?

50

1 MR. VEACH: Subsistence salmon fishing is
2 closed.
3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But sport fishing is not
5 closed?
6
7 MR. VEACH: Right. Yeah, you could
8 certainly sport fish for salmon. You know, in Tebay
9 itself, there's a falls there that's at least a partial,
10 if not a full barrier, so I'm not aware of any salmon
11 that actually escape into Tebay Lake itself.
12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: They do.
14
15 MR. VEACH: Okay.
16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: They do. They not only
18 do, they go all the way up to the upper Tebay lakes.
19
20 MR. VEACH: Okay.
21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And so they're
23 definitely vulnerable right there.
24
25 MR. VEACH: Uh-huh.
26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.
28
29 MR. CARPENTER: I guess that's kind of
30 interesting that Dean brought that up, because that's
31 always been -- I've never been able to understand why you
32 need to have -- you need to be in a resident zone
33 community to hunt in the park under the subsistence
34 regulations, but they allow anybody from anywhere to take
35 an airplane and go into the park and sport fish, but you
36 can't subsistence fish. It's absolutely just bizarre to
37 me how they could ever have come up with that regulation.
38
39 MR. VEACH: I couldn't agree more. In
40 fact I've been invited to speak on that very topic at a
41 number of difference Park Service conferences. It's
42 fascinating nationwide. I mean, you know, you enter some
43 place like Yellowstone National Park, if you take a rock
44 home, if you pick the flowers, you're subject to a
45 citation for any of those activities. Yet at least the
46 last time I looked at the regulations, you could harvest
47 two Yellowstone like cutthroat a day which are a native
48 species, and you could barbecue and eat them in the park,
49 and be completely within the regulations.
50

1 And it's a fascinating part of our
2 history that we deal with hunting very, very differently
3 than we do fishing. And some of that history is that a
4 lot of the advocates for creating some of the original
5 national parks were sports fishermen groups, and they
6 wanted to see sport fishing maintained, and they didn't
7 really have the desire to maintain hunting.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Just as an aside from --
10 I don't know if Tom can back me up on this, but from what
11 I've heard from the people who do sport fish rainbow
12 trout in Tebay, when I did it 25, 30 years ago, they were
13 all fairly small fish, pretty uniform in size. And now
14 that there's so much sport fishing pressure up there,
15 there's not as many fish there, but the fish are getting
16 bigger. Have you heard the same thing, Tom?

17
18 MR. CARPENTER: Yeah. I was up there
19 this summer a couple times, and Dean is right, there is a
20 lot more pressure on Tebay Lakes. There is some private
21 -- there's a lot of private in -- or several private
22 inholdings on Tebay Lake, owned primarily by one family
23 from Cordova. And they operate a pretty significant
24 lodge up there. And I actually believe that if the lake
25 was draining like it used to, it would probably be even
26 more significant than it is now. But, yeah, it's an
27 interesting place, and probably something to keep an eye
28 on.

29
30 MR. VEACH: Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
33 Eric.

34
35 (No comments)

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Eric. With
38 that we are going to go on to the Council charter review.
39 And, Donald, are you going to help us on that one, or do
40 we do that by ourselves.

41
42 MR. WATERS: Isn't BLM next?

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, BLM. BLM.

45
46 (Laughter)

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: By gosh, we won't forget
49 them. Do we have to? Okay. We're inviting the BLM up
50 here. I knew he wouldn't sit quietly and take it.

1 MR. WATERS: Good afternoon, Mr.
2 Chairman. Council members. My name is Elijah always
3 after lunch on the last day Waters.

4
5 (Laughter)

6
7 MR. WATERS: And actually I've got two
8 reports I'd like to give today. I'll start out with the
9 handout that I just passed out. Also I have some extras
10 here behind me if anybody would like to pick up a copy.

11
12 First of all, I'll talk about the moose
13 and caribou permits we issued this year. We issued over
14 2,000 caribou permits so far, and 970 moose permits.
15 Now, this is more than we've issued in the past. I'm not
16 quite sure why. It's not really a lot of new people. It
17 just seems like this year everybody wants to get them.

18
19 Also, this is the first year, if you'll
20 remember last year -- or at the last wildlife cycle, one
21 of the proposals was to have permits come to us, have the
22 hunt reports come to us. This is the first year we've
23 done that, and we've had 24 successful moose permits, and
24 53 successful caribou permits.

25
26 Those caribou permits are obviously going
27 to go up. A lot of people haven't sent them in yet.

28
29 Moose permits probably not going to go up
30 a whole lot more. One thing I happened to notice this
31 year about the moose permits, all of the moose that were
32 killed were killed by Glennallen residents, not the 20(D)
33 residents. And I'm not sure, I think maybe what's
34 influence that is that Unit 20 this year had that very
35 large cow sport hunt, and I think a lot of those 20(D)
36 residents choose to participate in that, and just didn't
37 come down and hunt Federal. That's what it appears
38 anyway.

39
40 The next thing I'd like to talk about is
41 the two special provisions hunts. Again, those are two
42 hunts that this council and the Board took action on at
43 the last cycle. And the Ahtna heritage foundation, they
44 came in, requested their permits for their culture camp.
45 The young man that came in, we prepared a letter, you
46 know, to go over the regulations and what he could do and
47 what he couldn't do, and the young man that came in was
48 extremely prepared. He could have recited the letter
49 without reading it. He was very familiar with the
50 regulations. He was extremely concerned about staying

1 within the boundaries and staying legal, and it was a
2 tremendous success, you know, to that outreach portion of
3 it. And unfortunately he didn't harvest anything. But I
4 think they picked him to be their designated hunter,
5 because he already had his moose, but he couldn't get the
6 one for the camp.

7
8 And finally, the fall population as Becky
9 mentioned before for the Nelchina Caribou Herd, we
10 anticipate that that's going to be over the 35,000. And
11 if you'll remember, a couple years ago that was the
12 minimum level set to allow a cow harvest. So at some
13 point, at some point in the second season, we anticipate
14 that we will go to an either sex caribou season. And I
15 say at some point for a couple reasons. One, the
16 estimate's not in yet, so we anticipate that it's going
17 to be about 35,000, but we'll have to wait and just see.

18
19 The other thing, the State's tagging some
20 of the cow caribou now, and we want to wait. We don't
21 want to interfere with that. We want to let the drug
22 that they use to collar those cows, let that get out of
23 the system before we open it up. So we're anticipating
24 probably about a mid November opening on that caribou
25 season. Or a mid November opening to cows. It will open
26 October 21st to bulls.

27
28 The next thing I'd like to talk about is
29 this cultural resources, our Native place names study.
30 And I don't know -- I'll try to do as good as I can to
31 tell you what I know about this, but this -- the Native
32 place names study coincides with our resource management
33 plan planning effort. And what it's looking at is
34 there's a lot of Native place names for things all
35 throughout our area, and the -- or John Jongual (ph), our
36 cultural resources specialist for BLM, he's put together
37 a contract that was awarded to identify these places and
38 to translate these Native place names, because a lot of
39 these Native place names, you know, we might call it by
40 its Native place name, but we don't know what it means.
41 Well, getting that translation, that translation will
42 have -- will imply a lot of culturally significant areas.
43 And he gave me several examples, and I think I listed one
44 here about the origin of the Caribou Clan. He also gave
45 a couple others that that might translate to something
46 like where a great chief is buried or something like
47 that. So he's been working with Jim Kari and the
48 villages, identifying these places, and I think the final
49 product should be out by the end of November.

50

1 And the last thing I want to talk about
2 is our trails and easements work that we always do. This
3 year we have hired a crew of four who worked all summer,
4 and we spent over \$200,000 in project money on trail
5 improvements. And when I say \$200,000, that doesn't pay
6 any permanent staff wages. That \$200,000 is in stuff
7 like the four people that worked the summer, of course,
8 but also the gas, the materials, the contracting for
9 equipment, all that kind of thing. We put together
10 \$200,000 worth of trail improvements.

11
12 Now, I could give you a figure in
13 mileage, but it's really misleading, because this is some
14 really intensive work. And mileage just really don't do
15 it justice, because you treat miles, but you treat the
16 bad spots. And if you look on that last page there, you
17 can see some of the before and after pictures. So even
18 though, you know, that's a very short piece of trail, you
19 know, it actually impacts a much larger trail system.

20
21 Also, kind of a spur of the minute thing
22 this year, we got to host a mechanized trail workshop.
23 And this mechanized trail workshop, it was originally
24 scheduled for Tok, but because of the fires up north,
25 they had to -- at the last minute they shifted it down to
26 Glennallen, so we got the expertise and the free use of
27 some of this mechanized trail maintenance equipment for a
28 little over a week down in our district. And we were
29 able to accomplish quite a bit of work that would have
30 taken a couple of years otherwise if we'd been doing it
31 by hand crews. So that's a little plus there.

32
33 And what they were doing was mostly
34 installing some of these rolling drain dips and just
35 literally redoing some of the trails. You know, putting
36 the cray (ph) on to keep the water off, the rolling drain
37 dips, allow the water to run off before it starts
38 rutting.

39
40 And that concludes that report. Now,
41 also I want to move over and do a presentation on our
42 East Alaska Resource Management Plan. But before I do
43 that, that's going to take about a half an hour. And so
44 I'm prepared to wait until the end, to the very end if
45 that's the Council's request.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What you're saying is
48 you're going to give everybody else an opportunity to go
49 home except you and the Council?

50

1 (Laughter)
2
3 MR. WATERS: Pretty much. Pretty much
4 that's what I'm saying.
5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do you think that we
7 would allow something like that to happen.
8
9 MR. WATERS: So it's whatever the
10 Council's request is, I could do it either way.
11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Your report's on what
13 now, Elijah?
14
15 MR. WATERS: It's going to be on the East
16 Alaska Resource Management Plan, which is the management
17 plan that affects the Glennallen District.
18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, don't you think
20 that's something everybody ought to hear?
21
22 MR. WATERS: If they want to, I'm ready.
23 It's whatever the Council.....
24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I will leave it up to
26 the rest of the council.
27
28 MR. WATERS: But I'll entertain
29 questions, too, on anything else I've said before I move
30 out.
31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You figure it will take
33 a half hour?
34
35 MR. WATERS: I would think so. You know,
36 it's.....
37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You can talk fast.
39
40 MR. WATERS: You've got to kind of get --
41 some of that stuff, you really have to get into a little
42 more. I'll make it go as fast as possible.
43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. I only have one
45 question on this -- what you've talked about so far. You
46 were talking about if the cows -- if the caribou are
47 above 35,000, you would institute a cow hunt for this
48 year yet, not next year.
49
50 MR. WATERS: Right, for this year.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Are you going to have a
2 limit on those cows? I mean, are you going to -- is this
3 going to be an emergency opener, emergency close type
4 season, or what's going to happen if -- when it opens up
5 in October, the caribou are still hanging around where
6 they're hanging, and all of a sudden we have a big take
7 of caribou under subsistence permits. Is that going to
8 affect the cow hunt?

9
10 MR. WATERS: Well, it could. I'll say
11 that, it could. If Bob Taube and Becky were given -- you
12 know, had some concerns, if we felt like there was going
13 to be a large, large cow harvest, we absolutely would
14 have the flexibility to close it. I don't really
15 anticipate it, however, just because the caribou -- they
16 just -- they haven't really cooperated real well this
17 year. In fact they were all over on the Glenn Highway on
18 the way into town. I'm sure some of you probably saw
19 them. And there hasn't -- it's been real sporadic in the
20 Federal areas. Now, what I'm anticipating is that
21 they're just not going to be in the Federal area enough
22 to really have a large cow harvest.

23
24 And the other thing, you know, even in
25 years where we give a lot of permits or a few permits,
26 and based -- even if you look at the history of the
27 harvest of those caribou, regardless of sex, the peak
28 harvest has occurred -- can occur in any of the seven
29 months that the season is in. And also regardless of
30 when the peak is, or regardless of when they're most
31 susceptible, the harvest level stays relatively stable.
32 If it's bull only, we take about 350 animals. If it's
33 either sex, we take about 350 animals. And so I don't --
34 I just don't anticipate that -- regardless of what
35 happens, I don't anticipate that the total harvest is
36 going to be over that.

37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

39
40 MR. WATERS: And this 53 animals, you
41 know, a lot of hunters still given the opportunity is
42 going to take a bull, or a young bull that might end up
43 being a cow. So I really don't anticipate that we're
44 going to have more than a couple hundred cows killed.
45 But if it -- you know, we do have timely reporting, the
46 reports are coming to us, and we track it daily. I mean,
47 we have a young lady that works for us, and she puts it
48 in the computer every single day when she gets the mail,
49 and I look at it every day. So if it does get up there
50 to where it's a concern, you know, we would be able to

1 react very rapidly.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, do you have a -- I
4 won't use the word target number, but do you have a
5 number at which point you would start being concerned?

6

7 MR. WATERS: I would personally bring it
8 -- you know, start taking it to ADF&G if around 200 cows
9 were harvested. That would be kind of my red flag level,
10 is when I would start to at least make sure that they
11 were aware. And, you know, if they had concerns, I think
12 they would be contacting me earlier, too. It's no secret
13 what goes on. When the caribou are available, word gets
14 out very quick.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's what I was
17 thinking. I just didn't know, you know, if the 35,000
18 was a trigger, at 35,000, what kind -- you know, so we
19 have 35,500, what kind of surplus do we actually have,
20 you know. I mean, are we trying to keep it at 35,000, or
21 is 35,000 the minimum that allows a cow hunt.

22

23 MR. WATERS: 35,000 is the minimum that
24 allows a cow hunt. I don't anticipate ADF&G being
25 concerned, and maybe Becky wants to come up and correct
26 me if I'm wrong, but when I initially talked to Bob Taube
27 about this, you know, over a month ago, six weeks ago, he
28 was even suggesting that maybe we -- he was wanting us to
29 have the flexibility to open it up to cows even earlier,
30 like, you know, September. The first season. So I don't
31 anticipate that concern.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Just a question.

34

35 MR. WATERS: That actually brings up one
36 other thing. We hired another law enforcement ranger this
37 year as well. You've already met him, that's good. So
38 you're the one.

39

40 (Laughter)

41

42 MR. WATERS: So we did hire another law
43 enforcement ranger, and, you know, they spend quite a bit
44 of time. And the reports they've given me is that
45 they've been very pleased with the low amount of
46 violations. And the last time, a year go I guess, when I
47 gave a report, there was some concern about shooting from
48 or across the road. And they have written more tickets
49 for that in the last year than since the Federal program
50 began. So they are looking for that, they are catching

1 people for that. And one of the things that they're
2 getting people on is if you report somebody, if somebody
3 else reports somebody for shooting across the road, if
4 that person is willing to write a statement, a sworn
5 statement, and face that person in court, they're writing
6 tickets based on somebody else's testimony. And so we're
7 -- you know, we're seeing it go down, or at least we
8 think it's going down.

9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, I know the day
11 that I met him, he said that he had already written one
12 ticket for shooting off the road. And thanks to him, we
13 went in the right direction to where the caribou were,
14 otherwise we'd have wasted our time up at Tangle Lakes.
15 It seemed like you have -- we saw between the State and
16 the Federal in one day up there, we saw three different
17 enforcement agents, so there definitely was coverage up
18 there this year.

19
20 MR. WATERS: That's good. I'll pass that
21 along to him.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that didn't count
24 the State Trooper that drove through.

25
26 Thank you. Shall we go on as fast as we
27 can now.

28
29 MR. WATERS: Go to the plan.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Go with the plan.

32
33 MR. WATERS: Okay. While this is loading
34 up, I do want to point out the blame for the PowerPoint
35 all goes to the Forest Service and Tim Joyce. For years
36 this Council never used PowerPoint. And once Tim Joyce
37 started, then everybody thinks they have to use it.

38
39 (Laughter)

40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You don't have to use
42 it.

43
44 MR. WATERS: Well, this will actually
45 make it easier. Do we need to dim some lights?

46
47 Okay. As I said before, this is the
48 update on the East Alaska Resource Management Plan.

49
50 First of all I want to talk about what a

1 resource management plan is. It's not used to make site
2 specific decisions. A resource management plan provides
3 a comprehensive framework for the later decision-making.
4 The initial -- the site specific decisions will be made
5 on a case-by-base basis and in a series of implementation
6 level plans. So this is not going to say, you know,
7 we're not going to use this plan to put a timber sale in
8 this location or anything like that.

9
10 Okay. Let me orient you to the area
11 that's covered by the East Alaska Resource Management
12 Plan. This is a map of our district. Right here is
13 Glennallen, here is Cantwell, Paxson, and Valdez. So you
14 can see that this goes well north of Paxson. This
15 actually goes up north of Black Rapids even into Unit 20.
16 Cantwell, all the way almost down to Talkeetna, down to
17 Valdez, Eureka, and then we have this large area down in
18 Southeast Alaska as well. This is Cape Yakataga, Icy
19 Bay, the large Bering Glacier country. So it's a very
20 large area. There's over 33 million acres encompassed in
21 this entire yellow looking blob here. 33 million acres.
22 Seven million of that is actually managed by the BLM.
23 Out of that seven million, 5.5 is either State, Native,
24 or dual selected, and only about one and a half million
25 acres of that are actually unencumbered BLM lands.

26
27 These unencumbered lands include the wild
28 and scenic rivers which don't show, but they're the Delta
29 and Gulkana wild and scenic rivers. A large portion of
30 this Bering Glacier is unencumbered, but it's mostly
31 glacier. And then also some of that utility corridor,
32 the pipeline utility corridor. Most of that's what makes
33 up the majority of the Federal hunting area, the wild and
34 scenic river corridors and the utility corridor.

35
36 To go over a little bit of scheduling.
37 You know, March of 2003 we announced that we were doing
38 this plan. The Federal Register notice went out, and
39 then we went through a public scoping process last summer
40 in 2003 where we had public scoping meetings, and these
41 public scoping meetings, every community that's affected
42 by this plan, we had at least one meeting at it. So
43 there was meetings in Tazlina, Chitina, there was even
44 some in Cordova. There was some in Anchorage and
45 Fairbanks, because a lot of our users come from there.
46 So we had quite a few public meetings, and, you know,
47 where people could bring their issues. I know
48 specifically I remember seeing Gloria at some of them.
49 And then we also were taking written scoping comments any
50 time, and still are if people want to, you know, give us

1 additional comments.

2

3 Then after we consolidated all those
4 comments into issues, and we come out with alternative
5 review. And that happened this past summer. We went
6 back and had another series of public meetings, and we
7 presented these alternatives. Now at the stage we're at,
8 we're taking those alternatives that have been commented
9 at a series of public meetings, and now we're reworking
10 those, tweaking them, doing what we need to do to get out
11 a draft RMP. And currently we're planning on having that
12 draft resource management plan out sometime in January.
13 It might be a little bit earlier. It might be mid
14 January, but sometime in January we think we'll have a
15 draft RMP.

16

17 After that there will be a minimum of a
18 30-day public comment period, and then at some point
19 after that, we'll have the final RMP out.

20

21 Now, as I said before, these public
22 meetings, we had 50 of them total, over 50, so at these
23 public meetings, this is the list of resources that
24 people came up with. You know, I'm not saying that
25 everybody had the, but that they're all that came up. So
26 -- and it doesn't say that everybody agreed on them, but
27 these are the things that people thought were important.

28

29

30 And we took these resources and resource
31 uses and tried to categorize them into seven issues. So
32 here are the seven issues. Tribal management. I'll just
33 read these off for the people that can't see. Tribal
34 management, which includes OHV use. Recreation
35 management. Protection of resource values. Land tenure
36 adjustments. Vegetation management. Mineral exploration
37 and development. And, of course, subsistence.

38

39 So, let's see. Now, we took those, and
40 the issues are what drives your alternatives. If
41 something is an issue, that means there's two ways to
42 look at it, and those then are what drives the
43 alternatives. So we came up with four alternatives, A
44 through D, and A is the no action alternative, which
45 means that we would continue management of the BLM lands,
46 we would continue management under the 1980 management
47 plan that we currently have. So nothing would change.
48 Alternative B tends to favor resource development.
49 Alternative C tends to favor resource conservation. And
50 alternative D is a mix of both, which is the preferred

1 alternative.

2

3 Now, I also want to say that just because
4 we call this the preferred alternative doesn't mean that
5 this is going to be the decision that's made. It's the
6 one we'd prefer at the time, but that's always subject to
7 change based on public input and other things. So that's
8 why we want to get this out to you early, get some
9 comments on it. Also, once the decision-maker makes a
10 decision, the decision-maker can take different parts out
11 of A, B, C, and D and make -- the final plan could have
12 components out of all four of these. So it's not binding
13 -- just because we call something the preferred
14 alternative, it's not binding. It's not binding until
15 the decision-maker signs it.

16

17 Now, I want to take you through these
18 seven -- the seven issues. I'm going to take you through
19 them one-by-one, and talk about some of the differences.
20 So this is the issue, tribal management, and then over
21 here, A, B, C, D, these are the four alternatives.
22 Remember, A being the status quo, D being the preferred.

23

24

25 Now, tribal management and mostly -- you
26 know, this includes road building, if there is any, but
27 it also -- mostly what concerns people about tribal
28 management is OHV use. And people were all over the
29 board when we had these public meetings. The public
30 recognizes that ATV use is a big issue, and wants the BLM
31 to address it. Now, how we address it, you know,
32 everybody has a different idea. Some people hate ATVs
33 and don't think there should be any allowed, and other
34 people think it should be unlimited.

35

36 So our preferred alternative is what's
37 called limited based on resource protection. Limited
38 means that there will be some limitations put on, but we
39 haven't -- the limitations won't be defined until later,
40 and they'll be based on this resource protection.

41

42 There's three categories of OHV
43 restrictions. Open, limited and closed. Open means you
44 can take anything anywhere. Closed means you can't take
45 anything anywhere. And limited means you can take ATVs
46 with some restrictions. So, for example, the Tangle
47 Lakes Archaeological District is an example of limited.
48 It's open, you can take ATVs on existing trails. So the
49 preferred alternative at this time is to categorize
50 everything right now as limited with -- that you can take

1 ATVs anywhere on existing trails as they are now.

2

3 I just wanted to follow up on that some
4 more, here again is the definition of limited, and talk a
5 little bit about the State and Native selected lands.
6 These recommendations at this time do not apply to State
7 and Native selected lands. Now, if the selecting entity
8 is willing to work with BLM, if they have some interest
9 in limiting ATVs or that kind of thing, then we are more
10 than willing to cooperate with whoever has selected that
11 land to help facilitate whatever they'd to see on it,
12 once that land's transferred.

13

14 And the important thing here I want to
15 point out about this is the distinction will be made
16 between summer and winter use and subsistence use. So
17 right now we have no plans at all to limit anybody's
18 subsistence use of ATVs. So whether it be for berry
19 picking, or -- this is purely recreational use of ATVs,
20 not subsistence use.

21

22 Recreation management. I'm not going to
23 spend a whole lot of time on this, because this doesn't
24 really affect the subsistence as much. But we
25 essentially, because again, you know, ATVs, OHVs are a
26 big issue, we've identified either special recreation
27 management areas where we would emphasize different
28 things. You know, some people want a quality wilderness
29 experience where they don't see anybody for three days.
30 And so we're trying to provide those, that type of
31 experience on some lands. Other lands, the Denali
32 Highway for example, you know, it obviously a very scenic
33 route, heavily used. In that kind of place, you know, we
34 can't manage for that wilderness experience.

35

36 So we've come up with these SRMAs, or
37 special recreation management areas to guide the
38 activities that we expect in some of those. And the four
39 SRMAs are, you know, if you look at this area here, the
40 Delta Range SRMA, Delta River, which is a wild and scenic
41 river, the Denali Highway, the Gulkana River, again a
42 wild and scenic river, and then that Tielke block, which
43 is down in the Federal hunting area. It's got a lot of
44 heli-skiing going on it, and it's also a real popular
45 back country ski where people like to go in on cross
46 country skis and get away from the motorized. So I'm not
47 going to go into what each one of these offer, but if you
48 -o- but I'll tell you where you can find it, and you can
49 see where each one of these, what alternative it's in.

50

1 The next thing, protection of the
2 resource values. The other thing, when you look at
3 protection of resource values, there's -- we have what's
4 called ACECs or areas of critical environmental concern.
5 So in alternative C, which is, remember, the heavily
6 towards resource protection, in alternative C, we'd
7 designated three ACECs and one resource natural area.

8
9 These ACECs, the next slide will tell you
10 what those are. You know, the Nelchina caribou calving
11 ACEC. West Fork ACEC. And Delta bison ACEC. The
12 Nelchina caribou calving ACEC, that is designed to give
13 some protection to the Nelchina caribou calving grounds,
14 to limit some of the disturbance in there just during
15 that critical time when the caribou are calving. The
16 West Fork ACEC is for moose and the trumpeter swans. A
17 very large population of trumpeter swans. High density
18 trumpeter swans. And also a pretty good -- there's some
19 of the best moose areas that we have is in that West
20 Fork. Delta bison calving, that's up actually in Unit
21 20(D) off of Federal hunting areas.

22
23 But in alternative C, these would be
24 enforced -- or enacted rather. In alternative D, which
25 is the preferred alternative, we wouldn't designate these
26 as ACECs, but we would have the next level down level of
27 protection, so, for example, instead of an ACEC for
28 Nelchina caribou calving, we would have a Nelchina
29 caribou calving grounds habitat management plan that
30 wouldn't be as restrictive or as binding.

31
32 The next is land tenure adjustments. And
33 I want to talk about this, because, you know, on the
34 surface, you'd think, well, this doesn't really affect
35 subsistence hunting, but actually it does. This land
36 tenure adjustments, this is mainly geared toward that
37 Slana area, and I don't think anybody here is probably
38 real familiar with that, but the Slana area is the last
39 area that the BLM Glennallen District allowed
40 homesteading. And so, you know, this chunk of land was
41 dedicated to homesteading. Well, people homesteaded on
42 it, and they might have defaulted on it, or whatever.
43 And so it's just been kind of -- it's been hard to manage
44 from that respect, you know, some trespass issues, not
45 intentional trespass, but if somebody defaults on their
46 homestead, you know, they might leave a half-finished
47 house or something on public lands which then becomes a
48 burden to us to clean it up. So we're looking at how to
49 handle that.

50

1 And technically those lands, once they
2 revert back to BLM management, technically those lands
3 are opened to Federal subsistence hunting, even though
4 it's kind of a residential area, and it's not something
5 that we advertise. So we're looking at how to treat
6 that. Also, the Village of Mentasta has some interest in
7 that. If you look, the preferred alternative, we're
8 looking at making those lands available for disposal, and
9 disposal, I don't mean throwing them in the trash can. I
10 mean by, you know, available for disposal to transfer
11 them to someone else, either open them up for
12 homesteading again, or public sales. We're not going to
13 open them up to homesteading I don't think. But either
14 public sale or land swap potentially. The Village of
15 Mentasta has some interest in possibly doing something
16 there.

17
18 The other thing that -- reason that
19 affects Federal subsistence hunting is because when that
20 does, if it becomes open for disposal or to sale to the
21 sale, then that's a potential area that people could be
22 moving into. You know, it could possibly increase the
23 use of the subsistence resources. I don't think so,
24 because most of, you know, the good land has been taken
25 by the homesteaders, and, you know, the uninhabited land
26 is about all that's left. But it's just something to be
27 aware of.

28
29 Vegetation, fire management, I'm not
30 going to -- I'll just leave it up there and let you
31 glance over it. It really doesn't affect this as much.
32 This kind of thing is going to facilitate things like the
33 prescribed burn that just happened. In fact, that's a
34 picture of the prescribed burn that we just did.

35
36 And mineral exploration and development.
37 Again, I'm going to -- this is a very convoluted
38 scenario. If anybody has any questions on it, I've got
39 my notes that we'll look through, but -- and I'll try to
40 explain it as best I can, but basically a whole series of
41 ANILCA and different public lands orders have made
42 different areas on the district either opened to oil and
43 gas or to surface mining, and some areas area open. Wild
44 and scenic rivers, portions of the wild rivers aren't
45 open, but the scenic rivers are, and that kind of thing.
46 And it's really complicated. And if you have any
47 questions, see me afterwards, and we'll dig through
48 everything, and I'll tell you everything you need to
49 know, but it's really complicated.

50

1 And finally the subsistence management.
2 And these I will spend a little more time on, just
3 because it's important, but obviously alternative A,
4 maintain current practices, current lands open for
5 subsistence. Alternative D is lands are retained,
6 including subsistence areas. So if the State or the
7 Native corporations drop their selections on those lands,
8 we'll bring those lands -- open them back up to
9 subsistence hunting. And then B and C are somewhere in
10 between. And this is -- what's important, you know, the
11 resource development, you know, would make it easier.
12 The mining, oil and gas exploration, you know, could
13 potentially affect some of those areas, you know, some of
14 the Federal hunting areas could be opened. And then C,
15 which, of course, is the resource protection, it wouldn't
16 affect subsistence hunting other than some potential ATV
17 restrictions at some point down the road. And again I
18 want to point out we don't -- we're not anticipating that
19 at this time. It's still an option by designating as
20 limited, but we're just not anticipating it applying to
21 subsistence hunting.

22
23 And I think that's it. Now, in closing,
24 I just want to, you know, point out our website here.
25 This is our website. It has all of this stuff in more
26 detail. It has, you know, written descriptions of a lot
27 of these alternatives that I just breezed through really
28 quick. And the next thing, the BLM has committed, I've
29 got Debbie Holland and Taylor Brelsford behind me here I
30 hope to confirm this, but we're committed to taking --
31 once the draft RMP is on the street sometime in January,
32 we are committed to coming to all of the affected
33 Councils, the Eastern Interior, the Southcentral and the
34 Southeast, and presenting, once that draft RMP is out,
35 presenting that draft RMP and the preferred alternative
36 once that draft comes out. And that 30-day comment
37 period, we're even going -- we're going to extend that to
38 whatever we need to extend it to so that that 30-day
39 period or whatever that period is, will overlap with
40 those Council meetings so that the Councils can get a
41 full-blown briefing, and you'll probably get it from our
42 planner who is much more familiar with this plan than I
43 am.

44
45 And with that, I'll take any questions
46 about this. Yes, Gloria.

47
48 MS. STICKWAN: Did you get more -- when
49 people gave comments, did they say alternative D most of
50 the time, or what alternative did they say?

1 MR. WATERS: Well, as you can imagine, it
2 was -- the comments were kind of all over. And
3 alternative D has also -- alternative D has changed
4 somewhat from when the alternatives went out to the
5 public comment early this summer, late spring.
6 Alternative D has changed since then. The alternative D
7 that I'm presenting is not the alternative D that was
8 presented four months ago, and that's changed based on
9 public input. I mean, people -- ACECs are a good
10 example, you know. ACECs, if you don't understand the
11 intent of an ACEC, you know, people, you know, might get
12 concerned. They think it's going to put some kind of
13 restrictions, you know, on something they've been doing.
14

15
16 So that's -- I don't know, does that
17 answer your question? I mean, we pick and choose the
18 parts of alternative D that we think the most people were
19 going to like. Alternative D will probably change more
20 over the next six weeks in fact.

21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions on
23 that, Gloria?

24
25 MS. STICKWAN: No.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
28 Elijah.

29
30 (No comments)

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you for the
33 presentation, Elijah, and we didn't make you wait until
34 last.

35
36 MR. WATERS: Yeah. Yeah. No questions,
37 because everybody's ready to go, I can tell.

38
39 (Laughter)

40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Would you talk to Donald
42 for the next meeting, and have him put you first on the
43 list so that you can't.....

44
45 MR. WATERS: Certainly.

46
47 MS. WELLS: We're going do a lottery for
48 the agenda.

49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, that's a good

1 idea. We'll just have them buy tickets.

2

3 (Laughter)

4

5 MR. ELVSAAS: See who wants to go home
6 first.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With that, we're
9 going to go on to the Council charter review. You'll
10 find it on Page 136. Donald, are you going to facilitate
11 that or am I?

12

13 MR. MIKE: Yes, I'll.....

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You are. Good.

16

17 MR. MIKE: I'll introduce it, Mr. Chair,
18 thank you. The Council charters are up for review every
19 two years on even numbered years, and this last charter
20 was signed by Secretary Norton back in September of 2002.
21 And this is an opportunity for the Regional Councils to
22 review the charter specifically the charter -- the
23 Council will have an opportunity, if they wish to do so,
24 to change the Council name, or change the number of
25 memberships, and any changes to the SRC appointments, and
26 certain criteria to remove memberships from the Regional
27 Advisory Council. So in your book you'll find it on Page
28 136. So -- and if the Council wished to do, they can
29 make recommendations to the Federal Subsistence Board on
30 the charter changes. And that's the briefing I have
31 there, Mr. Chair.

32

33 Thank you.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Having looked at the
36 charter, does any member of the Council see something
37 that they would like to change. I've only got one,
38 Donald, number 7, estimated operating costs. I think we
39 need to raise that to about 200,000 instead of 100,000.
40 I don't know if that's within our prerogative though,
41 so.....

42

43 MR. MIKE: Right. Yeah, the only thing
44 that the Council can change right now is the Council
45 name, the number of membership, SRC appointments, and
46 criteria to remove members from the Council.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

49

50 MR. MIKE: But all the language -- the

1 other language are pretty much standard format.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I realize that, but I
4 thought it was worth a try. I know we just went through
5 changing the number of members of the Council, and we
6 looked at the rest of it. I have nothing myself that I
7 would see that I needed to change on it, but if any other
8 member of the Council sees something that they would like
9 to see brought before the rest of the Council to change,
10 we can do that at this point in time. Otherwise we can
11 recommend that the charter just be renewed as is.

12

13 And a resolution to that effect -- I
14 mean, a resolution of one kind or another would be in
15 order. Fred.

16

17 MR. ELVSAAS: I just have one question.
18 I've been on the Council quite a while now. I still
19 can't remember when the terms are up. Are they fall
20 meeting, spring meeting or.....

21

22 MS. WELLS: December 2nd. At the bottom
23 of the Page 137.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Susan, what did it say?

26

27 MR. ELVSAAS: It says the length of the
28 terms, but it doesn't say the starting dates and ending
29 dates.

30

31 MS. WELLS: Well, it says the term of
32 office at the bottom of 137. Each member of the Council
33 will serve a three-year term, with the term ending on
34 December 2nd of the appropriate year, unless the member
35 of the Council resigns prior.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: December 2nd.

38

39 MR. ELVSAAS: Okay. Thank you.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions or
42 comments. A motion to pass a resolution to.....

43

44 MS. STICKWAN: I have a question.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:do we accept -- oh,
47 you have a question, Gloria.

48

49 MS. STICKWAN: It says we're going to
50 serve three-year terms under this.

1 MR. MIKE: Pardon?
2
3 MS. STICKWAN: We serve three-year terms
4 under this charter?
5
6 MR. MIKE: Yes, it says three-year terms,
7 unless the appointing -- the Secretary says otherwise. A
8 couple -- or last year or the year before we had terms
9 that were for a seat that was vacant, and the new Council
10 member served the remaining seat, until you can get
11 reappointed, you'll be serving three-year terms in
12 staggering -- I mean, staggering years. So if you're a
13 new appointment from last year, so I believe it was last
14 year you got appointed, so you'll serve a three-year term
15 I believe. I'll have to double check our records and
16 make sure.
17
18 MS. STICKWAN: I thought my seat was a
19 two-year term.
20
21 MR. MIKE: I'll get back to you on that.
22
23 MS. WELLS: It may have been because we
24 just added the five different people, right?
25
26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Yeah, Susan, when
27 we added them, we added them with staggered terms so that
28 everybody didn't run out at the same time. And that's
29 what they did at the original, too. We started with one-
30 year, two-year, and three-year terms, but then upon the
31 renewal, it goes to a three-year term. Otherwise
32 everybody would run out at the same time. And so I think
33 that's -- you were going to speak to that, Tim.
34
35 MR. JENNINGS: Mr. Chair, that's exactly
36 what I was going to speak to. You're correct. The idea
37 is that we want -- the way it's set up, is approximately
38 a third of the Council member seats would come up
39 annually. But when we added the seats, rather than add
40 everybody for three-year terms, there was a staggering,
41 so now this next coming year and beyond, we'll be back to
42 where approximately a third of the seats will come up
43 every year. So it's to keep that staggering of terms.
44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Tom.
46
47 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chair, I move we
48 recommend the Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional
49 Advisory Council's charter remain the same at this time.
50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second.
2
3 MR. WILSON: Second.
4
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
6 seconded that we move that the Southcentral Alaska
7 Subsistence Regional Advisory Council's charter remain
8 the same. Any discussion.
9
10 (No comments)
11
12 MR. CARPENTER: Question.
13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question's been
15 called. All in favor signify by saying aye.
16
17 IN UNISON: Aye.
18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
20 saying nay.
21
22 (No opposing votes)
23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. We're
25 on to No. 14, other business. We're only one block away
26 from No. 15.
27
28 Council topics for January 2, '05 Board
29 meeting. Tim, have you got anything for us on that, or
30 is that something that needs to come from our Council?
31
32 MR. JENNINGS: Mr. Chair, that's -- as
33 you know, normally you attend that Board meeting.
34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right.
36
37 MR. JENNINGS: And at that Board meeting
38 in January the Board will decide on the fisheries
39 regulatory proposals that you covered in your meeting,
40 the recommendations that you made, also the studies that
41 you discussed with Doug McBride and the Fisheries
42 information services program.
43
44 There's also an opportunity, as you know,
45 Mr. Chair, to bring other items of interest from this
46 Council to the Board's attention, and so that's what this
47 is about. If there's anything that the Council would
48 like to bring forward to that meeting, this is an
49 opportunity to discuss that.
50

1 MS. WELLS: Mr. Chair.
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, Susan.
4
5 MS. WELLS: Yes, I would like to bring
6 this Cook Inlet customary and traditional subsistence
7 fisheries assessment final report back before the body
8 for further discussion in our winter meeting, so that we
9 can read over it some more and maybe have -- I'd like to
10 have that put on the agenda.
11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. That's for future
13 meeting topics. This is for topics that you might want
14 me to take to the Board meeting in January at this point
15 in time. But I agree with you that that should be on our
16 agenda for our next meeting also.
17
18 But does anybody have any topics
19 particularly that they'd like taken to the Board. We
20 don't have the same -- we used to have a Council Chairs
21 meeting with the Board. We don't have that any more
22 because of FACA regulations, but we do have the
23 opportunity at the Board meeting to bring up topics that
24 are of interest to our Council that aren't on the -- you
25 know, that aren't on the proposals that they're going to
26 be acting on. Gloria.
27
28 MS. STICKWAN: I'd like to see better
29 maps, and they have the capabilities today to show Native
30 corporation lands on these maps. I'd like to see that on
31 the maps.
32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: For when we're having
34 our discussions in our meetings, or just in general.
35
36 MS. STICKWAN: Well, in the booklets.
37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: In the booklets. Okay.
39 That's a real good one. So that would be like for the
40 booklets in our meetings, and for like what they hand out
41 for the caribou hunt and things like that.
42
43 MS. STICKWAN: Yeah, these booklets right
44 here.
45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Good.
47
48 MR. JENNINGS: Mr. Chair, we can look at
49 that at our office. Maybe this clarification will also
50 help. The Native lands are in terms of the take or the

1 harvest of fish and wildlife is under the State of
2 Alaska's management, under their regulations in terms of
3 setting harvest limits and such. Of course, the access
4 to those lands is controlled by the Native corporations.
5 So how it's depicted in our books right now is Federal
6 lands primarily, and then non-Federal lands.

7
8
9

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Uh-huh.

10 MR. JENNINGS: But we can look and see.
11 We have the GIS capability. We just -- we'll look and
12 see if we can put it on without making it too busy. Some
13 of these maps are pretty small. Now, what we can do, we
14 have larger maps that we bring, and we didn't to this
15 meeting, but typically we'll bring these big wall maps.
16 And we could look at adding it to that if that's helpful
17 to have at your meeting when you're discussing fish or
18 wildlife proposals. But that's kind of the background in
19 terms of how we display Federal versus non-Federal lands
20 in our books.

21
22

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I see what you're
23 getting at, Tim, is that we actually have no, I won't use
24 the word jurisdiction, but the regulations that we work
25 on have no effect on Native allotment lands, but I'm like
26 Gloria, if it was -- it would give us a better context of
27 what was in the area if we could see that. And even if
28 we didn't see that in anything except the big maps, that
29 would sure help, because we'd be able to put things in a
30 better context. But we don't pass any kind of
31 recommendations or regulations for anything that happens
32 on Native allotment land then.

33

34 MR. JENNINGS: That's correct. So what
35 I'll do though is go back and look into this question
36 further.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So like what Elijah was
39 talking about where he says there's 7.5 million acres of
40 BLM-managed lands, some of that's over-selected lands,
41 some of that's State selected lands, some is Native
42 selected land. That 5.5 million acres that's over-
43 selected, Native selected, State selected and all the
44 rest of it, that is not managed for subsistence hunting.
45 That is classed as if it was other land then. And the
46 only part that's classed for hunting is the 1.5 million
47 acres that is clear title.

48

49 MR. JENNINGS: Since Elijah's not at the
50 microphone, I'll just indicate that he's nodding in

1 agreement, yes, that's how it's managed.
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Okay. Any other
4 subjects that somebody would like brought before the
5 Board. Susan.
6
7 MS. WELLS: I thought there was something
8 earlier, but I can't think of what it was.
9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, let me tell you,
11 if anybody thinks of something -- Gloria.
12
13 MS. STICKWAN: Who's going to do the
14 resolution for the research. Is that U.S. Fish and
15 Wildlife is going to do that?
16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The resolution for the
18 research -- the one that we passed, you mean?
19
20 MS. STICKWAN: Uh-huh.
21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, that will come
23 right out of the office.
24
25 MS. STICKWAN: Okay.
26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, do I need to sign
28 that?
29
30 MR. JENNINGS: Do we have the Chairs sign
31 those, Donald?
32
33 MR. MIKE: Yes, I believe we do. When I
34 get back to the office, I'll jot the resolution up and
35 share it with the Staff and the rest of the Council
36 members, and I'll need an updated address and e-mail
37 address from the Council members so I can share it among
38 the Council members.
39
40 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Well, hearing no
43 other topic, if anybody comes up with a topic that they
44 feel that I should bring before the Board before I go
45 there in January, let me know.
46
47 Future meeting plans. We need to decide
48 the time and the location for the next meeting. And if
49 we go look on the back page, we see a calendar. And I
50 think the calendar's got some windows on it.

1 MR. JENNINGS: Mr. Chairman, the first
2 thing is to look at Page 139 and just reconfirm your
3 winter meeting as March 15 through 17 in Anchorage.
4
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, the window's already
6 there.
7
8 MR. JENNINGS: That's what you had
9 discussed at your last meeting.
10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.
12
13 MR. JENNINGS: And if you would reconfirm
14 that, you could do that by unanimous consent, unless
15 there are changes.
16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Unless there's a need
18 for changes, do we have unanimous consent to stick with
19 March 15th, 16th, and 17th.
20
21 (No objections)
22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing no objection,
24 that's when our meeting will be, and it will be in
25 Anchorage.
26
27 Now we need to come up with one for fall
28 at this point in time.
29
30 MR. MIKE: Yes, Mr. Chair.
31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Let's take a look
33 at.....
34
35 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair.
36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Donald.
38
39 MR. MIKE: Just before you get started on
40 -- that's for fall 2005 meeting. We just need to avoid
41 the other region meetings, because we share staff with
42 some of the Regional Advisory Councils. So the dates to
43 avoid is Bristol Bay, they meet on October 6 and 7th.
44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Bristol Bay is
46 October 6th and 7th.
47
48 MR. MIKE: Right. And Kodiak/Aleutians,
49 they meet September 20th and 21st.
50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: September 20th and 21st.
2
3 MR. MIKE: And Northwest Arctic, they
4 meet.....
5
6 MR. ELVSAAS: Who's on the 20th and 21st?
7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Kodiak/Aleutians. And
9 what?
10
11 MR. MIKE: Northwest Arctic meets on
12 October 17th. And Seward Peninsula October 12th and
13 13th. So we have some suggested dates for the
14 Southcentral Council to meet. And we have the dates open
15 from August 29th to September 2nd. Or September 6th
16 through September 9th. Or September 26th to September
17 30th. October 3rd to the 5th, and October 18th to the
18 21st. So those are suggested dates.
19
20 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
21
22 MS. WELLS: Can you say that again?
23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: October 3rd through
25 October 5th, September 26th through September 28th -- or
26 September 26th through September 30th. The rest of it's
27 all silver salmon season or.....
28
29 MS. WELLS: Moose hunting.
30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Moose hunting or caribou
32 hunting. The 18th of October.
33
34 MR. CARPENTER: But weren't those some of
35 the dates -- the 18, 19 and 20.
36
37 MR. MIKE: Right. October 18th through
38 the 21st. And the other.....
39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's a good idea to
41 me, but.....
42
43 MR. ELVSAAS: What's that?
44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I don't know about
46 everybody else. October 18th, 19th and 20th, somewhere
47 in that neighborhood.
48
49 MR. MIKE: Yeah, the Kodiak/Aleutians
50 meet on the 20th and 21st of September.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, they're in
2 September.
3
4 MR. MIKE: Oh, we're talking about
5 October 18th.
6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We're talking about
8 October at this point in time.
9
10 MR. MIKE: Right. Okay. I'm sorry.
11
12 MR. JENNINGS: Mr. Chair, is there a
13 possibility of the 19th, 20th and 21st of October? The
14 reason why I ask is we have staff who go to Northwest
15 Arctic on the 17th, on Monday. They think that that
16 meeting will be one day. It might spill over into the
17 second day. And that would give us time to come back and
18 be ready for your meeting on the 19th if that works for
19 you all.
20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So if we had
22 October 19th, 20th or 21st, October 3rd, 4th, 5th, or
23 September 27th, 28th, 29th. What's the choice of the
24 rest of the Council? Do we throw them in a hat, take a
25 vote. Fred.
26
27 MR. ELVSAAS: Mr. Chairman, this is the
28 meeting traditionally that we go to one of the outlying
29 areas. The winter meeting's in Anchorage. And we were
30 talking about possibly having a meeting scheduled for
31 Seldovia. If Staff could find out if there's enough
32 accommodations in Seldovia for everybody. There's two
33 hotels and a lot of bed and breakfasts, but the later in
34 October it is, the less chance there is that the bed and
35 breakfasts are going to be open. I would like to propose
36 that Staff look at the accommodations and look at the
37 week of October 3rd. That's probably as late as we'd
38 want to do it. That's out for you?
39
40 MR. SHOWALTER: Yes.
41
42 MR. ELVSAAS: See, we're going to run
43 into this. We do this every meeting I think. We shoot
44 dates out and then we shoot them down.
45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.
47
48 MR. ELVSAAS: But in any event, I would
49 like to throw that out for consideration, you know, it's
50 a little late in the season, you know. August is the

1 ideal time for Seldovia, but we're supposed to be meeting
2 talking subsistence, not fishing, but -- so anyway, with
3 that, I guess we'd have to look at a different date then
4 if that's out for people. But I believe I'm available
5 myself for any of these suggested dates.

6
7 Thank you.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other comments from
10 anybody else.

11
12 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair.

13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Donald.

15
16 MR. MIKE: The other dates to avoid is
17 September 26th to September 29th. I believe that's
18 Southeast going to be meeting. So that was the region
19 that we want to avoid also.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, September 26th
22 through 29th avoid?

23
24 MR. MIKE: Right.

25
26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. That's Southeast.

27
28 MR. MIKE: And I know there are some
29 Council members that would like to attend the Board of
30 Fisheries meeting. There's a winter 2005 schedule for
31 the Board of Fisheries to meet February 20th through the
32 26th. And that will be Southeast long fish, crab, shrimp
33 and miscellaneous shellfish in Juneau. They'll be
34 meeting in Juneau.

35
36 MS. WELLS: February you said?

37
38 MR. MIKE: Right. February 20th through
39 26th. And March 17th through 25th the Board of Fisheries
40 will be meeting on statewide issues. And the fall of
41 2005, October 13th through the 14th, the Board of
42 Fisheries will have a work session in Anchorage.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So that kind of leaves
45 us with the 3rd, 4th and 5th that James can't come to,
46 and the 19th, 20th and 21st which might be a little hard
47 to go to Seldovia. Or we have to go way earlier in
48 September, and that would probably leave Tom out and
49 possibly myself.

50

1 MR. ENCELEWSKI: And leave me out.
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And leave you out, too,
4 Gilbert. James.
5
6 MR. SHOWALTER: What about September
7 19th.
8
9 MS. DOWNING: Your microphone.
10
11 MR. SHOWALTER: Yes. What about
12 September 19th you mentioned?
13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: September 19th.
15
16 MR. CARPENTER: It's moose season.
17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I definitely know where
19 I'll be on September 19th.
20
21 MR. ELVSAAS: You'll have it by then.
22 It'll be hanging up.
23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, I can come anytime,
25 but.....
26
27 MR. CARPENTER: Well, Mr. Chair, if we
28 actually -- have we actually picked a place to have the
29 meeting? I mean, that would make a lot of.....
30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We could pick the date
32 and then see if the place is available. And if the place
33 isn't available, we'll have to take an alternate place
34 this time.
35
36 MR. ELVSAAS: Right. That's what we did
37 with Cantwell.
38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's what we did with
40 Cantwell. So why don't we try that then. So let's --
41 James, you can make it on the 19th, 20th and 21st, right?
42
43 MR. SHOWALTER: Well, the 26th, if that
44 was open, yeah.
45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The 26th of September?
47
48 MR. SHOWALTER: Uh-huh.
49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's Southeastern.

1 MR. SHOWALTER: Okay.
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's out. So we
4 actually -- unless we want to go early in September,
5 we've got October 3rd, 4th, and 5th, or October 19th,
6 20th, and 21st.
7
8 MR. BLOSSOM: That's a better time. Get
9 through all the fall fishing and hunting and.....
10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: 19th, 20th, and 21st.
12 That's better for.....
13
14 MR. ENCELEWSKI: You could get a bed and
15 breakfast open.
16
17 MR. ELVSAAS: If you go the early part of
18 September. Or there's no accommodations.
19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Greg.
21
22 MR. ENCELEWSKI: For me, I have a one-
23 year term expiring here in December, so I'm not going to
24 comment on it, but I work a week on, a week off. And if
25 I wasn't reappointed I would be busy the 3rd through the
26 8th and the 17th through the 21st. But I would make
27 accommodations to make this meeting. I would do a swap.
28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.
30
31 MR. CARPENTER: Do we need a motion or
32 what?
33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, we need a motion
35 to put one on the table for Donald to see if he can work
36 it out and -- Tom.
37
38 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chair, I move we
39 schedule our fall meeting '05 for the 19th, 20, 21st of
40 October, and maybe we could have Donald see if Seldovia
41 has enough accommodations. If so, we could schedule it
42 there. If not, we could schedule it at another town at
43 the same -- during the same time frame.
44
45 MS. WELLS: Second.
46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
48 seconded. Any discussion.
49
50 (No comments)

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question's in order.
2
3 MR. CARPENTER: Question.
4
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question's been
6 called. All in favor signify by saying aye.
7
8 IN UNISON: Aye.
9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
11 saying nay.
12
13 (No opposing votes)
14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Now we have one
16 more little thing.
17
18 MS. WELLS: Well, any suggestions for a
19 second alternative before.....
20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's what I was going
22 to say. If we can't get to Seldovia, do we want to try
23 another outlying place, or do we want to do like we've
24 done sometimes in the past and just said that if we
25 can't, we can take Anchorage, because Anchorage is more
26 central. But has anybody else got -- I mean, we tried
27 Cantwell. We can't get Cantwell late, we know that.
28 We've tried that. Another area would be the Copper
29 Basin. We've been to Cordova just recently.
30
31 Barbara, you're jumping up like you have
32 something you want to tell us. Denali National Park.
33
34 MS. CELLARIUS: Barbara Cellarius from
35 Wrangell-St. Elias National Park. I'd be happy to work
36 with Donald if you guys wanted to come to the Copper
37 Basin Area and help figure out a place. I'm pretty sure
38 we've got accommodations. We have two hotels that are
39 open year round.
40
41 MS. WELLS: Sounds good to me.
42
43 MR. ELVSAAS: Where at?
44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What?
46
47 MR. ELVSAAS: Where at?
48
49 MS. CELLARIUS: So if you wanted to come
50 to the Copper Basin, I can -- I'd be happy to help with

1 Donald in terms of figuring out a location. There are a
2 number of village halls that might be available. I'm not
3 quite sure whether we can accommodate a RAC meeting in
4 our theater, but we could talk about that potential.
5 There are hotels available in both Glennallen and Copper
6 Center that are open year round, so I don't think the
7 date in late October would be a problem from that
8 standpoint.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I see what you -- and we
11 would just have it in the area. We don't need to pick a
12 community at this point in time then.

13

14 MS. CELLARIUS: Yeah, I think if you, you
15 know -- I'm not sure what the best accommodation would be
16 for a meeting hall, but there are a number of places
17 available. I know that Tazlina's got a hall where we've
18 had an SRC meeting. And I guess the point I wanted to
19 make is that there are hotels available at that time of
20 the year, and I'm not sure when the Council last met in
21 the Glennallen area.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been a long time.
24 The last time we met, we met at Copper Center at their
25 hall, and that was quite a while ago. So if we can't go
26 to Seldovia, Copper Basin would probably be a good place
27 to go, and either somewhere in the Glennallen, Copper
28 Center area if that would be -- you know, if we could
29 come up with anything. Does that sound good to you,
30 Gloria? Do you have any good ideas? We don't get a trip
31 to town that way though. Yeah, I think if that's okay
32 with everybody, that would be a good alternative. So
33 let's shoot for that then.

34

35 MR. ENCELEWSKI: There's -- Ninilchik
36 would be more than willing. That time of year, there's
37 probably not a lot of accommodations. A lot of bed and
38 breakfasts around there that are open though. And, of
39 course, it's close to town here, so people could make
40 that accommodation.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, that would be my
43 only objection Ninilchik is the fact that were here this
44 year, you know. I mean, it's almost like we're in the
45 back door right now, and we haven't been in the Copper
46 Basin for a while, and some place like Seldovia is out
47 far enough that we don't normally get to those kind of
48 places very easy, so it would be nice to go there.

49

50 MR. ELVSAAS: I poach there, too.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Huh?
2
3 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Fred said that he
4 poaches occasionally there, too, so it would be okay.
5
6 (Laughter)
7
8 MR. ELVSAAS: Yeah, that's the north end
9 of Seldovia. Ninilchik.
10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.
12
13 MR. ELVSAAS: You know, I've just got to
14 say it's kind of ironic, you know, Seldovia is
15 questionable as to accommodations. Cantwell is right on
16 the highway. It's kind of questionable, and we tried
17 there before and we couldn't get there. We never had any
18 trouble at Mentasta Lake.
19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No. Yeah. Okay. With
21 that, any other topics or issues that anybody on this
22 Council wants to bring up at this point in time. You've
23 got the next 30 seconds or hold your peace. No, you've
24 got as long as you want.
25
26 (No comments)
27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But if you have no other
29 topics or issues, then there's only one other issue on
30 the table.
31
32 MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chair, I move we
33 adjourn.
34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I've had a motion to
36 adjourn. Do I hear a second.
37
38 MS. WELLS: Second.
39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moves and
41 seconded to adjourn. The meeting's adjourned.
42
43 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

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 148 through 285 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 13th day of October 2004, beginning at the hour of 8:30 o'clock a.m. in Kenai, 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 19th day of October 2004.

Joseph P. Kolasinski
Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 03/12/2008 _