SOUTHCENTRAL FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
PUBLIC MEETING

VOLUME III

MARRIOTT HOTEL
Anchorage, Alaska
March 17, 2005
8:30 o'clock a.m.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ralph Lohse, Chairman
Doug Blossom
Tom Carpenter
Gilbert Dementi
Fred Elvsaas
Richard Greg Encelewski
Pete Kompkoff.
Harley McMahan.
James Showalter
Gloria Stickwan
Dean L. Wilson, Jr.

Regional Coordinator, Donald Mike

Recorded and transcribed by:

Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
3522 West 27th Avenue
Anchorage, AK 99517
907-243-0668
jpk@gci.net

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Anchorage, Alaska - 3/17/2005)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We're going to start with the report from Doug McBride. It's number -- I've got to open my book to find out. But it's No. 15 in your agenda. Thank you, Doug.

MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, members of the Council, thank you very much. For the record, my name is Doug McBride. I'm with the Office of Subsistence Management, Fisheries Information Services.

And I'll try to be mercifully brief here this morning. There are couple of things though that I wanted to brief the Council on.

First, I'll just be giving a brief overview of performance in the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program. That report is in your book, and it starts -- the cover page for it starts on Page 128, with the text starting on Page 129.

After that I will be giving you just a brief update on the strategic planning exercise that we recently completed. This is not in your book, and you received a fairly small executive summary. It was just put in front of you here a couple minutes ago, and I will be going over that after we're done talking about the monitoring program.

And then at the conclusion of that, we have a presentation by two of our investigators on the Copper River chinook assessment programs that we've been doing. Keith Van der Broek with Native Village of Eyak and Audra Brase with Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Sport fish Division.

Mr. Chairman, just to give you a brief background about where we're at with the monitoring program, if you look at the information on Page 129, there's information there about the finances of the -- the monitoring program. It's hard to talk about the monitoring program without spending a little bit of time talking about where we're at monetarily.

Those numbers that you see in the middle

of the page, what that represents is the amount of money available for new projects, new project consideration each year. So you can see that the program started off in 2000 with an initial investment of two and a half million, then in 2001 we got what we consider our full annual appropriation of a little over $7 million. And then you see varying amounts of money after that.

And the way we do -- or the way we administer the monitoring program, when we start a new project, we allow project commitments of up to three years. And that's why that amount of money is varying from year to year for new projects, because the total dollars aren't changing. It's the amount of money that's not already spoken for that is changing.

So what you can see is in 2001 we allocated all the dollars that were available for us for at least one year, but a lot of those projects went out two and three years, and so you see smaller amounts of money in 2002 and 2003. Then when 2004 happened, all -- virtually all of the money that had been spoken for, if you will, in 2001, all those commitments were expired, because that would have been three years later. So we had a lot of money to consider new projects or continuing old projects if you will in 2004.

And in 2005, this is the program that was just -- the Board just approved at their Board meeting here a couple months ago in January.

And then in 2006, what we anticipate is really the smallest amount of money we've had since the inception of the program, $1.3 million. And for that money, we had a request for proposals in November. The Technical Review Committee just met this week, and programs were evaluated and projects were forwarded -- some of the projects were forwarded for investigation plan and we'll be coming back to you in your fall meeting with a recommendation of what the monitoring plan for 2006 ought to look like, at least from the Technical Review Committee's perspective.

Reviewing the existing program, probably at least for me the easiest way to summarize where we're at is if you go to the table on Page 131, what you'll see there -- and I'm sorry, small print. By next year we're going to have to switch this to two pages. But what we've got there is a summary of all the projects that the monitoring program has funded since its inception.

And the way to read this table, if you start at the far left-hand side, you'll see just project number. That's just a coded number for each project, that for use makes each project unique.

Then the next column is data type, and there's two data types, and we've spoken about these before. There's SST, which stands for stock status and trends, and HM/TEK, which stands for harvest monitoring and traditional ecological knowledge. And like I say, we use those acronyms to divide the program into data types if you will. Stock status and trends are projects that assess fish populations, largely, you know, through tagging or weirs or towers, and the like. Harvest monitoring and TEK are projects that assess subsistence fisheries largely and that document traditional ecological knowledge.

The third column is just the project title, and you'll also notice under that column we've divided the projects up by what we call subsistence fishery units. So that first grouping of projects, there's the heading Copper River Salmon. That's every project that we have done for Copper River Salmon. And then the next one is Copper River steelhead, and moving on down, Copper River freshwater species, and on and on. So we've divided those up by what we call just fishery units. And in fact that division, if you will, was one of the projects that came out of our strategic planning exercise that I'll be talking about in a little bit.

The fourth column over are the investigators. That's just acronyms of the organizations that are doing each of the projects. The first one is the lead or the principal investigator.

And then moving to the right of there, then there's the financial information. And those numbers are in thousands, so, you know, if you see something like 114.1, that's $114,100. And that's the amount of money for that project in each year of its existence.

And the way to figure out what we're funding right now, what is current right now, if you go over in that budget column, and the third from the end there is 2005. Any project that has a number under that column is something that is current right now, okay. So, for instance, the first one, moving down the list there would be Long Lake sockeye escapement. That has a number

in 2005. And what you'll see there is we've basically got virtually the entire program tied up in Copper River salmon, because that's where all those numbers lie.

There's one steelhead project that we just started. It's just going to re -- or, it's not going be restarted. It's going to start here this year. If you move down under Copper River steelhead, you'll see abundance, timing, distribution of Copper River steelhead, a two-year project commitment. It's just going to start this year.

And like I say, those were all the projects that are current right now. Everything else is stuff that we have done, and is -- has expired.

Mr. Chairman, if you look at the rest of this report, all the text starting on Page 230 is just a summary of the projects, where we're at with each current project by these fishery units. And I'm not going to spend a lot of time going through those. In fact, the reason we've asked Keith and Audra to give you a presentation on the Copper River chinook is if you look at this body of everything we've done here, that assessment program for chinook, I think it's very safe to say, has been the largest and most significant work that we've done. And we're very proud of it. And I don't want to steal their thunder, but they've got a lot of information that didn't exist three or four years ago in terms of abundance, timing, and distribution of chinook salmon. It's been a really major effort.

Like I say, going through the rest of it, the only other fishery unit if you will that has any current projects in it are Copper River steelhead, and what we're doing there is where we left steelhead from before was we had two -- we did assessment on the two largest known spawning locations, which are Dickey Lake in the Gulkana drainage, and Hanagita in the Tebay drainage. We had a very successful program looking at that. Basically what we concluded was spawning abundance of steelhead basically numbers in the low hundreds on an annual basis. And where that program was left is, well, are there other significant spawning populations of steelhead. And so that's what that project is going to be doing, is they're going to be radio-tagging steelhead, and it's kind of an add-on project, if you will, for the sockeye radio-tagging that's just going to start this year, which was part of the '05 program. And they're going to be looking to see if there are other significant

populations of steelhead outside of Dickey Lake and Hanagita.

Mr. Chairman, I'll pause there and see if there are any questions about the -- just the overview of the monitoring program.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Does anybody have any questions for Doug. Tom.

MR. CARPENTER: Yeah, Doug, thanks. I just wanted to just speak a little bit about the strategic planning session that we had that Gloria and I attended. Has there been anything initiated to complete -- is there going to be a completion of that project? I know you spoke before we left last fall that, you know, since it was such a large group of people, that you didn't know when that might take place. Is that maybe going to take place next fall or just do you have any idea on that?

MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Carpenter, yeah, the next subject will be to get into this. But I guess just to give a really brief overview, what you've got in front of you is an executive summary that comes from where the work group left their work after the -- what was it, the November work session that we had, or workshop that we had. I think at this point we're not planning any future workshops, at least certainly not next year. We're -- what we need to do is at least get some of the other regions around the state up to this point. What we've done so far is Southcentral and Bristol Bay. Bristol Bay has a very similar kind of product, and they had a very similar kind of effort. But by next year we hope to be doing a similar kind of program for Southeast.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Gloria.

MS. STICKWAN: I was wondering what happened to the harvest assessment projects that I think four villages put in from Copper River. What was their -- was there a weakness in the description of the project or -- for the harvest assessment? The projects that were submitted by -- I think there was four villages. I'm not sure how many villages applied for it.

MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, Ms. Stickwan, I think you're referring to proposals that were recently received for the 2006 monitoring program. Yeah, to my

knowledge, there were several harvest monitoring projects that were submitted for 2006. I don't believe that any of those were forwarded for investigation plan. Yeah, I think there were some issues with those proposals, and I think the major one if I remember correctly is those proposals proposed to do some in-season harvest assessment.

And in fact we used the results out of the strategic planning workshop, because the work group very specifically spoke about the importance of in-season monitoring, and basically what the work group concluded was over the next three to five years, which was the planning horizon we were thinking of, they did not really foresee a need to go to the expense of in-season harvest assessments. So, like I say, when I get into this, I mean, we're already using the output of the strategic planning and that was one of the things that we went back and referenced.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pete.

MR. KOMPKOFF: Yeah, I have a question on the Copper River chinook abundance estimate. I noticed that project goes on to 2006, and pretty heavily funded. Could you tell me the reason for that?

MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Kompkoff, yes, like I say, the single biggest investment the monitoring program has made has been in assessment of Copper River chinook salmon. Prior to inception of this program, the assessment program for Copper River chinook was largely an aerial survey program, just looking at some selected spawning locations that they could actually physically see in the water up in the Copper River drainage.

What we've done through this program is we've done two things. We've funded a mark/recapture, or a tagging program to estimate the abundance of king salmon, and that's what Mr. Keith Van der Broek with Native Village of Eyak is going to be speaking about here shortly. And then the second thing that we did was we radio tagged some of those kings that we were catching in the fishwheels, which was the capture and recapture mechanism. And then track those radio tags so that we could figure out the distribution and the timing of the various spawning populations as they move through the Copper River, and that's what Audra Brase with Alaska Department of Fish and Game is going to be speaking

about.

We started that work in 2001, and so you'll see on that table that there are projects there that started in 2001, in fact that 01-020, feasibility of Copper River chinook abundance estimate, that was the initiation of that mark/recapture program, the big fishwheel program run by Native Village of Eyak. We funded that for three years through 2000 and -- let's see, 2003. And then as part of the 2004 monitoring plan, we received a proposal to continue that work, which we subsequently funded. So right now we have completed one, two, three, four years of study, and we've made a commitment for two more. And where that's going to lead, you know, in a couple more years, I'm not prepared to say right now.

MR. KOMPKOFF: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for Doug.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Doug, it's always interesting to look at what's been done and what's going on. Your table's pretty clear.

So like the projects that she was talking about, that's the one thing that as a Council we have to remember, that now the next fall then we start doing projects for 2006 is what comes in front of us. And all of these things just keep rolling over, and rolling over, and rolling over.

So we can see which projects by looking at this table are going to end, and when they're going to end, and have to decide whether we want to continue them or change them or use different projects on them. So I think it's a very good table.

Any other questions for Doug.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: With that, maybe we can go on to our.....

MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, members of the Council, what I'd like to cover right now then is just a

brief summary of the strategic planning exercise, and this is the exercise that Tom was just speaking about. When we evaluate project proposals and make recommendations for what to fund and what not to fund, we've already kind of framed in the criteria, if you will, of how we arrive at those conclusions and recommendations.

And specifically what we look at in FIS and with our Technical Review Committee, which is an interagency body of scientists if you will from the Federal and State agencies, what we look at are four evaluation criteria: strategic priority, technical and scientific merit, administrative expertise, and degree of capacity building. Those are the four evaluation criteria that we look at when we look at a project proposal.

The very first one, strategic priority, really is sort of a bar that you've got to get over to even be con -- for the rest of it to come into play. And what we mean by that is how important is that proposal for Federal subsistence management. And so the very first thing you've got to know about is whether it's connected to a subsistence fishery that has some connection to Federal public lands. In fact, that map behind you over there is a map of the Federal public lands on -- in Southcentral Alaska. So, for instance, you know, for us to consider a project let's say in the Susitna drainage largely is not going to get funded. It would be very hard to make a connection that that has any relevance, if you will, to a federal -- a subsistence fishery connected to Federal public lands. Projects obviously on the Copper River, Prince William Sound, that's largely what we're talking about in this region.

What we did -- or what we had before was we had the issues and information needs as laid out by the Council. That's what was used initially for this program. And in our view that really served us quite well to get the program off the ground.

The reason we went into the strategic planning exercise is if you go back and look at the money, I mean, the money is -- the total dollars has stayed static since 2001, and what that really means is our buying power is going down. I mean, the cost of inflation and stuff will eat into that.

So what we were compelled to do is to go

through a much more rigorous if you will exercise to figure out what's important for the monitoring program, and the whole impetus behind doing that was to stretch the dollars. It's to ensure that we maintain, keep the program focused on the highest informational needs for Federal subsistence management.

So to do that, what we did was we formed a work group and we invited technical representatives from basically the obvious agencies and organizations from around Southcentral Alaska, and it wasn't just a governmental thing. I mean, it largely was, but not completely. In addition to that, we specifically asked for two members from this Council to serve on our work group, and we got two great members. We got Gloria Stickwan and Tom Carpenter, and they both served on this work group and participated, you know, in both workshops in producing this.

Now, what you have in front of you is the executive summary of the work that we did. The final report is 90 pages long. The reason that it's so long is a lot of it is kind of a reference document, and I'll talk about some of the reference material in a minute that's in there, but one of the reviewers told me that it took gallons of coffee, handfuls of sugar, and electroshock therapy to finish the review on it, and so I didn't want to subject you to all that. But I can certainly make the full report available if you want it. But I thought for today's purposes, just going through an executive summary was what made more sense.

So if you look at this executive summary, I'll just kind of hit a couple of the highlights that are in here. That table at the bottom of Page 1 simply lays out the time line of what we did, and what you'll see there was we held a workshop just a little less than a year ago in April. Then we produced a draft document from that. That was sent out for public review.

This council reviewed that document at our request, and provided review comments last fall. Then in November, and this is the workshop that Tom was talking about, the work group reconvened. We addressed those review comments, and then we did several other strategic planning exercises to get us to where we're at today.

What I'd like to do right now then is go through some of the work products that we got out of this

strategic planning exercise.

If you turn to Page 3, what you'll see there is a graph of the subsistence fishery units. And these are the same subsistence fishery units that I talked about in the table in the performance report in your book.

And one of the first things that the work group did was they identified these fishery units, and then they prioritized them. And the prioritization is in terms of information needed for federal subsistence management. That's what we're doing here. So what you'll see there at the very top of that graph is Copper River salmon, and obviously the work group very strongly felt that Copper River salmon was of the highest priority for information needs for Federal subsistence management. And, I mean, that's not a big surprise to anybody. In fact, if you look at the history of our program, I mean, that's what we talked about. Most of the program has been centered on Copper River salmon, and that's really no accident.

But you can see then the fishery units going down that graph and how the work group ranked their relative importance for information needs. And we find that a very useful exercise. And what that really means to us is that obviously we need to, you know, mostly be concerned about Copper River salmon, and as you move down the list there, obviously to lesser degree some of the fishery units. And that doesn't mean you never touch on those other fishery units, but what it really means is when you look at information needs within, say, a lower priority fishing unit, let's just say like the bottom one, Prince William Sound Delta freshwater species, it really needs to be a very compelling proposal and address a very compelling information need within that fishery unit to consider funding. That's the way we would use that information.

The next thing I'd like for you to look at is the table on Page 5. And what you'll see there is the framework that the work group came up with for dealing with Copper River salmon. And what you see there are kind of three columns of stuff. There's, you know, the column headings are goals, objectives, and information needs. And what that is, we went through a very rigorous and quite frankly iterative processes to go through this.

And what I mean by that is we kind of sort of peeled the onion if you will. You know, we took, you know, Copper River salmon and we tried to divide the informational needs up into its component parts. And to do that, we established goals which are kind of -- I'm not sure visionary is the right word, but visionary statements of what we're trying to accomplish, so that's what those three goals are on the left. And then for each goal, we formulated objectives, and objectives are measurable statements of purpose, if you will. And then for each objective, we then formulated information needs, and information needs are impediments to overcome to achieve that objective. And like I say, it's just kind of a way of peeling the onion or breaking the problem down that you're trying to address. It's a complex problem, trying to break it down into its component parts.

And so the key thing out of this figure are those information needs. Those are the specific information needs that the work group identified for Copper River salmon.

Then the next thing we asked the work group to do, if you turn to Page 6, you'll see this bar chart, and what we did then was we went -- again went through a very iterative comparative process where we looked at the relative importance of each information need in comparison to its brothers, if you will, within an objective, and ranked them. So what you get then is a relative order of priority for each information need. And it just goes from top to bottom, and it -- like I say, I think it provides a pretty good, you know, easily digestible picture of how things rank in relative importance to each other.

That's pretty where we left things after our first workshop. That's largely what we wrote up, and that you reviewed for us last fall.

Some of the new stuff that's happened since we spoke about this last I'm going to go over right now. If you look at the table on Page 7, what you'll see is -- what it's titled is the gap analysis for Copper River salmon. And what we asked the work group to do were two things. The first thing we asked them to do was what we called a project inventory for each fishery unit and information need.

And what we had with the work group was a

lot of -- or a tremendous amount of expertise and corporate memory of all the agencies and all the agencies and all the organizations that have assessed Copper River salmon over the years. And so what we did was for each of those 28 information needs, we said, okay, what projects either currently exist or have existed in the past that are still providing relevant information today that address that information need. So we're trying to figure out for each information need, where have we been. And we went through that, and that's one of the reference documents that's in the broader -- the full report, and it goes on for pages. But it's a summary of where we've been for each information need.

And then once we had that information, excuse me, we asked the work group then to rate the state of knowledge for that information need. So if you look at this table on Page 7, those columns that -- under state of knowledge, we asked them to rate each information need. Do we have adequate information? Is it partially known, or is it largely unknown? And those were subjective assessments by the work group based on that project inventory.

Then the next question that we asked was we said, okay, since we've kind of figured out where we've been, and we've categorized kind of where we're at today in terms of the state of knowledge, then we asked the work group the question, okay, well, what needs to be done? And there are really two answers to that question in a broad sense. Either we're okay, we don't need to consider any action, or we need to consider proposals for that information need. And that's what those last two columns are all about.

So based on all of that, we took that information, we overlaid it with that graph that we just spoke about that's on Page 6, and what you come up with is the bar chart on Page 8. And this bar chart on Page 8, like I say, it overlaps all the information needs in their rank order of importance, and kind of lays on top of that this gap analysis. And if you think about it as a sieve, you know, one going one way, one going the other way, what falls out the bottom is information needs in their rank order of importance for which we need to consider proposals for Copper River salmon. And the way to read this graph is the dark bars are the information needs that we think for right now, for 2006, we need to consider proposals, and the hatched bars are the information needs for which we think at least today we're

okay, that we can kind of lay those aside and put our limited dollars in the other areas. So that's what this graphs is all about.

What Tom was asking me about a little bit ago was, are we considering taking this work any further, because if you go through the rest of this executive summary, what you'll see here are just basically the framework for all of the other fishery units. We didn't get any of the other fishery units as far -- you know, to completion like we did Copper River salmon. What we did was we simply identified the goals, research objectives and information needs for all the other fishery units. And that was just a function of time. We spent our time on what we deemed most important, which was Copper River salmon. We brought that to conclusion, and then we kind of got everything else off the ground if you will.

At least for the foreseeable future, at least for the next year, it's out intent to leave it as it is right now. What we would like to do in the future is pick these other informa -- or excuse me, these other fishery units up and carrying them all the way to completion like we did Copper River salmon. But, again, that's just a function of time. I mean, I think both Gloria and Tom would tell you that those were fairly intensive workshops. There was three days last spring, there was two days this fall. It should have been three days. We could easily have spent another very productive day in that workshop. But it's basically just a function of time trying to get through this, because it is very iterative, and pretty labor and time intensive.

But we still think, even though we didn't get these other fishery units as far, what we've got here though are very clear statements of information needs that we can lay out for investigators and stuff. And so I think even though we didn't carry this to completion, we've provided a lot of clarity in terms of what we think is important to submit proposals on.

So, Mr. Chairman, I'll end my presentation here and ask for any questions on this.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pete.

MR. KOMPKOFF: Yes, Mr. Chairman, is it possible for you guys to extend your subsistence fisheries activity to a different area, like over by Chenega and find out what subsistence fish are really

needed over there, like red salmon for instance? We have two lakes that they could possibly use for restocking or stocking of red salmon fry, and there would have to be a study first I would imagine. I don't know what procedure you guys go through to pick a program that you can fund and that would enhance subsistence fisheries in our area. Is that possible you guys can do something like that?

MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chair, Mr. Kompkoff, we have funded a very limited number of projects in the Prince William Sound area. And really the reason for that is for information needs, if you go back to, you know, to this graph here, I mean, for information needs -- I mean, what we're really looking at is sort of the intensity of management of the subsistence fisheries, and, you know, what you'll see there is Prince William Sound delta salmon sort of fall sort of in the middle ground if you will after Copper River salmon and Copper River freshwater. That doesn't mean we would never fund a study. In fact, we have funded studies there. And, so, I mean, that kind of puts it I guess at least in the work group's view relative order of importance.

We just completed, if you go back to this table, what you'll see there is we just completed an assessment program for Billy's Hole, which I -- I'm trying to remember the map, but I think that's one -- is certainly close to the areas that you're talking about, where we were looking specifically at sockeye abundance in a lake that's used by subsistence users. And so we just finished that work.

The only thing that I'd be very cautious of though, is this program by Board policy doesn't get into enhancement efforts, or stocking efforts. It's -- there are other avenues, if you will, through basically State and Federal agencies to consider projects that would do that.

That's not to say that we never do any assessment of stocked fish. We do. I mean, for instance, you know, when we get in Copper River sockeye, I mean, we're going to have to sort out the stocked portion versus the wild portion. I mean, that's just going to be part of the assessment that we're going to have to do to sort out what's going on in the main stem.

But what we very much try not to do is design projects specifically to look at stocking evaluations and those kinds of things.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Doug. I think that -- I think you covered it pretty clearly, Pete, but basically what he's saying is this program is to gather information to meet management needs. It's not a program for anything else. It's a program to gather information that's needed so that they can make management decisions. And so the assessment has to be basically on that.

And it's kind of interesting to me, because what Gloria asked you just before, and I have no idea what project she was talking about, but they were in-season harvest monitoring projects. And I see that your second highest priority, and it goes through this time and time after again, is subsistence harvest by location, gear type, and species. And one of the things that comes up time and time again in these meetings and in discussion with people is the difference between the reported catch and what we actually see when we go down -- like we go down to Chitina and watch what's going on with the fishwheels there. And we talk to people down there, and it doesn't jive at all. And if there's anything that we've had requests for and talked about was basically in-season monitoring, something that would go and actually see what's actually happening. And I don't know what kind of project she was talking about, but when I look at your priorities here, I would think projects that dealt with monitoring what's actually happening versus what's actually being reported would be pretty high priority, because we've seen in the past, we've seen so many fish through the counter, but those fish don't show up on the spawning grounds, and there's a gap between what was supposed to have been caught and what ends up, you know, what should be on the spawning grounds. So there's a difference in there somewhere. And I would think that, you know, if there are some in-season monitoring programs proposed that they'd be looked at very carefully, because they -- to me, it's your second highest priority that you have right here.

MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, I guess just a couple comments, and I certainly don't disagree with anything that you said. The work group very specifically looked at trying to provide -- at the question, do we provide what I'd call credible estimates of harvest on a post-season basis or on an in-season basis. And the reason that that is a real question has to do with money. It's a very true general statement that trying to get that information on an in-season basis is generally a lot more expensive than it is trying to get it on a post

season basis. And so the work group looked at do we try to design harvest monitoring projects to provide managers let's say a weekly estimate of harvest as opposed to a post season estimate of harvest by week. I mean, those are two very different questions from a study design standpoint.

They also look at the question you just raised. I mean, what -- you know, are we in fact getting accurate information say out of the permits, and those kinds of questions. So there's a difference between providing estimates by week versus a study designed to try to look at the accuracy and credibility, if you will, of the permits.

Like I say, just -- I can't remember the specifics of the proposals that we're talking about here. I guess I would certainly say that every proposal is considered very carefully.

And like I say, the other filter if you will that we used for a proposal obviously had to do with money. I mean, if you go back to that very first information I talked about on page 129, we've got the lowest amount of money available since the inception of the program, so we were trying to be very focused on what was important, and then technical merit, administrative expertise, and capacity building, so -- and there were actually a lot of projects, proposals for Southcentral. I think it was eight or ten or something like that, it was a bunch, with real -- I mean, and those dollar figures -- those are statewide figures, not figures for Southcentral.

In fact, I guess getting into the trees, if you will, administratively for this program, part of the money comes from the Forest Service, about $2 million, the remaining four to $5 million comes through Department of Interior. The Forest Service funds are used to fund Southeast in its entirety and virtually all of Southcentral, and that's just because of the location of the two national forests. And of that $1.3 million, the Forest Service only had about $150,000, lock, stock and barrel for both regions, so it was a very finite amount of money in '06, so those evaluation criteria were being looked at very, very diligently.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Doug, yeah, I wasn't saying that you needed to fund those projects, but I was saying that I was thinking that from what you were

using, the strategic planning, and the kind of projects that Gloria was presenting to us or talking about, it would seem like they would fit into your strategic planning, because it's -- you know, I look at your chart, and on both pages the second highest black line, you know, is subsistence harvest by location, gear type and, you know, and species. And that's information that -- that's the information that's been in question for as long as I've been here, and that's a long time.

And because it's almost -- I was here in July. I went down above the bridge to Copper River, and went and talked to people. And it's almost like a lot of those people right there consider the whole thing a joke as to what they report versus what they catch. And if that information is not accurate, you know, if that information is not accurate, then all the rest of the information doesn't mean a thing, you know, because then -- if that information is not accurate, then we need to adjust our escapement goals so that there's either sufficient there to provide for that over or we need to provide for enforcement so that we have accurate information.

And to me that's why -- it was interesting that that's the kind of proposals that Gloria brought up, because those are the kind of proposals that fit right into our informational needs. So, thank you, and I'm not telling you what to do either. And I know how finite the money is. But it's just kind of interesting that those were the ones that were -- that she was mentioning. And I don't really know the specific of her proposals, and I wasn't speaking for them. So thank you, Doug.

Any other questions for Doug.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Can we go on from there? I think you've done a lot of work.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Gloria has got a question.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.

MS. STICKWAN: Do you think those projects will be considered next year? Those harvest assessments?

MR. McBRIDE: You asked about future consideration of those projects. We will be doing another call for 2007, and in 2007 as I say virtually all of these prior commitments will have expired, so there will be substantially more money in 2007. By the same token, there'll probably be more competition as well.

What we do is we don't hold over unfunded proposals. What we would ask the investigators to do is to resubmit a proposal.

The other piece of information is for any proposal that we receive, whether it's forwarded for an investigation plan or not, the investigators will receive the review comments of the Technical Review Committee, and those review comments will probably be going out next week would my guess. And so what we would ask the investigators to do is if they resubmit a proposal, is to take those review comments into account, and what that should do is make for a stronger proposal. So the short answer is, yes, they will be reconsidered, but you would need to -- whoever the investigator is would need to resubmit, and then we would ask them to address those review comments. I mean, just -- and obviously those were questions that were raised about the proposal that was received, and if you can address those, it just makes for a stronger proposal.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Gloria.

MS. STICKWAN: There was a project funded a few years about doing a GIS for non-salmon species. Is that report finished? Was that project done? Is the report -- is there a report for that project?

MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, if I could. It would take me a minute to go through all this, and what you've got here are summaries of current projects. So if that's a project that ended before, whether it ended.....

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It ended 2003.

MR. McBRIDE: What's that?

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It was ended in 2003.

MR. McBRIDE: So that means it's not summarized here. I just don't know that off the top of my head, but I could find that information out and.....

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Could you find it for Gloria?

MR. McBRIDE: Absolutely. And that was for non-salmon species, is that correct? Okay.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That was on subsistence fish harvests in the upper Copper. Thank you, Doug, and I think you brought up a very good point, that actually in that review process you help submitters to produce a better submission the next time, because if they take your review questions into account, they can answer the technical and informational needs that are in those review questions.

Okay. Any other questions for Doug?

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Doug.

MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. If it's certainly okay with you, then the next speakers coming up are Keith Van Den Broek and Audra Brase, and they will be talking about the Copper River chinook assessment program.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Maybe we'd better turn our lights out.

(Pause)

MR. VAN DEN BROEK: Are we ready to start, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, we're ready.

MR. VAN DEN BROEK: Okay. For the record I'm Keith Van den Broek with the Native Village of Eyak, and this is Audra Brase with Alaska Department of Fish and Game. And we're just going to be summarizing the last four years of the study that we've been doing with chinook escapement monitoring and the chinook radio telemetry project.

And you all know who the partners are on this. The purpose of this study from the beginning has been to improve upon existing fisheries research, enhance the success of subsistence fisheries management in Alaska, and also to promote capacity building within

Alaska native and rural organizations, specifically the Native Village of Eyak on this project to enable a meaningful contribution to assessment and management of their fisheries, and to improve communication and cooperation between State and Federal resource management agencies and Alaska native and rural organizations.

The specific study objectives were to develop a long-term monitoring program to estimate the annual systemwide escapement of chinook salmon to the Copper River. We refer to this as the CEM project. And through the CRT project to determine distribution of spawning chinook salmon in the Copper River drainage, and through both projects to describe the stock specific migration timing of the chinook salmon run on the Copper River.

So the study design for CEM, the first sample event at Baird Canyon where we used fishwheels to capture and spaghetti tag a minimum of five percent of the anticipated run of chinook salmon. A second sample event at Canyon Creek where we used fishwheels to capture and examine for recaptures a minimum of five percent of the anticipated run of chinook salmon. And then to use the most appropriate mark/recapture model to estimate the total escapement.

Like I said, the first sample event, Baird Canyon. It's about 15 miles above the Miles Lake sonar station. And then our second sample event is at Canyon Creek, which is just below Chitina.

I'll start with the mobilization. I think most everyone here has seen the presentation that I gave at the last RAC meeting in the fall, so I'll just kind of breeze through this.

Baird Canyon's a remote camp and can only be accessed by jet boat, helicopter, float plane or ski plane, depending upon the conditions, and the conditions during the mobilization have been irregular and unpredictable. So to put it into perspective a little bit, in 2002 there was helicopter access only, river ice until 16th of May, and two to three feet of snow around the cabin. In 2003 we had float plane access for mobilization. There was no river ice or snow cover.

This was the field cabin at Baird Canyon in 2003. This is the field cabin at Baird Canyon in 2004. It's looking like 2005 is going to be more similar

to 2003, which will be great for us.

Mobilization of Canyon Creek, which is usually mid May, is a lot easier. The camp's near the road system, and it's easy access by jet boat. Conditions during mobilization have never been a problem. The river ice is cleared, and there's very minor to no snow cover. So it's far less logistically challenging than Baird Canyon mobilization, and can usually be completed within a few days.

I'll jump into the sampling methodology. Salmon are captured using fishwheels, and we've got three large purpose built research wheels in place. Two of them operate at Baird Canyon and one at Canyon Creek. And we've also got one smaller subsistence style wheel which was built for us by Johnny Goodletaw, and we're actually looking at building a fifth fishwheel now that Johnny will be helping us with again, that should be in place for the next season.

Fish are tagged, all chinook salmon that are of fit condition are tagged with a yellow spaghetti tag and given a right operculum punch. And 500 chinook salmon are given a radio tag and a gray spaghetti tag.

At the recovery effort, they're inspected for a tag and given a left operculum punch so that if they're recaptured, we know it.

For the data analysis, in a normal mark/recapture study on a closed population you would use a simple Peterson estimate, which is the number of fish equals the marked times the recapture divided by the recaptured. This assumes an equal probability of capture and recapture, and this is the assumption that most often fails. And you can read the other assumptions there. We generally meet these other assumptions. So the equal probability of capture and recapture implies that sampling was not selected for body length or sex, and that the ability to catch fish does not change throughout the study. And because we don't meet this assumption for any of the years, we couldn't use the simple Peterson estimator.

In 2002, we were able to use a Chapman's modification of the Peterson estimator. In 2003 and 2004 we used a Derux (ph) temporally stratified estimator.

Jumping into the results here, in 2001 we

didn't have the second event, so there was no estimate developed. It was just a feasibility study to determine who else could actually be used, which they could very successfully. So 2002 through 2004 we have a very good estimate, which is shown here. The abundance estimate in 2003 was 44,764. In 2004 it was 40,564.

And total chinook salmon catch shown here, you can see that there's a dramatic increase from year to year starting in 2001 with 914 fish at Baird Canyon up to 2004, 2,756. And at Canyon Creek, 3,339.

These graphs just break down the daily catch rate for chinook, salmon at each of the camps. We show Baird Canyon there and Canyon Creek there. You can see in 2004 we had much higher numbers earlier in the run.

And average travel time from Baird Canyon to Canyon Creek is shown here. You can see again in 2004 we're moving a lot faster, but also a lot more spread out. Later in the run the fish were held up by high water.

And conclusions on this, the project has proven to be a tremendous success, and we've been generating an unbiased and accurate chinook escapement abundance estimate for the past three years. And the ability to affectively sample the run has continuously improved since the project inception and will continue to improve into the future. And the capacity of NVE to manage subsistence fisheries resources has been very well established and will to strengthen and grow.

I'll pass the presentation over to Audra now to continue with the radio tagging.

MS. BRASE: Not if you guys had any questions for Keith for this portion of it.

MR. KOMPKOFF: Mr. Chairman. On one of your slides I noticed a red salmon -- I don't know if it was the high -- a real high number and then for 2004 it was really low for.....

MR. VAN DEN BROEK: For 2002 we had a large number of sockeye salmon, and it was causing a lot of problems with overcrowding in the live tanks, so after that year we put some escape panels into place, basically panels on the live tanks that are small enough for a

sockeye to get through, but not large enough for a chinook salmon to get through. So the numbers in 2003 and 2004 are not realistic numbers for sockeye, because they were able to escape.

MR. KOMPKOFF: The other question I have is do kings and red salmon spawn all the way up and down the Copper River, or do they have specific locations where they spawn or what?

MR. VAN DEN BROEK: Audra will be able to talk about the spawning distribution there. Maybe hold that question until at the end.

MS. BRASE: Yeah, I talk about that.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.

MR. CARPENTER: Yeah, Keith, thanks. I just wanted to say, you know, once again that you guys at NVE are doing good work. This is -- these are important projects, and they've been -- they need to be something that we need to continue to fund in the future, and hopefully the dollars will be there.

But just one question. I was looking at a graph you had earlier. And, you know, it's quite evident that last year that the amount of kings that you caught in your fishwheels were dramatically higher than prior years. But I noticed that, and I don't know if these are preliminary conclusions or estimates, but it said -- and I think that it said that your total in-river abundance issue was actually lower than it was in 2003, and I was wondering if you could maybe explain that?

MR. VAN DEN BROEK: Yeah, the abundance estimate is lower this year by about 4,000 fish. The higher number of capture is essentially just perfect conditions for catching fish. We were able to catch a much hither percentage of the run. Let me go back to -- you can see in 2003 we caught, you know, 2.1 percent of the run at Baird Canyon, and 2.9 percent of the run at Canyon Creek. In 2004 it jumped up to 2.9 percent and 7.7 percent at Canyon Creek. So we were just catching a lot more fish in the run. The higher catch didn't indicate higher abundance.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that's based on your ratio between tag and recapture, right?

MR. VAN DEN BROEK: Correct. Does that answer your question?

MR. CARPENTER: Yeah. Thanks.

MS. BRASE: Okay.

MR. VAN DEN BROEK: Any more questions?

(No comments)

MS. BRASE: Okay. We'll go on with the radio telemetry then. I'll introduce myself again. My name is Audra Brase. I work for Sport Fish up in Fairbanks.

Last year at this meeting Mat Evenson was down here and he spoke about this, and then a lot of you probably know James Saveride (ph). He's actually the project leader for this radio telemetry portion of the study. Both of them are off on spring break, so it's my duty to come down here and present to you guys. So I will see what I can tell you.

Okay. the study design for the radio tags was to use the NVE fishwheels first sample event to capture and radio tag 500 chinook salmon every year. We also utilized a network of ground-based receiving stations to monitor all the radio-tagged fish. I'll be showing a map that shows where all those tracking stations were. And then we also conducted a series of three aerial flights each year over the entire drainage to specifically locate the radio-tagged fish within like the Chitina. We know that they passed the Chitina tower, but we used the aerial surveys to find where exactly the fish are located.

Here's a map that shows where all the radio towers are. We had -- yes, that's -- usually these radio towers come in at different times, but not on this MacIntosh.

You'll see the black circle there, that's the personal use fishery. We have -- or the subsistence personal use fishery. You'll see that we monitor the fish closely right around there, and then further above the black circle, the amount of what goes past the fishery, and then down at that lower station, that's any fish -- to monitor any fish that back out and leave the river.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Is that the top of the mountains or is that just.....

MS. BRASE: Which one?

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: (Indiscernible - away from microphone)

MS. BRASE: Oh, that's just to show you what the little symbol is I guess. There. Yeah, you see Alaska looks like -- you can't see, that's kind of foggy there so.....

Oh, and the aerial surveys, they're done in stages, and it depends on the weather and pilot availability and biologist availability and they take about six hours a day for four days. And James does most of those.

So the results from the last three years, 2002, 2003, and 2004, we've tagged close to 500 fish every year. You see we didn't meet the goals in 2002 and 2004, but we were pretty close. And this figure here basically just shows that we can account for all the tags, where they failed to enter the Chitina fishery, the ones that went through the fishery, the ones that were harvested in either the personal use or the subsistence fishery, and then the sport fisheries as well, and then the ones that we were able to locate into the spawning streams there.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: When you say (indiscernible - away from microphone)?

MS. BRASE: Well, we didn't necessarily find them drop back out at that lower station, but they just never made it up to our -- the Chitina fishery, so it's either the tag was expelled somewhere down below, the fish died, it was caught somewhere below, but there's -- you know, doubtful anybody was fishing down that low. So that's just kind of a generic term I guess. So we don't necessarily know that it backed out of the fishery.

This snap here, or this figure here shows the distribution of all the major stocks. You see that the -- it's pretty constant there for the Klutina, Tazlina, and the upper Copper, but then there's some variability in the Gulkana and the Chitina and Tonsina. And that's for each year there you'll see. And the variability isn't exactly the same. Like Chitina is not

exactly low when the Tonsina was low. You see there.

Oh, and this is the furthest upstream location of the fish as well. So when we flied (ph) survey, the first one you might find the fish down lower in the main stem still, and then the second aerial survey you actually locate in a drainage, so it's that section aerial survey we're looking for that's showing the distribution here.

Okay. This shows the run timing. You guys have probably seen a lot of these graphs, because -- I'm going to show all three years, but this just demonstrates when 50 percent of the fish went past the capture site. For example, there -- it's not showing the colors. The red, there's the Gulkana, and if you look over to the 50 percent line, then down you see that about June 2nd is when approximately 50 percent of the Gulkana radio-tagged fish went passed the Baird Canyon fishwheels there, so this -- kind of the pattern to look at here is the first ones that come in are the upper river stocks. The second ones that come in are the lower river, and then the third that come in are the -- that's the lower river, and then the middle river. I don't know why the lines didn't show up there. Yes.

So the two on the left side there are -- let's see, that's the Gulkana and the upper Copper. The two in the middle are the Tazlina and the Chitina. And the two on the right side are the Tonsina and the Kluchina. But the colors aren't showing up correctly on there unfortunately. So to just kind of demonstrate the upper river stocks came in earlier than the lower river stocks. And the Chitina, even though it's a lower -- oh, okay. The Chitina, even though it's a lower river drain -- part of the drainage obviously, but it's a longer part of the drainage, so those fish had further to travel even though they were turning off sooner. If that makes sense. Does it make sense?

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So that top line is when 50 percent went past Baird Canyon, right? I mean the flat line at the top, that's when they hit the 50 percent mark, is that flat line at the top, right?

MS. BRASE: No. No, you look at the 50 percent line -- or there's actually not a line for it, but.....

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's the 100 percent

line?

MS. BRASE: That's 100 percent line at the very top, yeah. So if you look at the 50 percent and then if you just, you know, like drew a dotted line over and then down, you'll see the dates when 50 percent went by.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So the latest ones are the -- by this chart, the latest ones are the Klutina and the first ones are the upper Copper?

MS. BRASE: Yes. Yes.

MR. CARPENTER: Just one other question in regards to the run timing. You know, the last five years we've had some pretty unstable, you know, climate changes. Have you ever -- has anybody ever compared the run timing with the water levels in regards to are these fish entering the river system earlier with certain water levels than they are with -- you know what I mean?

MS. BRASE: Yeah, there's -- you'll see it's -- in 2004, last year, we had really high water levels, so the patterns look -- they're real similar. Are you talking about actually entering the main stem part of the river, or entering the spawning tributaries?

MR. CARPENTER: Well, I think it's interesting that a few of the charts even at Keith showed was that there are a lot more fish that seem to enter the river system last year earlier, but then they actually took longer when the water levels came up to actually reach above the Baird Canyon area.....

MS. BRASE: The travel time.

MR. CARPENTER: .....and I was wondering if you ever looked at -- because there -- you know as a management tool, that's an important issue, and I just had wondered if any -- over like the last 10 years if they've actually taken the water levels and compared that with -- to the run timing to where they actually reached, the fish actually reached the subsistence areas.

MS. BRASE: Yeah, I see what you're asking. I don't think anybody's looked at that specifically. It would depend on -- I guess they'd have to look at water levels, they'd have to pick a specific spot. I guess the Baird Canyon would be a good place to

look at it, and then compare it. But some of the fish have already gone upriver past that high water event, so it might be kind of difficult to tease out, but it's something that could be looked at.

So here for the -- this is the 2003 graph. It's the same sort of pattern where the upper Copper and Gulkana were the first couple -- you see it's a lot more compressed here. It's not quite as nice and obvious the way it was in 2002, with the Tazlina and Chitina in the middle, and then the Kluchina and Tonsina as those last two.

And then 2004, there's the first, upper Copper and Gulkana. Here's the Kluchina and Tonsina, and then Tazlina and Chitina. Those ones are kind of -- this is where we had the major high water event, and that has something to do with the way it's all so spread out there, the run timing. So I guess you could kind of infer from there that the fish, you know, it took them longer to get up there.

I know James looks at the run timing, the specific, you know, when it was tagged and how quickly it got up to the tributary, but I don't have that specific information with me per fish.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Question. When you say Chitina, that's when it passes that lower station on the Chitina River, right past the last radio station right then. When you -- so the Chitina fish aren't on the spawning grounds at that time, but that's when it passed that lower station around the corner going up the Chitina Valley?

MS. BRASE: I believe so. I believe that's what James has done there. Because when he flies the aerial surveys, he doesn't necessarily know if that fish has spawned already, if it's a carcass down there, or if it's on its way, and it's just kind of sitting there waiting to spawn, so that's.....

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So for the graph, it's when it passed that point that it entered the Chitina.

MS. BRASE: Yes. Yes.

MR. KOMPKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pete.

MR. KOMPKOFF: On that graph, the different, the green one showed -- just was almost straight up and down. Does that signify that the run has made it to its location faster or what?

MS. BRASE: Not necessarily that it made it faster, but it was just the first to enter the river. Or it's.....

MR. KOMPKOFF: Go back to that graph and you'll see where the green lines goes up from.....

MS. BRASE: Okay. How it -- when it.....

MR. KOMPKOFF: Yeah.

MS. BRASE: .....went up basically right there?

MR. KOMPKOFF: It's almost vertical.

MS. BRASE: Yeah, that could be any number of things. It's depending on how many fish were tagged. If there was very few fish tagged there, that might have something to do with the pattern you see, or the fish may have moved quicker. I don't know off the top of my head how many fish that represents. I'm sorry.

MR. KOMPKOFF: I was just curious. Thank you.

MS. BRASE: Yeah, so it could be either of those things. It's just a couple of fish, so you just only have a couple data points, or it could have been they were able to move up there quickly.

MS. STICKWAN: (Indiscernible - microphone not turned on.)

MS. BRASE: Oh, yeah, we usually comment on that, yeah, because that usually affects the catchability of the fish, how successful we were at putting out the radio tags.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do you have a chart, like if we take a look at 2004 here, do you have a chart that tells how many fish each one of those different lines represent? I mean, like what -- you know, how many fish are in the upper Copper, how many fish are in the Tonsina, how many tags ended up going to each of those

units?

MS. BRASE: Yeah, I don't have that with me. I know that we do have that, it's just I didn't bring that for this presentation. I could provide it to you if you were interested.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's not that important. I just was wondering, because that would skew a line if you ended up having.....

MS. BRASE: If you just have a couple fish, yes.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If you had a couple fish, that would skew a line real fast.

MS. BRASE: Uh-huh. We try and put the radio tags out in proportion to the run, so hopefully we're getting them distributed.....

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: A cross variation.

MS. BRASE: .....well, but that doesn't always work depending on the run, the water conditions, and catchability.

MR. KOMPKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, Pete.

MR. KOMPKOFF: On those radio-tagged fish, do they go to an area where they eventually spawn? Do you guys locate those spawning grounds, you know, hopping down the Copper for those?

MS. BRASE: When we fly the aerial surveys, you find the last location of the fish, and we don't go down on the grounds and, you know, actually physically look at the fish and see if they're spawning. We just kind of make some assumptions. And we can't fly -- I mean, in a perfect world, we'd be able to fly every single week and be able to tell exactly where the fish ended up, but unfortunately that costs a lot of money, and we can't do that. So we just try and identify what the latest, the furthest upriver point was that we saw those fish, and then we assumed that they spawn in that area.

MR. KOMPKOFF: Okay.

MS. BRASE: But like I say, we don't actually go on the grounds of every single spot and check for sure.

MR. KOMPKOFF: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'll ask one question. It's probably a dumb question, but do they ever cross over the top of divides where there's no water? Radio tags?

MS. BRASE: When you're flying the aerial surveys?

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

MS. BRASE: They used to before we had good GPS locations in there, but actually now the radio tags and these new receivers we have, they're really good at identifying the fish like right down there, so when you look at your -- you do an overlay with your map, and the fish are right there in the river the way they should be.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, I was just wondering if possibly they ended up in the stomach of a bear and.....

MS. BRASE: I've heard that occasionally they do find them that are pretty far off, and, yeah, you figure it was a bear of -- yeah, either the bear ate it or the bear dragged it off.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Because we've taken a lot of spaghetti tags out of bear piles.

MS. BRASE: I imagine so.

MR. VAN DEN BROEK: I had a few spaghetti tag returns this year that were found in bear scat miles from the river.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, I think we sent you one that was from 1970 something.....

MS. BRASE: Really? Wow.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: .....that we found at a bear -- that we found where the bank had washed out, where it had been deposited as bear scat. Gloria.

MS. STICKWAN: Can we get a copy of this report?

MS. BRASE: Yeah, we're in the process right now of writing up the final three years report, so that will summarize all three years. And that should be ready -- it will hopefully be ready by your fall meeting, but we'll definitely -- we'll send copies out to all the Council members if you'd like.

MR. KOMPKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, Pete.

MR. KOMPKOFF: Yeah. Thank you. Do the -- did you guys do the study over by Bering River as well to see the escapement of reds over there?

MS. BRASE: We haven't done anything with the sockeye for the radio tags. That's something that's going to be started up this year.

MR. KOMPKOFF: Okay. I was just wondering.

MS. BRASE: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Pete.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So in conclusion, from the radio telemetry, we've discovered that radio telemetry on chinook salmon in the Copper provides an accurate and precise estimate of the spawning distribution and the run timing. The estimates of spawning distribution are fairly consistent and the variability observed that I showed in those graphs there could be due to varying levels of exploitation in the commercial and in-river fisheries. And the estimates of run timing have shown a consistent pattern where those upper river stocks pass early, and the down river stocks pass later on. So that's what we found out from the radio telemetry.

And in the -- as everybody's alluded to, this was the final year of the radio telemetry portion for chinook salmon. NVE is going to be working on radio tagging sockeye salmon and James will be helping out with that study, maintain those same radio towers.

And then as an aside, Sport Fish is also

going to be working on that steelhead study that Doug mentioned. So that's going to be going on this year.

So if there's further questions, I'd be glad to answer them.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Can I ask one question?

MS. BRASE: Sure.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, when you're sampling these fish, you have all of the length data that corresponds with each radio tag?

MS. BRASE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So you would basically have a correlation of size of fish to the watershed that they go to?

MS. BRASE: Yeah, we can look at each drainage, and if there was size differences.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Have you noticed a large variation in size, average size difference? I mean, historically we've always thought that the later kings are the larger kings, and I see the later kings are the kings that go to the Klutina, and the Klutina's known for sport fishing for big kings as opposed to the Gulkana which are, you know, fairly -- I look at them as fairly small kings, but -- so has that proven true in the information that you've -- I mean, have you seen a variation that, you know, different runs basically are different size fish

MS. BRASE: Uh-huh. I don't think there's been significant differences. There probably are differences, but I don't know whether they were significant. You know, we run our statistical tests on them. That would be something I could, you know, talk to James about and see, and get back to you on that one.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I was just wondering if whether it was an average thing or if it was just that one run has the occasional bigger fish than the others that we're talking about.

MS. BRASE: Uh-huh. And you just happen to see that really big fish and that really small fish.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

MS. BRASE: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

MS. STICKWAN: Question.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions. Gloria.

MS. STICKWAN: Can you tell the difference between wild stock and hatchery stock in your.....

MS. BRASE: Tell the difference between?

MS. STICKWAN: Hatchery and wild stock.

MS. BRASE: Oh, with the king salmon?

MS. STICKWAN: Or salmon -- yeah, king salmon I guess.

MS. BRASE: Well, the king salmon, there shouldn't, you know, in theory be any hatchery fish. They should all be wild fish. The Gulkana, there will be hatchery fish mixed in the Gulkana sockeye. They'll be looking at those. They do -- the hatchery does some marking of the sockeye. I think they use strontium, and they also -- they used to use coated wire tags in the fish, so if you, you know, kill the fish, you can get an idea, you know, for sure whether it was a hatchery fish or not. And that's something we actually do down at the Chitina fishery. We sample, we go to people, we ask them if we can collect the heads of their fish, and we'll see -- we can identify from there whether it was a hatchery fish or a wild fish, and they can get an idea of what the proportion is. But just looking at the fish externally, I don't believe you can make a call on that.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: These programs are particularly interesting to me, because in 1968 I worked on exactly the same kind of program at Woods Canyon when they were talking about putting a dam there, which would have stopped the whole fishery that we have today. And

it's interesting that really the technique hasn't changed that much. You've probably come a long way in your number crunching, but that tag and recapture program is still basically the same as it was in 1968.

MR. WILSON: I've got a question.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Dean.

MR. WILSON: For those of us that have fishwheels on the Copper, one of the only real means we have for daily checking whether or not we have fish coming up the river are the sonar. I think they post those data, Fish and Game does. So we usually check, I don't know, like 10 to 14 days or some, something like that, and figure, but I think that's what Ralph was alluding to earlier. Those have been way off, and at times they just flat don't show up, and we have a lot of people that -- I think they drive a long ways to turn their fishwheels on for those days, coming out of Fairbanks or wherever, and they just -- they don't show up. Have you guys ever done any actual representation I guess between the sonar and your -- I guess what I'm trying to say is Miles Lake we're thinking holds up a lot of fish during high water times, and have you guys ever done any checking between the two, your Baird Canyon lower fishwheel and the sonar?

MS. BRASE: I know there is a lot of variability. I mean, I go down there to go dip netting, too, and it's frustrating to go all that way and find out that, oh, the fish really aren't here. And, yeah, it does have to do with water levels. We don't have a specific, say, okay, when the water is X number of height, fish are going to be these many days later. That would be very interesting to do, but we'd have to design the study a different way, because right now we're not set up to be looking at -- it's not a question we're trying to answer.

MR. WILSON: Yeah, I understand that. I guess what I'm wondering is, it would make more sense, maybe not from a logistical side, but it would make more sense if that sonar was above Miles Lake to a lot of people. And that's one of the questions that a lot of people have asked, because in general during high water, a lot of people think from the Copper River area that they're holding up in Miles Lake, because that's -- when we're getting a lot of counts coming through the Miles Lake station, that's directly below Miles Lake where the

water pressure is very -- it's nil compared to the high water that they're going to hit going through the canyon and going on up, but again I'm sure that's a logistical thing to some matter, because in trying to move everything and sending somebody on a 24-hour watch up in Baird Canyon would be tougher, but I'm just curious.

MS. BRASE: Yeah, it would be good to have stations along the river, too, to see what the water heights were and the velocity and.....

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Dean, I can still remember back in 1968 when we had fishwheels below Woods Canyon and above Woods Canyon for our tagging/recapture thing. And we could be filling our fishwheels below Woods Canyon. When the water was high, you wouldn't catch them above Woods Canyon.

MR. WILSON: The water pressure.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that's when they came through with their noses rubbed off and everything from going right along the bottom trying to scoot their way through. I think your biggest block is -- I think your biggest block is Woods Canyon, because back then we would see them backed up into every little slough and creek below Woods Canyon when the water was high, and then as soon as the water would go down, they'd shoot through Woods Canyon and the fishwheels above Woods Canyon would be full.

MR. WILSON: That makes sense.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think that -- I don't know, Bairds Canyon is pretty powerful, but I think Woods Canyon is even more of a bottleneck than Bairds Canyon when I look at it on the map and when I've flown over them. There's a lot of water compressed in a very narrow area right there, which is why they considered it for a dam to start off with.

MR. WILSON: Where is Bairds Canyon?

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bairds Canyon is just above Ambercrombie Rapids. It's down there.

MR. WILSON: (Indiscernible - microphone not turned on.)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's not really a

canyon. It's not a canyon like Woods Canyon at all. Bairds Canyon is just basically where the river goes up against the rock wall on one side. It's not a canyon like Woods Canyon.

MR. WILSON: Is it before Chitina?

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, it's down there by Mile -- here, take a look at the map. It's just above Miles Lake and Ambercrombie Rapids. It's way down there. Woods Canyon is the narrow space just below Chitina. It's up above Haley Creek. Between Haley Creek and O'Brien Creek. And it's the narrowest spot on the river.

MR. CARPENTER: Can I ask a question?

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.

MR. CARPENTER: Yeah, and please tell me if I'm way off on this, because I'm just doing some quick calculations, because it's just something that caught my eye. With this chinook telemetry program, you said that 462 fish entered the -- or you tagged 500 fish, 39 fish didn't make it to the subsistence fishery, so that's 462 fish. Of those 462 fish that entered that fishery, 110 of them got caught either in the fishwheel or the dip net, you know, somewhere they got caught. So basically that represents about 25 percent of the fish.

Now, the abundance estimate for chinook was at 40,000, so am I to take from -- if you take that abundance estimate, am I to take that basically 25 percent of all the kings would get caught then, that actually enter the river, because if you actually -- if that -- if you equate that and calculate that out, if you look at the Department of Fish and Game's numbers, only 5500 kings were harvested in all the fisheries units in the river. If you use the 40,000 fish estimate, at 25 percent, there's a whole lot of fish that aren't accounted for somewhere. Now, I don't know, am I way off here, or -- just a question. I'm just sitting here looking at this real quick.

MS. BRASE: Yeah, that's a good question. I mean, there could be different factors involved there as far as the catchability of the fish, if they're more vulnerable to being harvested at a certain point, if we did indeed radio tag the fish in proportion to the run. I don't know exactly how to.....

MR. CARPENTER: I guess I'm probably not considering the sport fish harvest, too, because that's included in here, but, I don't know, I was just thinking about that.

MS. BRASE: Yeah, I mean, it is a small sample size, too. It's only 500 fish compared to the entire run.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Can I ask a question?

MS. BRASE: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Are those fish that don't make it through the fishery or are those fish that are taken in the fishery?

MS. BRASE: The?

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The 100 and some fish.

MS. BRASE: Let me take a look at that.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Because if they don't make it through the fishery, they've got the Tonsina River, the Klutina River, and the Tazlina River that they could turn off into, too. But, that's right, you've got counts if they went up there. Okay. So these are the ones that are harvested then.

MS. BRASE: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Because the other ones you've got counts of, because they went up into those other rivers. Okay.

MS. BRASE: Right. You've got the harvest of the Chitina, the subsistence and the sport fishery there. So those are the numbers you're adding up, is that.....

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

MS. BRASE: Yeah. So it is really a small sample size, so I wouldn't want to make an extrapolation like that to the entire run.

MR. CARPENTER: Well, yeah, I mean that -- it probably isn't a fair thing to do. It's just I was sitting here going, well, if the total harvest was 5500,

but the abundance -- and the abundance is 40,000. I mean, it just doesn't compute. But I agree, that is a small sample size.

What is the -- on a small sample size like this, when you're using huge amounts of fish in an in-river system, what's the degree of error?

MS. BRASE: If you were to make a....

MR. CARPENTER: To make an assumption like I'm using right here, is the degree of error 20 percent? I mean, is it that high?

MS. BRASE: Yeah, it would be very large.

MR. CARPENTER: Okay. Thanks a lot.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think, Doug, that that's why I was talking about the need for the actual in-season monitoring, because what Tom just pointed out is exactly what I observed when I visited the fishery up above the Chitina Bridge last summer. I mean, I would actually put the error at that much. And it's kind of interesting that Tom pulled it out of there. I wasn't going to pull it out of there, but that's exactly what I observed by talking to people. And I wouldn't be a bit surprised if the rest of that is accurate, that that's just as accurate as the rest of the assumptions that can be made from that chart. And that's why I really feel that some in-season monitoring of that fishery, like Gloria was suggesting would probably come up with some more accurate information, and it probably would come pretty close to corresponding to what you have your chart right there. Doug.

MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, I agree with you. One thing to remember about these numbers though is, and I think it's what Audra was alluding to, is that what they're trying to figure out is all the stock-specific, you know, distribution and timing. So you need to remember that, for instance, in each one of those years -- you know, one of the things that was learned in this study that really was new information is, for instance, how important the Chitina River is in terms of the total king production. I mean, I think going into this study -- I mean, if you asked most people, they would not have said that the Chitina river was a major producer of king salmon. But if you look at one of those other drafts that they had up there, I mean, the Chitina

was a very consistent high producer of king salmon. And so those roughly 500 tags a year that they got, you know, a good proportion of those are destined for the Chitina River.

Now, those fish don't suffer much exploitation. I mean, you know, they go up the river and then they turn right at the Chitina, so the only fishery they to through is the Chitina subdistrict, which is the dip net fishery and the few fishwheels that are down there. But then they are not really -- I mean, there's -- for all practical purposes, there's no major sport fisheries up in the Chitina drainage, and so they're not subjected to the remainder of the fishwheel fishery, and then the relatively sport fisheries, particularly in the Klutina, Tonsina and Gulkana rivers.

So I think that's kind of why Audra, Tom, was giving you, you know, the answer that she was, because in a general sense you're right, but like I say, this study is looking at -- it's stock-specific information, and the exploitation on the different stocks is clearly quite different. So when you take the average, you can get large errors.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But, Doug, that's exactly the point out of that. If you took that 500 -- let's take 2003. You took that 500 fish, and you took the Chitina stock out of that, and we'll just say, for example, that the Chitina stock's 100 fish. And you took that 100 fish out of there, that leaves you with 400 fish. Then the exploitation rate goes up even more yet, because then that's no 99 fish or whatever, 92 fish out of 500. That's 92 fish out of 400. And so that's why then the number that comes out with the post season reporting is even farther off if you want to put it that way, than what -- than the number that you have right there. Because all of a sudden what you're doing is you're taking 33 percent or 25 percent or 27 percent or something like that of your upriver stock.

And that's why from what I've seen, that that's why when she brought that up, I really consider that -- and we've stressed this time and time again, I really consider that one of the most important things that could be done on the upper Copper, is to get an actual estimate, because we have these fish that go through, and they don't end up on the spawning grounds, and they're not accounted for by the amount of fish that were supposed to be taken. There's a discrepancy there.

A fairly large discrepancy on some years on king salmon. And that discrepancy needs to be addressed. And part of that discrepancy shows up right there.

MS BRASE: Just a point of clarification I guess. Tom Taube just told me that I guess the 5,000 fish you're recording, I guess that's subsistence and personal use, and the sport harvest is another 5,000 fish on top of that, so that's a little bit closer -- the 10,000 fish totals. That would make a little bit more sense there.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Closer. Thank you. That accounts for a lot of them right there then. But it's interesting then, if 5,000 are being caught in the personal use and subsistence fishery, and 5,000 are being caught in the sport fishery, that you've got 20 tags harvested in the sport fishery, and you've got 110 tags harvested in the subsistence/personal use fishery. Doug.

MR. McBRIDE: No, Mr. Chairman, I mean, I think the points that we're discussing here really speak to how much this program has advanced management of Copper River chinook salmon from where we were even just five years ago. I mean, with this information, not only do we have real estimates of total abundance and we'll be doing that, but we also have very good estimates of their distribution and timing by stock. And so, for instance, I mean, you're talking about the sport fishery, that sport fishery is concentrated in certain ones of these stocks. I mean, it's largely the Gulkana, Klutina and probably to a lesser extent the Tonsina, so the sport exploitation, if you will, of certain ones of these stocks is, you know, it's whatever it is of the Gulkana. And on others of these stocks, it's virtually nonexistent, so it's very, very different. And so when you look at the total exploitation of sport fishery, subsistence, personal use, and even if you back all this way up -- back all this all the way out to the commercial fishery, what we're finding here is that the exploitation by stock is likely very, very different when you add all those numbers up.

And, like I say, I can't -- I guess I can't stress enough what a huge step forward this is, when you look at the old -- just the aerial survey program, and where we're at with this information today, it's like night and day.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, I agree with you,

Doug. To me it's tremendous. Just the fact that you know what goes in and then you can start looking at what's left at the end, and you can start figuring out, you know, where have they gone in between time. Yeah. Would be interesting to see how many end up in the stomachs of bears. But anyhow I think it's pretty tremendous.

I think you've gotten some good data out of it, and I think the more we look at this data, the more questions we're going to see that it answers. And also the more questions it's going to raise. And it's going to call for other projects simply because some of those things like what Tom brought up needs answers.

MR. CARPENTER: I've just got one more comment.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.

MR. CARPENTER: I just wanted to make another comment, because I hope you guys don't think we're grilling you, because it's just this is important. This is important to everybody that's in this room, and the people especially that are on this Council, because this is where we live, and this is how we survive. But I just think that this gets back to the ultimate point that this is how important that strategic planning session was, because we prioritized what the greatest important resources are on the Copper for the people that live in the region, and the more and more that the dollars get cut, the more and more that we're going to have to look at, you know -- we're going to have to have our top projects funded, and it just -- it's quite obvious that sockeye and chinook salmon through the Copper River drainage are the most significant, so anyway I just thought I'd make that comment, and thanks for your good work.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug, you were going to say something?

MR. McBRIDE: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, thank you. I guess just a couple of comments or observations. From a -- like I say, from a technical standpoint, this information I mean by any management organization standards is really good information. In fact, from a technical standpoint, one of the things that wasn't mentioned is that the -- for the abundance part of this program, and that's the part of the program that's been

going on the longest, the major investigators, NVE and their subcontractors, LGL, Limited, they have very recently drafted a publication to be published through the American Fisheries Society publication network. I reviewed that report, and, I mean, it's outstanding. But from a technical standpoint not only, you know, can we stand here and tell you this is good information, but I mean really the rest of the professional world is going to know about that fairly soon. There's a draft publication that's going out.

Another aspect of this that Keith touched on is the capacity building part of this program. When we entered into this in 2001, it was a totally open question whether a relatively small organization like MVE had the horsepower to make a project like this work. I mean, this program -- I mean this would make any major agency grunt a little bit. I mean, these are big programs. There's a lot that goes into this from both a logistic, administrative and technical standpoint, and that's one of the subjects that that paper talks about, and this has been a real shining star in the monitoring program that, you know, how well this very large program has worked, and that a non-government organization like Native Village of Eyak is making it work.

The other thing I would point out is these reports very recently -- all the reports in the monitoring program we have just gotten -- finally, I'm glad to say, our website up and running. You can download any of the final reports right off the Office of Subsistence Management website now. If you go to the OSM website, and then go to the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program, I mean, you follow the links, they're pretty straight forward, and you can find any of these reports and you can download them right off the internet, so that's been something that's been a very, very long time coming.

The final point I'd like to make, Mr. Chairman, is when you look at the capacity building aspects of the monitoring program in total, like I say, this has been a huge shining star for the monitoring program.

The other one that I just, I'm sorry, but I just totally failed to mention when I came up here the first time, but it's also our partners for Fisheries Monitoring Program. And, Mr. Chairman, one of the things that we also wanted to cover is just an update with where

we are with the partners program. And Erica McCall, who's the partner's position for Native Village of Eyak, she is here and is also ready to give a brief presentation on the Partner's Program, if that fits into your schedule, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Doug. If I understand you right, like that report that Gloria was asking about then on GIS, she can download that right off of your website?

MR. McBRIDE: Yeah. Actually on that question, I went and looked at that, and several other people did as well since that question was asked. That particular report is under review. I mean, we have received a report and it is under review. What we're putting on the website are reports that are final and, you know, completely a done deal. So I don't think that report is on the website, but it should be shortly.

Now, there was another project that dealt with non-salmon species, and I don't remember the project number, but it is done. I saw that that one was final and is on the website. And the summaries of those projects that you're asking about I think were on page 134 of the progress report that's in the book.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Maybe we should take a break before we have our next little session. And then we'll have the Native Village of Eyak present theirs. Thank you, Doug, and thanks for you guys' work and the information you've collected.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Let's come back into session, and we're going to have a report from Native Village of Eyak.

MS. McCALL-VALENTINE: Good morning, Mr. Chair, Council members. My name is Erica McCall-Valentine, and I am the Southcentral regional social scientist under the Partners for Fisheries Monitoring Program.

As it's set up, I've been asked to give bi-annual reports of my ongoings, and so this report will cover the last six months of my position. It's going to

be a very brief report. The first three months of the last six months I've been on maternity leave, so I only have about three months to talk about.

Particularly with my position, I have co-investigator status on two of the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program projects. One of them is the TEK of salmon runs in the upper Copper River basin. With that project, I am a co-investigator with Bill Simeon who is an anthropologist with the State Division of Subsistence. With that project, within the last -- well, I guess the total status of that project right now is we have done all of our community consultation meetings. We've presented the project to Mentasta, Chistochina, Tazlina and Gulkana. Is that right, Gloria?

And then the next step in that process is doing the community interviews. And Bill and I plan to be in the upper Copper River basin late April and May to conduct those interviews, and then throughout the summer in follow-up interviews.

Going along with the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program, I did assist six Southcentral village councils in writing research proposals for research projects, research project funding. Some of those were for the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program, as Gloria questioned earlier about the harvest monitoring projects. I did help in writing those proposals, and my hope is to continue working with those village councils that are interested in doing harvest monitoring for the FY 07 funding.

In addition, Pat Petrivelli asked for me to mention that her position, her new position as the BIA anthropologist, she also will be available to assist in writing those research proposals.

Just last weekend, this is of particular interest to the Regional Advisory Council, I presented a paper at the Alaskan Anthropological Association meeting that was here in Anchorage, and my paper was on public participation, and it highlighted the fishwheel project that the Native Village of Eyak is running, and it highlighted the public participation and the effective use of public participation in that project. And it was a great avenue to introduce that project to a realm of individuals and researchers who otherwise wouldn't know of it, particularly of being a fisheries resource monitoring program looking at stock status and trends.

It was a good way to show anthropologists how they can be involved in those types of projects, instead of just focusing mainly on harvest monitoring and traditional knowledge.

The other thing I did in conjunction with the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program is, as many of you know, the Native Village of Eyak hosts an annual fisheries workshop to review the fisheries projects on the Copper. That project -- or that happened just after my maternity leave was over, and I did help the Native Village of Eyak host that review.

Other things I've been doing is I have helped the Native Village of Eyak in writing the MOU with the BLM Glennallen office to be involved in some of their research projects and the ongoings there, particularly looking at the Bering River area, the Bering Glacier area, and so they can be involved. That is a traditional use of the Eyaks, and they're interested in their subsistence resources that are there and the research that's going on there.

This also is of interest to the Regional Advisory Council. There is a Copper River collaborative workshop that's going to be going on in April. I'm on the steering committee for that, and Gloria Stickwan, Bill Simeon and I are forming a TEK panel for that workshop, and we're going to invite elders from the Copper River area to present some of their traditional knowledge to the biologists and managers and other audience that will be at that meeting. So that's a good avenue to get out some of that traditional knowledge and how things used to be, and perceptions of how things are now.

And then lastly I've participated in a lot of monthly meetings, particularly the AHTNA Region subsistence community meeting. Those have been meeting in Glennallen. Gloria Stickwan is highly involved with those meetings, and I've been helping her with those, and assisting at those meetings.

I also participate in the Copper River/Prince William Sound Native Fishermen's Association meeting, and monthly I attend the Native Village of Eyak Tribal Council meetings. And from there I get directives from the Eyak Tribal Council on my position and where I'm going and where they think I should go.

So with that, that concludes. If there's any questions.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pete.

MR. KOMPKOFF: Yeah, you mentioned the April workshop in Cordova, which is going to involve TEK. Is it possible -- we've got a program with Chugach Regional Resources Commission. We're targeting ages 18 to 45 for internship and fisheries biology or water quality, things like that, if they work with TEK and the University of Alaska. And the contact person for that would be Patty Longberg at CRRC, 562-6647. Just FYI.

MS. McCALL-VALENTINE: Okay. Actually that is a good contact. One of the things that could happen, that meeting actually is going to be in Anchorage. It's at the Captain Cook. A poster presentation actually on that project would be quite good. As those people are out on their coffee breaks and that sort of thing, they could pass by. And then I can look into the possibility of having a presentation on that program that Patty's working on, so thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.

MS. STICKWAN: I don't have a question. I just want to say that Erica's been really helpful with the village and helping with their projects. People in the villages, they don't the knowledge to do the whatever you call it, the investigation plans, so she's been helping, and I really think that was a good thing that U.S. Fish and Wildlife did was to get somebody out in the field to help the villages, because we don't have the -- you know, we don't have the education to do some of those projects, to write them up. And she's been helpful in writing them up and it's a good program.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Gloria. That's kind of the reports that we've heard. Anybody else have any questions for her?

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you for your presentation.

MS. McCALL-VALENTINE: Yeah. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Keep working. Okay.

With that, we've already gone through 16 and 17, so we're on number 18. We've had the NGO, we've had Bureau of Land Management, we've had the Office of Subsistence Management, Subsistence Use Protocol. We've had the Forest Service. We've had the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, but we haven't had the National Park Service. And if I said somebody that we didn't have, we can go back. Yes, Donald.

MR. MIKE: Yes, I was just going to say that Fish and Game, we have Tom Taube.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. That's right. Now, we can grill him. Tom, Sorry.

MR. TAUBE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, that's okay to be ignore. I know BLM's had their fair share of being ignored and being last in this meeting, so it's only right to share the blame.

For the record, my name is Tom Taube. I'm the area fisheries biologist for the Alaska Department of Fish and Game out of Glennallen. There should be two handouts here received yesterday that have the State of Alaska letterhead on. I'll be addressing the two-page one first, and then go to the single page.

This first one basically summaries the harvest and participation in the Glennallen and Chitina subdistricts. What's presented here is the State harvests. It doesn't include the Federal component. I believe Barbara will be briefly summarizing that in her talk.

The first table shows the harvest from 1984 through 2004. The 2004 estimates are still preliminary, they're not our final estimates, but they're probably going to be pretty close to what the final estimates will be. In that table, the allocation column, that is what is set aside in the Copper River District Management Plan for that component to be passing the Miles Lake sonar. So for the Chitina subdistrict, which is this first table, the range is 100 to 150,000. The total harvest for 2004 fell within that range. Total harvest of around 110,000. I believe the Federal component was probably only about 1,000, so even with the Federal component, we're still within what the guidelines outlined in the Copper River Management Plan are set.

The one thing that we did have, there was

no access fee associated with the Chitina permit this year, and as a result our number of permits issued increased by about 1500. The one thing I have noticed with that is that there's probably about 10 percent more people that are not fishing. They're getting the permit, but they're not fishing, because the permits are available at 40 different vendors and five Fish and Game offices throughout Southcentral area. So it's -- you know, that permit number, you probably figure about another 800 of those are permits that were picked up, but never fished.

In the second table, that's a summary of the Glennallen subdistrict. Again, within the Copper River District Management plan there's an allowable harvest of 60 to 70,000. The State harvest component was around 62,000. Generally the Federal components been about 20,000. I expect its the probably the same, so we actually probably exceeded that range within the management plan, but the Miles Lake sonar, I believe the final sonar counts were about 100,000 above what the projection was for the escapement goals, so, you know, that additional 5,000 was accounted for in that surplus passed the sonar.

Our permits issued still are around 1,000 permits. You know, if you can see that in 2001 when the Federal permits began to be issues, we dropped approximately 100 to 200 permits since then, and that has stayed relatively stable.

In table -- on the next page, the small table, it says Table 1, it should be Table 3, I've got the breakdown of permits, State permits by locality. And you can see for the Glennallen subdistrict, the Copper River basin component has dropped, you know, by roughly 20 percent from prior to the Federal permits being issued to in 2004 when Federal permits were issued. The increase in Anchorage and other ones are probably just more the fact that those Copper River permits are no longer issued by the State.

The Chitina subdistrict distribution has remained about the same. About 40 percent of those permits go to Fairbanks residents, 30 percent to Anchorage, one percent or less are picked up by Copper River basin residents that choose to take the State permit down there and fish.

And the final table in this handout,

basically just breaks down the Glennallen subdistrict by gear. You know, fishwheels represent about 60 percent, or permits fishing fishwheels represent 60 percent. Under State regulations, permit holders must choose whether they're going to fish with a dipnet or a fishwheel when they get their permit, so they cannot under State -- under Federal regulations they can fish with either dipnet, fishwheel or rod and reel, but under State it's required they must choose the gear type.

We have seen an increase since 2000 of dipnet permits, and that basically is probably more attributable to the reduction in chinook bag limit in the Chitina subdistrict in 1999 by the Board of Fishery. The bag limit was reduced from four to one, so we had a few, or a couple hundred probably, or 100 permits that shifted up to the Glennallen subdistrict where they can take five kings with a dipnet under State regulations.

One item, 2005 is the Board of Fish cycle for the Copper River. Proposals are being accepted up until April 8th, and then the Board meeting will likely be held in December. Right now it sounds like it might be held in Anchorage. And that will be for proposals concerning the Copper River and Prince William Sound.

The second handout is one that was provided me by the Commercial Fisheries Division. Their representative, Sean Palmer, had some other prior obligations. He wasn't able to make it here. He just put together a table for the forecast estimates for Prince William Sound and Copper River and upper and lower Cook Inlet. I'll just let you look through that.

One thing I guess to point out is that the top portion of that table is for the wild stock forecast estimate, and then the lower portion is the hatchery component. So for the total forecast, harvest forecast, you need to add those two together. So, for example, for pink salmon under Prince William Sound, the wild component is about 4.3 million, but if you add the hatchery component, which is 27 million, you'll see that we're going to be slightly above the recent 10-year commercial harvest average for pink salmon. And essentially that's the forecast for this year. It basically puts us above the recent 10-year average for all species.

And with that, I'll conclude my presentation and field any questions.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Tom. Gloria, do you have a question?

MS. STICKWAN: Unh-unh. (Negative)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other question. Dean.

MR. WILSON: Where's the breaking point between the Glennallen subdistrict and the Chitina subdistrict?

MR. TAUBE: The boundary is the Chitina/McCarthy bridge, and so upstream of the Chitina/McCarthy bridge up to the Slana River is the Glennallen subdistrict, and downstream of the Chitina/McCarthy bridge to Haley Creek is the Chitina subdistrict.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anybody else have any questions for Tom. I've got a couple.

MR. TAUBE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom, when you said that this forecast right here, the top part is the hatchery -- the top part is the wild, the bottom part is the hatchery, you add them together for all species then?

MR. TAUBE: Right.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Okay. The other thing is you were sitting in the audience when we had that little discussion on the radio tags before. Have you got any comments, insights or do.....

MR. TAUBE: Well, I tried to provide like.....

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: .....do those numbers look skewed to you in some way or another, or.....

MR. TAUBE: Well, I think once you add the sport fish component, and I've made myself in a note in the future to include sport fish harvest in the information I provide the Council, you'll see that it actually is a lot closer to the breakdown when you look at that radio tag information when you include that sport fish harvest component. And, you know, what Audra had mentioned, and then Doug also had mentioned, that, you

know, with the sport fish component, why those number of tags are lower is that, you know, 95 percent of our sport harvest occurs in the Gulkana/Klutina, so it's not necessarily representative of all the distribution of tags. So, you know, really when you factor in that amount of harvest that, you know, doing the, as we refer to it, as the calculations on the back of a napkin are pretty close when you factor in the radio tag and that total harvest.

But the information we have gotten from those projects has been amazing. I mean we know so much more now than we did six years ago in what we rely on.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, I redid my calculations on the back of my napkin and the sport fish harvest actually skewed it more, and that's what I was wondering, because the sport fish harvest basically says about 5,000 fish, yet in the capture, tagging, and the CRT, the radio telemetry thing, the sport fish harvest only account for 20 of the 498 rags, and that amounted to 5,000 fish. Where the other 110 tags in 2004 accounted to 5,000 fish. But I just realized something, that's 5,900 fish basically from the State. We still have to add the Federal fish in here yet, too.

MR. TAUBE: Right.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that's -- they are not part of this number, are they?

MR. TAUBE: No, Mr. Chairman. And I believe the chinook component from the past has been between five to 700 fish under the Federal harvest, so you could probably add less than 1,000 onto that total.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But basically like you were saying, that now in the Glennallen subdistrict, an awful lot of the permits have gone to the Federal Government, right?

MR. TAUBE: Right.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So when we look at -- well, let's just take the Glennallen subdistrict, Table 2, and we look at the allocation was 60,000 to 75,000, but like you said, there was an extra 100,000 that you could take something out of. And it says the total harvest is basically it's 68,000 sockeye right there. That's 68,000 on the State permits in the Glennallen

subdistrict, or is that a total of 68,000 sockeye combined the State and the Federal permits in the Glennallen subdistrict?

MR. TAUBE: In Table 2?

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: In Table 2.

MR. TAUBE: Table 2 is the State component only. So you could probably add, you know, like I said, about 20,000 fish to that total, and the majority of those would be sockeye.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right.

MR. TAUBE: I believe last year's harvest was right around 20,000 for the Federal component, and I think it was five to 700 kings under the Federal component also.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So what we need to do then is add these tables together.

MR. TAUBE: Right.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We need your report and her report and add them together, and that gives us the actual number that we're dealing with.

MR. TAUBE: Right. The only issue, and I expect when we have our -- we usually have a preseason Park Service/State meeting, is that generally the Federal component is only reported harvest, where these are estimated harvest for a total State harvest. So there's a missing component. I mean, none of us have 100 percent permit return, you know. The State is between 85 for the Chitina subdistrict and 90 percent for the Glennallen subdistrict. I believe Eric has about the same, you know, 85 percent returns for the Federal components, so there's an expansion factor in the Federal harvest that needs to be included into that harvest also.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, what is the difference between an estimated and a reported?

MR. TAUBE: The estimated factors in the people that do not turn their permits in, so there's a nonresponse factor that's factored in. It's not necessarily a straight expansion, because generally people that turn their permits in later may not have --

not all of them have fished at all. So what the State has done, we have two reminder notices that go out, and they look at that ratio of non -- or people that did not fish versus that fished, and factor that into their -- you know, weight the calculations for the estimated harvest based upon that.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So your's is the estimated then, and the National Park Service's, they only report what they actually got back as reported?

MR. TAUBE: Right. Yeah.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Any other questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tom.

MR. TAUBE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

MR. TWITCHELL: Good morning, Chair, Council member. I'm Hollis Twitchell with Denali National Park. I have no actions requested of the Commission, so it's simply information I have for you today.

There isn't any need to take actions on the Council's appointment to the Commission. Gilbert's appointment is good until this next summer, so come fall we'll need to look at one reappointment to the Denali Commission, but we're good for now.

At the last meeting I mentioned that the Commission passed a hunting proposal looking at -- or actually requesting continuing of the predator/prey research in Denali on wolves and caribou, with an emphasis of looking at that data base to try to clarify the term natural and healthy, which is a term that Congress attached to parks and monument lands for managing wildlife populations. The Regional Director responded to that hunting plan recommendation to the Commission, indicating that, yes, the predator/prey research was funded and will continue at Denali, and also that there is a recognized need to put some effort into clarifying what is meant by the terms natural and healthy since it's not defined in ANILCA or regulation.

She went on to say that both the strategic plans for resources and the subsistence group in the Park Service has identified that as a high priority, and we need to spend some time looking at that, but she didn't allocate any funds to do that particular research. So we're back in ground zero still.

Subsequently, Denali had put forth a proposal through our funding request to do a conference of subsistence managers, subsistence users, biologists to look at two populations in particular, the Mentasta herd and the, excuse me, Denali caribou herd, since there is a pretty extensive data base in terms of those populations, and use that as a model of what that might mean for caribou populations in particular. That proposal is out there. It wasn't funded this cycle either.

So the SRC has subsequently passed a motion and sent a letter up to the Park Service regional director urging her to move forward with that particular proposal and that conference, and so that is out there before her. So that's one of the actions they took at their last meeting.

Another issue I mentioned in our last -- at your last Council meeting was that Denali is looking at the ATV use for subsistence in the Cantwell area specifically as a result of requests from some Cantwell users suggesting that they have additional information supporting that there was a traditional use of ATVs for subsistence uses in that area. Subsequently the Park Service has been going through that review process, and we're a little over half way through it now. The superintendent has agreed to come to a decision on that request by the first of June, and we're in that process right now. We've held multiple hearings in Cantwell with the Cantwell community, and we've conducted 16 additional in-depth interviews and oral histories with individuals identified that had additional information, and doing other research in terms of use of trails and routes, that sort of use. So that's proceeding with the intentions of coming to a decision by the first of June.

This decision is needed, because in 1986 when the Park did its general management plan, it was determined at that time that ATVs were not a traditional means for subsistence access in Denali. So there will need to be a positive determination if they are going to be allowed.

Subsequent to that, the Park Service would also, if it turns out to be a positive determination, need to have some management program in place to ensure that where and when they're used could be done in a way that doesn't significantly impact park resources. So that's all underway.

A final thing I was going to mention is the wolf controversy continues on as usual at Denali. About a month ago out on State lands outside of Healy the alpha female out of the East Fork Pack was trapped along with another member from that pack, which stirred quite a controversy, and ended up with an independent biologist submitting a proposal to the Board of Game to close what's often referred to as this donut hole. It's an area between two buffer zones on State land that are opened to State harvest. a proposal to close that area off. And I understand the Board of Game denied that emergency closure request.

Nevertheless, recent tracking on this East Fork Pack, a new female has joined up with the alpha male. This is the mating period, so very often they break away from the rest of the pack for that activity. About a week ago that female along with a male, the alpha male and one other individual was observed. Initially the East Fork Pack was 11 animals before trapping last month. So it's down to at last observance of the whole pack, it was nine animals out there at this time.

There also was a third animal that broke lose from a trap and has been observed up in the park carrying around the snare on its leg. So we haven't seen that individual for some time.

So the bottom line is the wolf population in Denali is approximately 75 for this time of year, which is in the normal range of wolves. So we're not, in terms of the Park Service, not alarmed in terms of the population as a whole, although this particular pack that has had a lot of trapping activity is one of the most frequently viewed packs in the central part of the park area, so it could very well have influence on that aspect.

I think I'll stop here and just respond to questions.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions. Dean.

MR. WILSON: Yeah, Hollis, how are you guys tracking the wolf pack up there? Are they radio collared, or are you guys chasing them down?

MR. TWITCHELL: They're radio collared. We currently have 10 packs that are being monitored at this time. We usually try to get about two collars out in these packs. Some of the collars are GPS collars, others are aircraft tracked and locations determined by fixed wing. We typically get out at least once a month and do the aerial tracking as well, since that's needed to actually make the counts of other animals with the collared individuals.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. James.

MR. SHOWALTER: Yes, you said there was 10 packs of wolves up there, approximately how many wolves are there in the park?

MR. TWITCHELL: Well, that's a good question. I was flying just two weeks ago out on the west end of the pack -- of the park, I'm sorry, and came across a pack of 10 wolves just heading into the park from the west, which we aren't monitoring. There's no collars in them otherwise. So we don't know exactly how many wolves there are at this time of the year in. We've had three packs demise this winter -- actually this summer and winter, in that western region of the park. Those three packs through dispersal and mortalities have just went away. They're not in that area at all, so I'm certain that there's going to be other animals moving back into those territories.

A side note, we had five mortalities of wolves due to starvation in this particular region of the park, this western flank of the park. Those wolves were picked up and necropsied, and they died due to starvation.

So I couldn't give you a solid number that there are right now. We're estimating 75 known through these 10 packs that we monitor.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any other questions for Hollis.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hollis, I always

remember what you told us at that one meeting how the biggest mortality on wolves is other wolves. We had that evidenced. A neighboring trapper in the area that we were trapping in the Wrangells, was driving down his snow machine trail, and all of a sudden there was blood on the snow machine trail, and then there was a little pool of blood and then blood went down the snow machine trail. And he followed along the corner, and there's a dead wolf. It had hits throat slashed and its rear end picked (ph). And obviously another wolf must have -- and it was a big, big wolf. It was a great big male. So either it was a fight for dominancy or something, but it was in good shape, but another wolf had killed it.

MR. TWITCHELL: That's clearly true with Denali. The highest mortality is from being killed by other wolves. In this last two years we've had a lot of unusual movements of wolf packs outside of their normal territories looking for moose and caribou. Some of the packs have moved from this western area that I just described clear over into that area near Healy, which is crossing three or four wolf territories to get over there. Very unusual movements in terms of those wolves. They're hungry.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And when they pass those other territories, they're vulnerable to attacks and fights by other wolves then?

MR. TWITCHELL: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, is it because the moose population or caribou population in the western part of the park is down, or were they basically sheep wolves, or were they -- I mean, were they on moose and caribou or were they on sheep? What are they starving to death for lack of?

MR. TWITCHELL: Well, that's an interesting question. The area out on the western part of the park is predominantly out in the flats and the arboreal forest. There is with the exception of tight against the Alaska Range, and there are fairly low moose densities out in that region. Our most recent survey indicated a density of .29 moose per square mile overall in the northern side of the park. In this particular area out to the northwest it's probably even lower in that region.

So they don't have the populations of

sheep in that area, nor caribou. That far western flank is periodically occupied by the Tonsina Herd, which is a very small caribou herd, I believe less than 1200. The main Denali Herd stays farther to the east from there. So there are very low numbers of caribou and low densities of moose in that area.

Interesting research that Lane Adams has looked at was the importance of salmon associated with these wolf packs, and he's looked recently at the nitrogen stable isotopes in the wolves in that western flank of the park where we have fisheries, salmon streams, as compared to the more central and eastern part of the park where we don't have any spawning salmon habitat, but just sheep, caribou and moose, and have found that those wolf packs out to the west, looking at this stable nitrogen isotope in the bone tissue of those animals have 11 percent of their diet due to salmon. And then in certain times of the year when salmon are in the water, the chinooks, the chums and the coho, he's speculating that a third of their diet during that time of year is due to salmon as opposed to the Alaska Range and eastern packs where there's no salmon spawning. There's little or no stable nitrogen isotopes in the bone tissue of those wolves. So a big difference going on regionally of what's happening with those populations.

In aerial surveys that we flew this summer for chinook and later on in the fall showed relatively lower numbers of salmon observed on the spawning grounds than we had seen in the past. Even though the numbers of chinook and chum had increased in the Yukon River drainage, for some reason we didn't see as many fish up on the spawning grounds.

So guess it would be a good assumption or speculation that with the lack of caribou, moose and sheep out in that western flank, and less than normal observed salmon on the spawning grounds, that these wolves just starved to death.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. All this sounds pretty interesting. Anybody else have any questions for Hollis.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'll talk to you later.

MR. TWITCHELL: Thank you.

MR. TWITCHELL: Okay. National Park Service Wrangell.

MS. CELLARIUS: Mr. Chair, members of the Council, my name is Barbara Cellarius, and I'm the subsistence coordinator for Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve. Just a few quick things about what's going on in the park, and then Eric sent me with some information about the fisheries program.

The only wildlife report I have concerns the Chishana Caribou Herd, and I will present that only if you're interested in hearing about that, because that's a Unit 12 herd. Talk about the recovery efforts that are going on.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anybody? Is anybody interested in hearing that other than me? I'll ask her later if nobody else is.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Why don't we skip the Chishana Caribou Herd.

MS. CELLARIUS: Okay. I just wanted to.....

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'll talk to you later on that topic.

MS. CELLARIUS: .....make that offer in case anyone was interested.

We have a new superintendent. He joined us in November, and his name is Jed Davis. He came to us from Glacier Bay, so he's got some Alaska experience, although not a lot of subsistence experience. I think Ralph actually stopped and met him earlier this week.

We also have a new Nebesna district ranger, and that's an area that's very highly used by both subsistence hunters and sport hunters, so we're glad to actually have somebody in place for this hunting season. We had people assigned there last hunting season, but he's permanently based in Nebesna, or in Slana at the Slana ranger station.

We currently have an environmental assessment out for review on some improvements that we're

talking about doing at the Twin Lakes camp ground. That's about half way out the Nebesna Road, and as I just said, it's an area that's used by both sport and subsistence hunters fairly highly. We're sort of interested to see what, you know, there may be hunters using that campground if the facilities are improved.

Your appointment to the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission is good until November of 2005, so I'll be bringing that to you at the next meeting.

And so I guess I'll go to fisheries now. For the 2004 reported Federal Copper River subsistence harvest, this is as of last week, in the Chitina subdistrict, 109 permits were issued, and we have 77 of those permits were returned, 1,526 sockeye were harvest, 9 chinook and 18 coho. In the Glennallen subdistrict, this is based on 187 permits returned out of 263 permits issued, 15,945 sockeye, 610 chinook, 149 coho, and 12 steelhead. The Batzulnetas fishery where we just typically issue one permit, there were 182 sockeye harvested. So I would just try to do a few quick calculations here, so we had 17,653 sockeye for those three areas was the Federal harvest, and 619 chinook. So that's what I have on this year's fishing so far.

If there are any questions about that before I move on to the last thing I have to talk about.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none, go on.

MS. CELLARIUS: Okay. The last thing I wanted to let you know about is some -- a change in how we manage part of the Copper River. And this concerns the enforcement of a particular Federal regulation in the Copper River where it flows through the boundaries of Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve. There's about 17 miles of the river that has the park and preserve on both sides of the river. This is between Indian River, which is just north of Chistochina, and basically the Slana River. So it's the upper 17 miles of the upper Copper River district.

And since the McDowell decision by the Alaska Supreme Court in 1989, all residents of the State

of Alaska are eligible to use fishwheels or dipnets to harvest salmon in the Glennallen subdistrict of the Copper River. This conflicts with 36 CFR 2.3(d) which prohibits fishing in fresh waters in any matter other than hook and line, with a rod or line being closely attended.

Subsistence -- there's separate regulations that would apply to the Federal Subsistence Program, but people aren't eligible for the Federal Subsistence Program, using anything other than rod and reel within that part of the district is not allowed.

And the park intends to enforce this regulation in 2005. This will likely displace about 10 urban households who have previously harvested salmon within the park boundary using a fishwheel. So a fishwheel is not in that piece of the river that I was talking about, that 17-mile chunk of river, non-Federally qualified subsistence users can't use a fishwheel. And so in short that's what we're planning on doing this year. And we'll be notifying people ahead of time to the extent that we know who's fishing up there.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Barbara, if I understood that right, they're not displaced out of Glennallen subdistrict, they're displaced out of the portion of the park's on both sides, so they have to drop below Indian River.....

MS. CELLARIUS: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: .....where the river is contiguous to the park, but not in the park?

MS. CELLARIUS: Yeah. It only affects the -- for most of the park boundary, for most of the length of the Copper River that's part of the Glennallen subdistrict, the park boundary is the eastern shore of the river. And so the river is not actually within the park. But at Indian River, the river enters the park, and so it's that section where the river has got park on both sides.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So at that section then, from there on up, the regulations apply as to if you are a resident of a resident zone community or have park status, have a 1644, or if you are not that, then you are strictly a sport fisherman, and you're only allowed rod and reel?

MS. CELLARIUS: That's basically, yeah, what the -- so people could use rod and -- sport fishermen could use rod and reel. I'm not sure how much actually sport fishing takes place on the main stem of the Copper, but that would be the only legal means for someone who is not Federally qualified.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Has this resulted in any opposition or litigation or anything on that order?

MS. CELLARIUS: This is a fairly new decision, fairly new -- you know, we have sort of been talking about it. We talked about it at the SRC meeting, and I'm actually not sure where the State is, but we haven't -- from folk who fish, we haven't heard any complaints. And as I said, our -- we estimate there's about 10 urban households that would be affected.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: By urban households, you mean urban households outside of resident zone communities?

MS. CELLARIUS: Urban as in non-rural.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Urban as in non-rural. Okay. Okay. Gloria.

MS. STICKWAN: You didn't mention Mentasta Herd, but I was wondering if you knew -- yesterday I heard Harley say that there's Nelchina mixing, going across the Copper River. Do you guys know how much of a mix there is between the Nelchina Herd and the Mentasta Herd, and what's going on there?

MS. CELLARIUS: Mason didn't give me any information on that, but we can certainly check with Mason if you would like to get that information. Do you want me to -- okay.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anybody else have any questions for Barbara.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Barbara, thank you for the information.

MS. CELLARIUS: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With that we're

going to go on to -- have we missed anybody? Donald? We haven't missed anybody. Okay. We would hate to do that.

With that we're going to go on to other business. Council topics for the May 2005 Board meeting. Have any members of the Council got topics that they would like to see on the agenda for the 2005 Board meeting at this point in time. Gloria.

MS. STICKWAN: I would like to see if we could ask the NPS director to support the Mentasta Herd and the Denali Herd research project that they submitted.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Barbara, you didn't have that with you, did you, the Mentasta Herd, anything on that one there. Just the Chishana Herd.

MS. CELLARIUS: Yes, I asked Eric -- or I asked Mason, and (indiscernible - away from microphone).

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So you'd like the status of the Mentasta Herd?

MS. STICKWAN: No, I just wanted this Council to support the project that was submitted by Denali I guess for the Mentasta and Denali Herd.

MS. CELLARIUS: What Dean and Hollis was talking about.

MS. STICKWAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Did you get that, Donald? Okay. Pete.

MR. KOMPKOFF: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to have that subsistence hunt for moose out at Chenega that we have scheduled over to King's Bay changed to Cordova area. Is that possible?

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think a proposal would have to be put and doesn't Chenega at this -- I know that Tatitlek does, but doesn't Chenega have c&t for the Cordova area already?

MR. CARPENTER: No, Mr. Chairman. About, well, it must be five years ago, Pete, there was a proposal that was put in to do the c&t analysis for the Cordova moose herd, because it went from a State hunt to a Federal hunt, and the only people that were given a c&t

were actually the people from Cordova. They actually looked at -- they actually did the analysis for Chenega and Tatitlek, but they found that over the last 25 years that there wasn't enough harvest that had taken place from Chenega and Tatitlek to give them a c&t for it. So that's how Cordova only got included.

MR. KOMPKOFF: So there's no chance of change?

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's not a question of change, but first of all what would have to happen is another proposal would have to be put in to give Chenega c&t in Unit 6(C), and that would have to pass. It's not like you can take one subsistence hunt and switch it to another subsistence hunt. Nobody else has access to King's Bay. And whether Chenega takes them or not, nobody else has access to them, because nobody else has c&t for King's Bay. Cordova people can't hunt there, Tatitlek people can't hunt there.

MR. CARPENTER: I think what you'd have to do, Pete, is you'd have to get the Chenega Corp or you could do it individually. The next time there's a call for game proposal, which would be this next year, you'd have to ask for a c&t for Chenega Bay for Unit 6(C).

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

MR. CARPENTER: I think that would be the first step. I don't know, maybe Jerry -- I think that's the way it is though.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And then if Chenega would have a c&t, then residents of Chenega could put in for the same drawing as Cordova. I mean, you know, they wouldn't be given a hunt there, because that's a drawing subsistence hunt, but they would then be qualified to enter into the drawing. At this point in time, they're not qualified to enter into the drawing.

MR. KOMPKOFF: Well, I can sign up for the drawing for the regular hunt.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You can sign up for the drawing for the regular State hunt.

MR. KOMPKOFF: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But the Federal hunt in

Cordova is limited to residents of 6(C), right?

MR. KOMPKOFF: So before that could change, I'd have to go through that process like Tom mentioned?

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right. You'd have to go through the c&t process.

MR. KOMPKOFF: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other topics to put on the agenda? I think -- is there still -- where's my staff? Is there still the opportunity to put a proposal in to that effect for this fall's meeting?

MR. CARPENTER: Fisheries proposals.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, it's fisheries proposals in fall. My fault. It would have to be for next spring's meeting. Thank you, Tom. It's been a long day. Okay.

With that, any other topics that somebody would like to see put on this agenda? Doug.

MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman, really not a topic for the main Council, but would it be possible somehow to in the future get the people that propose different things in this book to have to attend and talk about their proposals? You know, I noticed this year no one came. They proposed things, but no one came. I think it would be very important when they -- Proposal No. 7, for instance, that that proposer came and talked about it so that we hear first-hand what is going on.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug, I don't think we can make them attend, but we have not exactly turned proposals down, but we've given them very little weight because nobody shows up to speak for them. And I think it's to the best interest of anybody that puts a proposal in, if they really want it passed, to come and speak to that proposal and possibly to bring other people to speak to that proposal. I mean, we've had requests for access from an area, but nobody from the area has ever written a letter on it, commented on it, said anything on it, or come to the meeting, and it's pretty hard to give that much priority. And I agree with you on that 100 percent. But I don't think we can require them to come, but we have the ability to give weight or not weight if they

don't come.

Any other topics that somebody -- you know, the whole thing about the topics is if you think of a topic prior to the meeting, Donald's right there, and call Donald, give him the topic. He can call me, and between us, if it's a topic that needs to be on the meeting, we can get it on the meeting agenda. Gloria.

MS. STICKWAN: We might want to mention to the Federal Board about the BLM thing.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes. Let's put that on our topics for the next meeting is the BLM thing. And we're going to still write the letter to try to see if we can get them to postpone it, but we want that on the agenda. And even if it's over, we'll put it on the agenda so we can comment on it.

Okay. Annual report is the next thing. And the annual report are things that we think it's important that we need to put into the annual report. And I think that is a very good place for us also to put our comments on the BLM thing is into the annual report, to include our comments that we're going to put in the letter, we'll include them in the annual report. I think the status of the Mentasta Herd would be a good one.

Can anybody else think of some things that we would like to -- now, the annual report is what goes to the Board, and it's things that this Council thinks are important, things that need to be addressed, things that we need to thank them for, things we need to say that they didn't do a good job on. And what else, Donald?

MR. MIKE: You know, you did a good job of covering it, but I just wanted to mention that the annual report was an oversight by our office, and we were supposed to have a draft by this meeting for you to approve. But since it was an oversight from our last fall's meeting, we can try to get this annual report letter out, and we can either mail or e-mail or fax and get the comments back, and that way we'll have time to submit it to the Board at its May meeting.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So we'd have it assembled by the fall meeting?

MR. MIKE: Pardon?

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So we would have it by the fall meeting?

MR. MIKE: Yeah, it was supposed to be -- the draft annual report is supposed to be drafted in the fall meeting in preparation for the Board meeting in May. But since it was an oversight, the items that you mentioned, I can draft up the letter and fax it or e-mail to all the Council members for their comment. That way we can have it at the Board's meeting in May.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, we would have it at the Board meeting in May. Okay.

MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.

MR. CARPENTER: Yeah, I think we should include in our annual meeting, you know, seeing how the Board is actually made up of the heads of these Federal agencies, they are the ones that have the ability to request money from Washington, D.C., and I think it's important to stress how important these monitoring programs we've established are on the Copper River, and that we need to see funding come into OSM to continue to fund these into the future.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's a good one. And like you brought out, since the heads of these different departments are there, we can also bring out the need for issues that affect subsistence, that in their studies they have to give us a timely time to respond to them, and that means that, you know, we should at least be able to respond to them over one of our meetings, and not -- and that would be especially applicable to the BLM at this point in time.

Okay. Anything else on that? Can anybody think of -- I think that BLM one is our biggest pressing issue.

Okay. Council review, comments on Council's Operation Manual. Donald, I think you're going to present that to us, right?

MR. MIKE: Yes, Mr. Chair, at our work session we briefly discussed the Regional Council Operations Manual, and this was produced back in 2003, and our office thought it might be a good idea to update

the manual, and this will give the Council an opportunity to see if they like what they have in the manual already, if they'd to see additions or changes. So this is an opportunity for you as a Council to provide your input as far as what goes into the manual and what needs to be changed or any other comments that you'd like to see to the manual

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And would you like those comments today?

MR. MIKE: I'll tell you, if you need time to further review it, just send me the comments. Either give me a call or e-mail or send me a letter, and then I'll talk to Ann Wilkinson, she's in charge of doing the update on the manual, and see when is her next deadline.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So what is the date that it needs to be in by?

MR. MIKE: Jerry, do you have any idea? Well, I can give the Council another couple, three weeks if that's plenty of time.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. And what he's talking about is this one right here. He's saying take it home and look at it, and if you see something that's needed in it, let him know. If you see something that you don't think is needed in it, let him know. If you like it, let him know. If you don't like it, let him know. And we can review it and comment on it. And if you don't see anything that needs change, you don't see anything that you like or dislike, you don't have to say anything.

MR. KOMPKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, Pete.

MR. KOMPKOFF: As a new member, I was going to make a comment. I didn't have a chance to go over that manual, so three weeks would be good for me, thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You're welcome. Okay. That covers that.

Future meeting plans. We need the time and location of the next meeting. And we have currently

set October 19th through 21st at Seldovia as the meeting place. Is that still on, and is that still okay to everybody. Donald.

MR. MIKE: Yes, at our last fall meeting in Soldotna, the Council choose Soldotna (sic) as the primary place to meet, and the alternate location would be Copper Center.

The Council requested that I a little background information, check on the possibility of having a meeting in Seldovia, and I made contact with the Seldovia City Clerk's office, and they said they would be able to accommodate the meeting in Seldovia. And they said they would have some bed and breakfasts open, hotel open, and some restaurants open.

But if the Council would like to continue to go forward and have the meeting in Seldovia, that's your prerogative, or if you want to go with the alternate location, that's your other option. So it's up to the Council. You can meet in Seldovia or Copper Center. You just need to have to affirm that today.

MR. KOMPKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pete.

MR. KOMPKOFF: I don't have a problem with Seldovia. I like Seldovia. I'd like to go there once a year anyway.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, we looked at it as an opportunity to go some place most of us never get to and see a different place. If they have the facilities, and they're going to be open, and we can get transportation there with no problem, I'm still all for the Seldovia meeting. Fred.

MR. ELVSAAS: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You probably don't want it though.

MR. ELVSAAS: What's that?

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You probably don't want it, Fred.

(Laughter)

MR. ELVSAAS: Oh, that would be great for me. I'll be right at home. But I think there's sufficient lodging. There's two small hotels and bed and breakfasts.

But the one thing that we've got to do, Donald, is be sure and contact them early, because it's toward the end of the season, and several bed and breakfasts may want to be leaving if there's no more business for them. The one hotel I believe has 14 rooms and the other one has 7. And then there's quite a few bed and breakfasts around. I was surprised how many Seldovia had. I think there's like 19. But then also to contact the restaurants and so forth. But you can pull that up on the website.

As for transportation, there's a couple air taxis out of Homer, there's tour boats still running at that point. If they know there's traffic, they'll be available. And if you do use one of the tour boats as a group, you know, you want to let them know. So that's something that everybody would need to decide if they want to do the tour or just do the air taxi. Of course, if it's southeast wind, then you want the tour boat. I just came out of there on a southeast wind the other day, and it wasn't a very good flight, you know. But for fall time, i's not that bad.

And I think it would be good to do it. I know we went to Mentasta late and there was no housing there. We had Mentasta Lodge and Tok and so forth, so if there was a real crunch, you know, flying out of flying Homer is not that bad either on a daily flight. There's several flights a day for both air taxis. So I think it's a great idea.

MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chair, I move we go forward with our confirmed plans for the Seldovia meeting in October.

MR. KOMPKOFF: I second that.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and seconded that we go forward with our Seldovia meeting plans at this point in time.

MR. CARPENTER: Question.

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

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by saying nay.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries.

Okay. Then we need to go on to time and location of the winter meeting 2006. Donald.

MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair, for the winter -- we've got the fall meeting taken care of. It's in Seldovia.

And for the winter meeting for 2006, we just need to keep in mind that we share staff with Northwest Arctic area and Southeast with the FIS folks. So in your book you have your calendar of meeting winter opportunities. But the Northwest area choose March 7th and 8th, and the Southeast Council selected February 27th to March 3rd. So you have the opportunity to select the meeting dates prior to or after the Northwest area meets, which is March 8th, so it's up to the Council.

MS. STICKWAN: Mr. Chair.

MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.

MS. STICKWAN: We have an important proposal that we have to address at the Alaska Board of Game next year. I don't know when that meeting will be held, but it's usually held in February. I really need to go to that meeting.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So you think March would be better then for you?

MS. STICKWAN: I don't know when that Board of Game meeting is, but I know it's next year sometime in February.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, did anybody find the time that we came now a hardship, because that's open, the same week that we were here right now.

MR. CARPENTER: Mr. Chair I was going to

recommend that we have the winter meeting in Anchorage next year during the week of March 13th.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that way it would be after the Board of Game, and be basically the same time as right now.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: March 13th?

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, 14th, 15th. We need, because people travel, we need to have a day on each end of it, so let's have it if possible the 14th, 15th, and 16th.

MR. CARPENTER: So moved.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved that we have it March 14th, 15th, and 16th, and we have it in Anchorage. Do I hear a second?

MR. KOMPKOFF: Second.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and seconded.

MR. CARPENTER: Question.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question's been called. Tom wants to go home. All in favor of March 14th, 15th and 16th in Anchorage, signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by saying nay.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. With that, the meeting is adjourned.

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 210 through 282 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the SOUTHCENTRAL FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME III, taken electronically by Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC on the 17th day of March 2005, beginning at the hour of 8:30 o'clock a.m. in Anchorage, 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 25th day of March 2005.

_____
Joseph P. Kolasinski
Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 03/12/08