

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

SOUTHCENTRAL FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

PUBLIC MEETING

VOLUME III

Kenai, Alaska
October 27, 2005
9:00 o'clock a.m.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

- Ralph Lohse, Chairman
- Doug Blossom
- Tom Carpenter
- Richard Greg Encelewski
- Pete Kompkoff
- James Showalter
- Gloria Stickwan
- Dean L. Wilson, Jr.
- Regional Council 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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Kenai, Alaska - 10/27/2005)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We're all in our places with bright, shining faces and it's time for class to begin. I will call the Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council fall meeting back into session. We're getting ready to go on to WP06-07, the moose one, but we have a couple things we need to take care of before we do. The Wrangell-St. Elias has asked whether we could take care of our SRC appointment because they have to go and that's something we need to take care of.

Something was brought to my attention and I need to ask Doug a question for the record and that was when you made your amendment yesterday were you intending to include Whittier in that or were you not?

MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman. No, I considered Whittier in Prince William Sound. I made it for the Kenai Peninsula. They've never been considered that in anything.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. How about the second. The second was James. Did you understand that Whittier was in that amendment you made yesterday?

MR. SHOWALTER: Yes. That's where I goofed up and I kept saying Valdez.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You kept saying Valdez but you meant Whittier. I think you're talking about a different proposal on that one. The one that you seconded that Doug made, all rural residents of the Kenai Peninsula.

MR. SHOWALTER: Right. All rural residents.

MR. BLOSSOM: Did you consider Whittier part of Kenai?

MR. SHOWALTER: Well, the Peninsula, yes.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So we have a confusion on that one there.

1 MR. BLOSSOM: I guess then, Mr. Chairman,
2 at your pleasure we should bring that back up.

3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think we're going to
5 need to do that. So a motion for reconsideration on that
6 one is in order after a while.

7
8 MR. BLOSSOM: You tell us when.

9
10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So, with that,
12 now we're going to start and, like I said, our first
13 thing on the agenda that we're going to try to handle
14 this morning is our SRC appointment.

15
16 MS. CELLARIUS: Mr. Chairman. My name is
17 Barbara Cellarius and I'm the subsistence coordinator for
18 Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve and with me
19 is Eric Veach, our fisheries biologist. We also have
20 some information about fish returns and hunting permits
21 if you're interested in hearing that this morning, but we
22 can start with the SRC appointment.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Let's take care of the
25 SRC appointment.

26
27 MS. CELLARIUS: Your current appointment
28 to the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission
29 is Cole Ellis. He served for two years. When I
30 contacted him about re-appointment, he said it is
31 difficult for him to make meetings and that he would be
32 just as happy if you appointed someone else. This
33 appointment to the SRC, the RAC, the people who are
34 qualified to be appointed are either members of a local
35 advisory committee or the Regional Advisory Committee.
36 Two members of this RAC had previously contacted me with
37 an interest in appointment to the SRC. Those are Dean
38 Wilson, Jr. of Kenny Lake and Gloria Stickwan of Tazlina.
39 So I would offer those as a place to start in your
40 consideration and you certainly know them very well. I
41 don't know if you want me to say a few words about them.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, please do.

44
45 MS. CELLARIUS: Okay. Let me look at my
46 notes. Do you want me to tell you who else is on the
47 SRC?

48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Go through the whole
50 thing.

1 MS. CELLARIUS: I'll just read the list
2 of the SRC appointments. There are three appointments by
3 the Secretary of the Interior. Those individuals are Ray
4 Sensmeier of Yakutat, Paul Klaus, who lives on the
5 Chitina River within the Park and Robert Marshall with
6 Tazlina. There are three appointees by the Governor of
7 Alaska. Those are Suzanne McCarthy of Gakona, Don Horrel
8 of Tazlina and Robert Pitheon (ph) of Kenny Lake. And
9 then the Southeast RAC appointee is Bert Adams. The
10 Eastern Interior RAC appointee is Chuck Miller of Dot
11 Lake. And then we're considering who to appoint then for
12 the Southcentral position.

13
14 So I've just written up some brief
15 information about the two individuals who have expressed
16 an interest to me in the SRC.
17 Gloria has actually been a member of the SRC in the past.
18 She attends meetings of the Commission on a regular basis
19 and actively takes part in the meetings. In addition to
20 her personal and family experience as a long-time user of
21 the Park's subsistence resources, Ms. Stickwan has
22 knowledge of subsistence uses and practices in the region
23 that has been gained through participation in a variety
24 of subsistence studies. She has good contacts with
25 subsistence users in several communities in the Ahtna
26 region. Finally, as a member of the RAC -- well, this
27 would be the case with either of them. If you were to
28 appoint a RAC member to the SRC, that individual could
29 serve as a bridge between those two bodies.

30
31 Dean Wilson lives in Kenny Lake where he
32 has taken on leadership roles in the local volunteer fire
33 department. Dean and his family have been active in
34 using resources in the Wrangell-St. Elias area. He hunts
35 and traps for a variety of species, including moose,
36 caribou and goat. His family uses a fish wheel on the
37 Copper River. He occasionally works as a transporter.
38 Dean is a relative newcomer to subsistence boards and
39 commissions, however he's completed a term on the
40 Southcentral Council, as you know, and is seen to be an
41 effective member of the Council.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Okay. So
44 what you need is action on our part.

45
46 MS. CELLARIUS: Yes. If you could vote
47 to appoint one of these individuals or someone else. You
48 would also be someone from within the Park area who could
49 be appointed.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Who is on the advisory
2 committee.
3
4 MS. CELLARIUS: Somebody who is on the
5 RAC or on a local AC, so there's a couple other people on
6 this RAC besides Dean and Gloria, like yourself.
7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Don't worry. Myself is
9 not applicable. Gloria, you wish to serve on that one?
10
11 MS. STICKWAN: Yes.
12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And Dean, you wish to
14 serve on that one?
15
16 MR. WILSON: Yes.
17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So what we need
19 is -- Bob.
20
21 MR. CHURCHILL: I'd like to nominate Dean
22 Wilson, Jr. to serve.
23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second.
25
26 MR. KOMPKOFF: Second.
27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Seconded by Pete. Dean
29 Wilson is nominated. Greg.
30
31 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Mr. Chair. I nominate
32 Gloria.
33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.
35
36 MR. KOMPKOFF: I second it.
37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Seconded by Pete. So we
39 have Gloria and Dean. So, with that, you know what I'm
40 going to ask for, I'm just going to ask for a piece of
41 paper for all of us and we'll just take a written vote.
42 Unless somebody knows somebody else that can be
43 nominated, nominations cease, because the only other
44 person that's eligible is not running for the office. We
45 can only select one. We have to vote for one out of the
46 two.
47
48 MS. CELLARIUS: There's always Harley,
49 but he hasn't said anything to me about being interested.
50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's true. While
2 we're waiting for the results, if we could have our fish
3 report.

4
5 MR. VEACH: Good morning, Mr. Chairman,
6 Regional Council. Thanks for indulging us and letting us
7 go a little early this morning. A couple things I wanted
8 to highlight for you out of our agency report is we did
9 once again this year issue a special action to close the
10 Glennallen subdistrict of the Upper Copper River district
11 for the last two weeks of May so the Federal season on
12 the Copper River open concurrently with the State season
13 in the Glennallen subdistrict.

14
15 The reason we did that was really the
16 same reason that we had done it in 2004. Essentially we
17 were going forward on the same information. Relatively
18 low returns during the early portion of the brood years
19 of '99 and 2000. And certainly also concerned, again, to
20 meet the needs of the upriver users in Batzulnetas.
21 Hopefully we won't need to do that again this year.

22
23 Certainly as we look at what we would
24 expect to see from the brood years for next season,
25 hopefully we'll have a little better return during that
26 early portion of the run. At least at this point in time
27 we wouldn't anticipate needing to do that again in 2006.
28 As near as I could tell, the Federal subsistence users
29 certainly didn't seem to be too adversely impacted by the
30 two-week closure.

31
32 While there wasn't any harvest in the
33 Batzulnetas fishery this year, that I think was due
34 probably more to the fact that the bank had eroded and
35 the traditional site for the fish wheel completely
36 disappeared. There was 30 feet in width of bank that was
37 just eliminated by the Copper River, so it was a real
38 tough year for those folks to find some place to fish up
39 there.

40
41 But certainly the subsistence users at
42 Slana, which would be kind of the next downstream area
43 where folks would fish in the Glennallen subdistrict
44 there, were very successful this year. In fact, some
45 fish wheels reported catches of over 200 salmon in the
46 night, which was certainly better than they had seen in
47 recent years at least at Slana as well. Most of the
48 users that I talked to at Slana were very happy with
49 their catches this year.

50

1 The other thing I wanted to mention along
2 those lines that also affects that same general vicinity
3 of the Glennallen subdistrict was we came across a
4 National Park Service regulation this year which
5 prohibits the use of any gear type except hook and line
6 or closely attended line inside the National Park Service
7 Unit boundary, so that would apply to both the Park and
8 Preserve. So what that means is if you're using a fish
9 wheel, which we would consider a trap, inside the Park
10 boundary, you could only do that under the authority of a
11 Federal subsistence fishing permit. Which means if
12 you're not a local rural resident and if you work from,
13 say, Anchorage, North Pole, Fairbanks, Eagle River, you
14 wouldn't be eligible to use a fish wheel inside the Park
15 boundary.

16
17 So what we did is we actually drafted a
18 letter to individuals in the past who have utilized fish
19 wheels in the Park boundary, really the Preserve boundary
20 there, and let them know that it was our intent this year
21 to actually enforce that regulation and that if they were
22 fishing there they would be in violation of Park Service
23 regulation 36 CFR 2.3. I think that worked fairly well.
24 We had two Rangers that went down to the area where folks
25 were using fish wheels numerous times over the summer.
26 They never actually encountered anyone who was in
27 violation.

28
29 There was maybe 10 households that were
30 actually affected by this, but out of that, I think, four
31 really felt seriously displaced and we certainly worked
32 with those folks. We talked to them on the phone, wrote
33 some additional letters with them and kind of worked
34 through the situation with them, helped them understand
35 why we needed to enforce this regulation. Again, we felt
36 it went relatively well with kind of our pre-season work
37 to get the word out, then the fact that we didn't find
38 anybody actually in violation down there.

39
40 Moving on away from the upper portion of
41 the Glennallen subdistrict there, as I mentioned
42 yesterday, we believe there was about 4,200 fish and
43 maybe a few more that went through the weir at Tanada
44 Creek. At Long Lake it was a real successful summer for
45 operating the weir there. We didn't have any of the high
46 flow problems that we had in Tanada Creek. We saw about
47 7,730 sockeye salmon and 439 silver salmon that went
48 through the Long Lake weir.

49
50 We also issued a few special actions to

1 basically open and close the Chitina subdistrict of the
2 Copper River and that was done simultaneously with the
3 State of Alaska, so all of our periodic openings for the
4 Federal season in Chitina subdistrict coincided with open
5 periods for the State season in the Chitina subdistrict.
6

7 We actually issued a few less permits for
8 the Glennallen subdistrict this year. We issued about
9 150 subsistence fishing permits rather than 165, I think
10 is what we issued last year. But, by and large, it was
11 about the same number that we issued last year and that
12 was the same for the Chitina subdistrict as well, about
13 100 permits, which is about what we issued last year.
14

15 We also were able to cooperate with the
16 State of Alaska Department of Fish and Game this year on
17 a steelhead radiotelemetry project, looking at steelhead
18 distribution in the Copper River. And the Central Alaska
19 Network of Parks, which includes our Park and then Denali
20 National Park and Yukon/Charley River Preserve, hired a
21 stream ecologist that will actually be based out of
22 Fairbanks, but one of his primary duties will be to look
23 at developing monitoring protocols for the flowing of
24 waters and fish within our parks, so we're real excited
25 about that. He brings a lot of expertise in developing
26 sound monitoring protocols.
27

28 That's all I have, Mr. Chairman. I'd be
29 happy to answer any questions.
30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I've got two. One is a
32 clarification. When you say where the Copper River goes
33 in the Park, you mean where the Park is on both banks of
34 the Copper River, not where it borders the Park.
35

36 MR. VEACH: That's correct, Mr. Chairman.
37 So basically from about the confluence of Indian River
38 with the Copper River upstream, the Copper River is
39 entirely within the National Park, so both banks are in
40 there and the Park boundary crosses the river at that
41 point. After the Park boundary crosses the river, what
42 it does is it follows the high water mark downstream then
43 for the length of the Park. So, technically, the Indian
44 River downstream, the Copper River is outside of the
45 Park.
46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's why we had two
48 sets of regulations as to what could be done in there.
49

50 MR. VEACH: Exactly. So basically the

1 last 17 upstream miles, I guess, falls within the Park
2 and then the remainder of the Glennallen subdistrict is
3 outside of the Park.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The other question that
6 I have, you said that that closure probably won't be
7 necessary this year, but when we looked at the escapement
8 and we talked about how many years it takes for a return,
9 the return this year should be on that 1,660 fish
10 escapement. That's not classed as a good escapement, is
11 it? That's a low escapement, isn't it?

12

13 MR. VEACH: It is. It's definitely low
14 escapement. As I mentioned yesterday, it opens up a
15 pretty big can of worms. It's sort of tough to look at
16 escapement to escapement, which is kind of what we're
17 doing here because there is a much larger return. I
18 think that's a good point, Mr. Chairman.

19

20 I guess what I was alluding to is the
21 information that drove the need for the special action
22 for the last two years, which was the low return during
23 the early portion of those brood years, that won't
24 continue to be a concern. Again, we'll probably need to
25 look at all the available information in the spring and
26 certainly work closely with the users as we have in the
27 past.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Because the last couple
30 years you have not had low escapements in the early part
31 of the season, we kind of think that's a trend because of
32 the weather and the way things are going. The other
33 thing that I was thinking of, if this fyke trap gets
34 approved, that may take some of the pressure off as far
35 as getting them their fish because they won't be quite so
36 dependent on the river itself, you know, and what you
37 were talking about with the banks eroding and problems
38 with the fish wheels.

39

40 MR. VEACH: I think that's definitely
41 correct. An increased efficiency would certainly help in
42 that situation.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other question.
45 Bob.

46

47 MR. CHURCHILL: Through the Chair. What
48 accommodations do you make these four people that
49 appeared more than mildly upset that had the fish wheels.

50

1 MR. VEACH: I don't know that we can say
2 we made any accommodations other than -- you know, we
3 certainly did explain to them that the rest of the
4 Glennallen subdistrict would still be open to them. I
5 think I need to emphasize the point that this isn't a
6 decision that we made.

7
8 Really, this law has been on the books
9 probably prior to the creation of our Park and it was a
10 similar issue that was wrestled with with Lake Clark a
11 few years ago and we really weren't aware of the fact
12 that we had folks who were not local rural residents
13 fishing inside the Park. When we started taking a closer
14 look at who was actually fishing on what fish wheels and
15 where those fish wheels were located, at that point it
16 became readily apparent to us that we did have folks
17 outside the Park and it also triggered us to start
18 looking at our National Park Service regulations.

19
20 So we really just explained to folks that
21 it wasn't in response to any decision made by the
22 Superintendent or even in his role as the in-season
23 manager, that this was simply a National Park Service
24 regulation that we really don't have any choice but to
25 enforce.

26
27 MR. CHURCHILL: In your testimony you had
28 indicated there was some sort of accommodation made.
29 What you were really saying is you put it as nicely as
30 you could that that was the rules.

31
32 MR. VEACH: That's pretty much correct.
33 We certainly did point out to folks that there might be
34 other opportunities for them to fish on lands outside of
35 the Park downstream.

36
37 MR. CHURCHILL: Always a great task to
38 have, isn't it? Thank you.

39
40 MR. WILSON: That's kind of along the
41 same lines of the question I was going to ask. That was
42 actually a rule that was brought up from Yellowstone or
43 some other place. That wasn't put in for Wrangell-St.
44 Elias.

45
46 MR. VEACH: That's correct. That rule
47 applies nationwide to all national parks. And then with
48 the Alaska parks, what we have in the part 13 regulation,
49 it provides an exception for local rural residents who
50 engage in subsistence. So anyone who is qualified as a

1 local rural resident to engage in subsistence in the
2 Park, then is allowed to use a trap, seine, net or spear
3 to harvest fish in the Park. Basically the definition of
4 a trap, a fish wheel fits nicely into the definition of a
5 trap, so it wouldn't affect anyone who is qualified as a
6 Federal subsistence user. But if you can't qualify to
7 fish under Federal subsistence regulations, then you're
8 not able to use these gear types in the Park.

9

10 MR. WILSON: So these were people that
11 bought land along the Copper in the area of the Park on
12 both banks and they were fishing with a fish wheel in
13 there. They didn't live there.

14

15 MR. VEACH: They actually weren't fishing
16 on private land, so what they were doing is -- there's a
17 portion of the Park right behind the Slana Ranger
18 Station, right where the Nabesna Road starts, that
19 there's an ATV trail that crosses the Park and then
20 accesses the Copper River. So they were crossing the
21 Park and accessing the Copper River and then actually
22 hauling their fish wheels across the flood plane and
23 fishing the Copper River there. So they were on public
24 land. It wasn't a case that they owned land or purchased
25 land within the Park.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions.
28 Thank you.

29

30 MR. VEACH: Thank you.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do you have your
33 results?

34

35 MS. CELLARIUS: I think Donald has been
36 tabulating the results.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Donald.

39

40 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chairman. We have a tie
41 vote for Dean and Gloria.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And I think we all
44 voted. We have a tie vote. Do either of you wish to
45 withdraw for the other one? (Pause) I don't hear it.
46 Okay. Now you're going to each have to make a speech and
47 explain to us why you are better qualified for the job.

48

49 (Laughter)

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, that's not fair.
2 How about if we have a tie vote, is it within our
3 capability to draw straws? Or flip a coin. That's fine.
4
5 MR. CHURCHILL: James wants to see it's
6 not two-headed.
7
8 (Laughter)
9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I have one of these new
11 quarters. It's got a head on one side and something else
12 on the other side. Which one of you wants to pick what
13 it's going to be. Gloria, heads or tails.
14
15 MS. STICKWAN: Heads.
16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Heads it is. (Flips
18 coin) Tails it is.
19 If that is considered legitimate, tails got it, Gloria.
20 Dean, you're appointed.
21
22 (Applause)
23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So, with that, we've
25 taken care of one piece of business. Do you have one
26 more thing for us.
27
28 MS. CELLARIUS: At the last meeting, Dean
29 had actually asked for some information about hunt
30 permits and harvests and I ran some preliminary numbers
31 for the season if you'd like to hear those.
32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Please.
34
35 MS. CELLARIUS: As I said, this is
36 preliminary. The sheep season has actually just closed,
37 so we really don't have very good harvest numbers on
38 those, but I can give you what we have. We issued 40
39 permits for goat in Unit 11 and that season is still
40 open. Thus far we've gotten 13 hunt reports and there's
41 been a take of three animals. That season is open until
42 the end of the year.
43
44 MR. WILSON: How many?
45
46 MS. CELLARIUS: Three. But that's three
47 out of 13 hunt reports, so there may still be things
48 trickling in since the season hasn't closed yet. As I
49 said, this is preliminary.
50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Three out of what,
2 1,300?
3
4 MS. CELLARIUS: We issued 40 permits.
5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.
7
8 MS. CELLARIUS: We've received 13 hunt
9 reports and out of those 13 hunt reports three people had
10 taken a goat. For moose in Unit 11 we issued 231
11 permits. We've received 151 hunt reports, so a little
12 over half of the hunt reports and there's been a take of
13 21 animals. I'll just give you the numbers for the
14 sheep, how many permits we've issued. 13 for the elder
15 sheep hunt in Unit 11, 2 for the junior/elder sheep hunt
16 in Unit 11, 8 for the Unit 12 elder sheep hunt and we
17 have had the take of one animal reported so far -- oh,
18 I'm sorry, no, we've got one report but no take. And no
19 permits were issued for the junior/senior sheep hunt in
20 Unit 12.
21
22 The Park Service also issues the special
23 moose permit for the Batzulnetas Culture Camp for Unit 11
24 or 12 and they did succeed in harvesting a moose this
25 year and that's what I have for you.
26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any
28 questions.
29
30 (No comments)
31
32 MS. CELLARIUS: And if I could just say,
33 I'll get in touch with Dean.
34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With that maybe
36 we should, at this point in time, since there was a
37 disagreement, have a motion for reconsideration and go
38 back over WP-09 and re-make the motion.
39
40 MR. BLOSSOM: So moved.
41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You were on the
43 affirmative side. You can move for a reconsideration.
44 Do I hear a second.
45
46 MR. SHOWALTER: Second.
47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. It's been moved
49 and seconded to put WP-09 up for reconsideration. Doug.
50

1 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman. I'll try to
2 restate it in a different and clearer fashion. I'll
3 amend Proposal FP06-09 to say rural residents of
4 Ninilchik and Cooper Landing on the Kenai Peninsula use
5 all species of fish present on Federal lands and meet the
6 C&T for use of this resource. Also residents of Tuxedni
7 Bay meet the same requirements and should be given C&T
8 for the resource. Mr. Chairman, I guess Hope could be
9 included. There was talk for them yesterday also.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So rural residents of
12 Ninilchik, Cooper Landing.....

13
14 MR. BLOSSOM: And Hope.

15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:and Hope. And
17 you're putting Tuxedni Bay in there with this part of it
18 this time instead of just leaving it as a separate part?

19 MR. BLOSSOM: Yes, I'm making it all one
20 motion.

21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. I'll see if I've
23 got it right. What you've got is rural residents of
24 Ninilchik, Hope and Cooper Landing on the Kenai Peninsula
25 use all species of fish present on Federal lands and meet
26 the C&T for use of this resource. Also residents of
27 Tuxedni Bay meet the same requirements and should be
28 given C&T for the resource.

29
30 MR. BLOSSOM: That's right.

31
32 MR. KOMPKOFF: You did good.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have a second.

35
36 MR. ENCELEWSKI: I second that, Mr.
37 Chairman.

38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
40 seconded. This clarifies things. Doug.

41
42 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman. After
43 listening to all the Board members and the confusion that
44 they had last night and talking about more places in, I
45 thought we should just specify the people that came and
46 asked for it and when the others come and ask, then we'll
47 consider them. I heard a lot of talk among the Board
48 members that unless they have enough interest to at least
49 come here and talk about it, I guess we'll leave them out
50 until they show up. So I made it a lot clearer. You

1 asked about Whittier. You know, they didn't come here
2 and ask. There might be other places. This way it's
3 clear cut. These people came and asked for it and I
4 think they deserve it.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other discussion.
7 Bob.

8
9 MR. CHURCHILL: Well, as far as asking to
10 be included, I think we've had pretty clear testimony,
11 both here and when I was in the meetings in Cooper
12 Landing, that they did not wish to be included and I
13 think we have their AC chair. He might come forward and
14 be able to talk to us a little bit about that.

15
16 MR. BLOSSOM: They said they did.

17
18 MR. CHURCHILL: That isn't what they said
19 in their meetings. At least that was my impression and I
20 think Mr. Stockwell is here. He's attended all the
21 sessions. He might be willing to come forward. I could
22 be wrong, but I think that had been their request.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Bob. I was
25 under the impression from what he said yesterday, and
26 maybe I misunderstood, that he thought Cooper Landing and
27 Hope should have it but that Ninilchik shouldn't. That
28 was my impression.

29
30 MR. CHURCHILL: Could be. It wouldn't be
31 the first time I've been wrong this morning.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If he's here, we'll
34 definitely ask him to come forward and speak to it.
35 Dean, you had something.

36
37 MR. WILSON: Yeah, I'll speak on this one
38 real quick. First of all, the Tuxedni Bay, right now my
39 understanding is they have C&T on the west side only, is
40 that correct, is the way the proposal is written, and now
41 we're going to include them on everything or were they
42 included with everything initially?

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug.

45
46 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman. It's my
47 understanding they have some C&T now on some species but
48 not everything, so we're including the other species.

49
50 MR. WILSON: On the west side.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: On the part that they
2 asked for is what I was under the impression.
3
4 MR. BLOSSOM: Right.
5
6 MR. WILSON: Now we're just including
7 salmon for them, but the way this is written we're
8 including them for the west and east side of the Cook
9 Inlet, is that right?
10
11 MR. BLOSSOM: No.
12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I didn't think so, but
14 maybe it is.
15
16 MR. BLOSSOM: Tuxedni Bay is on the west
17 side of Cook Inlet.
18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: My impression was that
20 Doug was saying the C&T that they asked for they're
21 qualified for. Is that what you were meaning?
22
23 MR. BLOSSOM: Yes.
24
25 MS. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair.
26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Helen.
28
29 MS. ARMSTRONG: I just wanted to give
30 some clarification on what the Cooper Landing Advisory
31 Committee had in their written comments. What they were
32 opposed to was the broad scope. What they said was the
33 Cooper Landing Advisory Committee amended this proposal
34 to read that only the community of Cooper Landing would
35 have a customary and traditional use determination for
36 salmon, Dolly Varden, trout and char in the Federal
37 waters of the Cooper Landing area. And that the Federal
38 waters of the Cooper Landing area would be defined as all
39 waters, et cetera. So they did ask for it. So sorry,
40 Bob.
41
42 MR. CHURCHILL: Not a problem. I just
43 wanted to make sure we were clear before we went forward.
44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug.
46
47 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman. That's why I
48 did what I did this morning. The areas that have asked
49 for this I included and the areas that haven't asked I
50 excluded, trying to make this a narrower scope and more

1 palatable to the Board members.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Dean.

4

5 MR. WILSON: I think it was pretty
6 obvious yesterday listening to testimony that there's
7 some folks in Ninilchik that use Tustumena Lake, they use
8 some other areas out there, so this will include that in
9 there and I'm happy with that portion of it
10 and give some of those folks back some of the rights that
11 they deserve. By the same token, we're not throwing a
12 broad spectrum in here that could affect a lot of these
13 areas.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other discussion.

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 MR. KOMPKOFF: I call for the question.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Rural residents
22 in Ninilchik, Hope and Cooper Landing use all resources
23 and should be given C&T. Also residents of Tuxedni Bay
24 meet the requirements for the C&T they requested. Does
25 that meet everybody's intent.

26

27 (Council nods affirmatively)

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. All in favor
30 signify by saying aye.

31

32 IN UNISON: Aye.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
35 saying nay.

36

37 MR. CHURCHILL: Nay.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. Okay.
40 Thank you for the clarification, Doug. With that we're
41 going to go on to WP05-07. This is a deferred proposal
42 that can continue to be deferred or we can take action on
43 it. Am I correct on that, Dan?

44

45 MR. LAPLANT: That's correct, Mr.
46 Chairman. Just to give you a brief introduction to the
47 issue here. On Page 210 of your book what we've done is
48 we've reprinted the proposal analysis as it appeared in
49 the Federal Board book last May. So, again, this is just
50 a reprint of what was in there. Proposal WP05-07 was

1 initially submitted by the Ninilchik Traditional Council
2 and it was asking for an extension of the moose season in
3 Unit 15. They asked the season be adjusted actually 10
4 days out from its current dates. They were asking for a
5 start of August 20th and an extension to September 30th.
6

7 The Department of Fish and Game was
8 opposed to that adjustment and the Southcentral Regional
9 Council, when you met last winter, made a modification of
10 that proposal. Your statement was that you supported it
11 with modification to maintain the early season dates of
12 August 10th to September 20th, but also to provide more
13 opportunity by lengthening the season with the additional
14 season dates of September 26th to October 15th. So
15 that's what went to the Federal Subsistence Board.
16

17 At the Board meeting in May, the Board
18 had pretty extensive discussion on the issue. They heard
19 from all parties and at the conclusion of their
20 discussions they decided to defer the proposal and asked
21 the stakeholders to get back together and discuss this
22 further. The primary objection was having a season
23 during the rut and the effects that might have on the
24 moose population in the Peninsula.
25

26 So since that time the Refuge Staff has
27 had further discussions with OSM and the Department and
28 discussions including Ninilchik Traditional Council took
29 place up until, I believe, lunch yesterday. That
30 discussion continued and I guess I'll leave it at that
31 and I believe Member Encelewski was at the meeting and
32 will have something to say about the results of those
33 discussions.
34

35 MR. ENCELEWSKI: (Nods affirmatively)
36

37 MR. LAPLANT: I do want to say that we
38 have in the audience Robin West, the refuge manager, to
39 answer any questions that might come up, as well as Jeff
40 Selinger from the Department and, of course, the
41 Ninilchik Tribal Council is also represented here.
42

43 That's all I have for you and I'll turn
44 it over to Mr. Encelewski.
44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. The results
46 of those discussions didn't come to any conclusion then.
47

48 MR. LAPLANT: Mr. Chairman. I wasn't
49 part of the discussion, so Mr. Encelewski may have a
50 report to you to explain those results.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Greg.

2

3 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Mr. Chairman and
4 everyone else here. We did have a good meeting with Jeff
5 and Robin and the Council. The big concern was hunting
6 during the rut and we're trying to work out a way that
7 would benefit both parties here. Actually we may have
8 come to an agreement that may work is a later season and
9 that starting somewhere around October 20th after the rut
10 and going to about November 10th. I realize this may not
11 be the best, but it is acceptable to the Council. It
12 does provide for additional use and I think this would
13 work. If anyone else wants to talk to this, we can
14 discuss it, but that would be acceptable to us and I'd be
15 willing to make a motion to that effect.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Greg. That's
18 interesting because that's what I was thinking. That
19 goes along with what some of the objections were, the
20 early season of incapability of keeping meat without a
21 freezer and everything else, and the fact that most of us
22 don't object to eating moose that have been through the
23 rut. Greg.

24

25 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Mr. Chairman. I left
26 out a very important part. We also discussed dropping
27 15(A) and the reason for that is the moose population
28 doesn't appear to be very stable and may be declining and
29 we want to do all we can to conserve the moose population
30 because we depend on it heavily.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So this would be just D
33 and C then.

34

35 MR. ENCELEWSKI: That's correct.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. I guess, you
38 know, let's just go through it with the regular procedure
39 and when we get to where we're discussing it as a Council
40 then you can make an amendment because that will give us
41 a chance to hear the other people that have something to
42 testify on it. Doug.

43

44 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman. I guess I'll
45 ask you first of all, do you have a season in 15(A)
46 during this time period?

47

48 MR. LAPLANT: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Blossom.
49 The current Federal season in 15(A) is August 10th
50 through September 20th.

1 MR. BLOSSOM: Also you brought up an
2 October 20th to November 10th. Do you have some kind of
3 season in 15(A) during that time?
4
5 MR. LAPLANT: Mr. Chairman. No, we do
6 not. That was a proposal from last year that the Federal
7 Board did not adopt.
8
9 MR. BLOSSOM: I think you do have a
10 season there.
11
12 MR. LAPLANT: The State has a season,
13 yes.
14
15 MR. BLOSSOM: On the same ground, on
16 15(A).
17
18 MR. LAPLANT: The State season, and I
19 guess I'd have to defer to Jeff Selinger to respond to
20 that question, but I don't believe it includes all of
21 15(A).
22
23 MR. BLOSSOM: Okay. I'll ask him when
24 he's up.
25
26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Dan.
27
28 MR. LAPLANT: I just wanted to say that
29 whatever recommendation the Council comes up with here
30 will go back into the next regulatory cycle and an
31 analysis will be completed by our Staff and this issue
32 will come back to you then in your winter meeting for
33 consideration by the Board at their main meeting, is the
34 way the process will work.
35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Alaska
37 Department of Fish and Game.
38
39 MR. SELINGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman
40 and Members of the Council. I appreciate the opportunity
41 today. I'm kind of new at this gig here in front of this
42 Council, so bear with me.
43
44 Basically the major concern we had when
45 this proposal initially came forward, just like we all
46 discussed and it's already been mentioned, was hunting
47 during the peak of the rut. I will go on record as
48 saying that I am opposed to any hunts during the peak of
49 the rut. Does that mean that some hunting can occur and
50 potentially not damage the resource? I think that

1 possibility is out there, but, as a principal, I do not
2 think it's appropriate to hunt during the peak of the
3 rut.

4
5 As far as the discussion went yesterday,
6 there is still some concern on my part as the area
7 biologist. Most people know those bulls are very
8 vulnerable late in the season. We went through a period
9 of time on the Kenai where we had depressed bull/cow
10 ratios. That's what brought the onset of the spike-fork
11 50 regulation. We saw our bull/cow ratios increase and
12 better herd health overall for our moose populations.

13
14 My only concern right now with having the
15 season at that time is the vulnerability of large bulls.
16 One of the reasons it was so successful, despite fork 50
17 on the Kenai, is that the number of legal large bulls did
18 make it through the hunting season. If we took out every
19 big legal bull, I don't think we'd be seeing near the
20 success we did with this program.

21
22 If a limited number of large bulls are
23 harvested during this late season, and I don't have an
24 exact number, but we're talking a half a dozen or so
25 large bulls are coming out of this late season hunt.
26 It's not as much of a concern, but with the number of
27 potential hunters out there, if we're starting to see 10,
28 12, 20 of the large bulls come out of this hunt, then
29 I'll have reasons for concern.

30
31 The spike fork component is not a concern
32 if those animals were removed, but I'd like to see this
33 closely watched if this goes through the way it's
34 proposed so we limit the number of large bulls that are
35 being harvested.

36
37 I have my big book of everything in front
38 of me, so with that I'll just answer questions.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug.

41
42 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman. If I may, I
43 have several questions. I guess first of all, for a
44 great number of years while Ted Spraker was in charge, he
45 maintained very strongly that if we stuck to the spike-
46 fork 50-inch rule, we could never damage our bull moose
47 population on the Kenai. Has that changed now? Is that
48 not any longer the direction?

49
50 MR. SELINGER: I have the utmost respect

1 for Mr. Spraker. We don't always agree on everything. I
2 believe that, in my experience, we can damage a moose
3 herd still under the spike-fork 50 if we take every legal
4 bull. I'm sure Member Stickwan and Member Wilson can
5 attest to some of the stuff that's happened up in the
6 Glennallen area. They had to go to a spike-fork 50 four
7 brow tine because so many of the bulls were being taken.
8 It's a lot more open country. It's easier to determine
9 whether or not a bull is legal up there, you get more
10 time to look at the bulls, and it hadn't been as
11 successful when they moved up to a spike-fork 50 and four
12 brow tine up there and antler configuration played into
13 that, too.

14
15 But I think it's very important for a
16 number of the large bulls to make it through each year to
17 have a healthy population.

18
19 MR. BLOSSOM: So what I'm hearing is the
20 Department has changed its stand. I just wanted to make
21 sure I knew.

22
23 MR. SELINGER: That's the world according
24 to Jeff Selinger.

25
26 MR. BLOSSOM: Well, that's fine. I just
27 wanted to make sure because during the time that Spraker
28 was in charge he stated if we shot every bull except the
29 ones that he kept protected we could not hurt the herd,
30 so we have a change in policy. That's fine.

31
32 I guess the second thing, the reason we
33 have this proposal in front of us is the people involved
34 asked for more hunting time. And I was the one that said
35 because we already have a hunting season from September
36 26th to October 14th or 15th, I thought it would be more
37 desirable to have it during that time. So you have a
38 hunting season during the time that you're objecting to.
39 My goal was if we gave them more time, to give them a
40 time when there are also hunters in the field, so we
41 don't get in this special hunt thing. I prefer that it's
42 more common for people to use. So that's why it was
43 picked from September 26th.

44
45 My next question to you, you do have this
46 hunt right now in 15(B) east?

47
48 MR. SELINGER: (Nods affirmatively)

49
50 MR. BLOSSOM: You have an early and late

1 season. The subsistence users are able to wholly use the
2 early season from August 10th to September 20th.

3

4 MR. SELINGER: (Nods affirmatively)

5

6 MR. BLOSSOM: How many moose do they take
7 during that time?

8

9 MR. SELINGER: Member Blossom, the
10 subsistence users or the permittees?

11

12 MR. BLOSSOM: The subsistence users
13 first.

14

15 MR. SELINGER: I have vague information
16 on that. Mr. West may have better information, but it's
17 only a few moose that I see on the reports that I get are
18 harvested.

19

20 MR. BLOSSOM: A few. Meaning more than
21 three?

22

23 MR. SELINGER: A handful. Two to four a
24 year, maybe. Some years none reported as a Federal
25 subsistence harvest. That's the information I have.
26 There's probably other people who have better
27 information.

28

29 MR. BLOSSOM: And they're able to hunt
30 the Federal lands in
31 15(A), (B) and (C), right?

32

33 MR. SELINGER: Correct.

34

35 MR. BLOSSOM: All right. In your second
36 season that you're objecting to have this subsistence
37 hunt in, how many permits do you let out during that
38 time?

39

40 MR. SELINGER: At that time we issue 50
41 permits for the September 26th through October 15th each
42 year and it's for five different areas.

43

44 MR. BLOSSOM: Okay. So, in essence, you
45 could take 50 moose.

46

47 MR. SELINGER: We have never done that.
48 Since 2000 we've averaged 15 out of all the hunts, early
49 and late, and roughly two-thirds of those happen in the
50 late portion. So roughly 10 animals annually come out of

1 those late season hunts and five prior to that out of the
2 100 total permits that are issued up there.

3

4 MR. BLOSSOM: And then I asked the other
5 people about a hunt in 15(A). You have a late hunt in
6 15(A). When is that?

7

8 MR. SELINGER: That hunt is drawing hunt
9 522 and it started in 1999. When it was first put in,
10 prior to this last year, it started October 20th and ran
11 until November 20. Currently, at the last Board of Game
12 meeting in March, that season was shifted to August 10th
13 through November 10th. I did not support that.

14

15 MR. BLOSSOM: October 10th.

16

17 MR. SELINGER: It went October 10th to
18 November 10th, what it is now. Sorry. I think that's
19 too close to the rut. The peak rut here on the Peninsula
20 is the first week of October, so you have rutting
21 occurring on each end of that. That's just the peak, the
22 first week of October. In my personal opinion, October
23 10th is too early. It's too close. The problem with
24 hunting during the peak of the rut or during the first
25 rut is we want first estrus breedings on cows. If cows
26 don't get bred during the first estrus, they'll go into
27 estrus again roughly 20 to 28 days later. Those calves
28 that are born to second estrus breedings do not have a
29 very good survival rate.

30

31 MR. BLOSSOM: If we're going to give
32 these people more time, I'd like it when there is hunting
33 taking place. Would you then support an October 20th to
34 November 10th season in 15(A) for subsistence?

35

36 MR. SELINGER: I would not support 15(A).
37 A couple reasons is it's roaded. There's lots of access
38 into that area. I believe with the declining moose
39 population, from what our numbers is showing us, I don't
40 think it would be prudent to harvest more animals in
41 there than we are currently harvesting. We're also
42 seeing habitat decline since there hasn't been major
43 event there since 1969, was the last major habitat event.
44 All those factors, when you put in predation and
45 everything else, I wouldn't support additional harvest in
46 15(A).

47

48 MR. BLOSSOM: I guess one last question
49 for right now. Would you support any additional hunting
50 for the people that have asked for subsistence?

1 MR. SELINGER: Now what areas are we
2 talking about?

3
4 MR. BLOSSOM: I'm asking would you
5 support any additional hunting time for the people that
6 asked for it, the subsistence people, in 15(A), (B) and
7 (C).

8
9 MR. SELINGER: I think there are
10 opportunities in 15(A) to support extra harvest
11 potential.

12
13 MR. BLOSSOM: Because I consider you the
14 expert in the area, what would you prefer?

15
16 MR. SELINGER: I would prefer spike-fork
17 bulls only to protect the large bulls that are out there.
18 The other thing that there may be potential for down the
19 road, I'll have to look at it more, is potentially some
20 cow harvest opportunities where we're killing a lot of
21 cows along the roads. However, that's off the Federal
22 land, so that would probably not occur under these rules
23 and regulations because the land we're talking about is
24 off the road system.

25
26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

27
28 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you. You made a
29 comment in your discussion that 50 permits were issued
30 and the assumption I think that was brought up was that
31 the target was to actually take 50 animals. Generally,
32 my experience is that the target is significantly less
33 the number of permits based on historical success rate.
34 Can you clarify that?

35
36 MR. SELINGER: Yeah, I'm sorry if I gave
37 that impression. Throughout the State system with the
38 drawing permit system we always issue more permits than
39 there are animals to harvest. That's for several
40 reasons. One is success rates. Not everybody harvests a
41 moose. The second is some people don't go. The classic
42 example that I can think of and it makes me very nervous,
43 but it's one that I inherited and it seems to work fine,
44 is the Kenai Mountain Caribou Herd. I did the count down
45 there two days ago and counted roughly 300 animals. We
46 issue 250 permits annually on drawing permits for that
47 herd. Our average harvest is 20 animals almost every
48 year.

49
50 My basic philosophy, there are some

1 species that I will gladly issue more permits than we can
2 harvest if it's shown that the harvest rate is going to
3 be a certain level. Sheep are one of the exceptions and
4 goats. That's not as much of a meat hunt as I would
5 consider a moose or a caribou, so we want to give people
6 a very reasonable opportunity to harvest an animal. If
7 we put 10 people in a small area for sheep and there's
8 only one or two legal rams, I don't think that's fair to
9 the people who are drawing those permits.

10

11 MR. CHURCHILL: As a follow up, this hunt
12 9/26 to 10/15, if my notes are correct, where you issue
13 50 permits, what's your target? What's the harvestable
14 surplus?

15

16 MR. SELINGER: We want to take roughly 10
17 to 15 animals a year up off the bench, probably not to
18 exceed 25. The population on 15(B) east, there aren't as
19 many large bulls as there once were up there, is the
20 impressions that I'm getting. I've only been in the
21 position for three years. I don't have the antler data
22 right with me, but the antlers that are coming out of
23 there are smaller than they were when these hunts were
24 first initiated.

25

26 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you very much.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions.

29 James.

30

31 MR. SHOWALTER: Yes. What I'm hearing
32 from you is moose hunt, period. This proposal was just
33 from Ninilchik. Was that Ninilchik residents, was that
34 from the tribe of Ninilchik to harvest these moose or who
35 was it from?

36

37 MR. SELINGER: That would be a question
38 for somebody else, please. Help me.

39

40 MR. LAPLANT: Mr. Chairman. The proposal
41 was from Ninilchik Traditional Council.

42

43 MR. SHOWALTER: Okay. So the way I'm
44 seeing it, maybe I'm wrong, but you're saying if they get
45 it. Let's put them out in the middle of nowhere where
46 they can't get to the moose to harvest them. And this is
47 subsistence. Again, I may be wrong, but subsistence is
48 supposedly the first priority and that's the way I'm
49 looking at it right now unless there's a different
50 clarification to it.

1 MR. SELINGER: I'll try that and maybe
2 Dan can help me out. It's just an artifact of where the
3 Federal lands occur. The Federal lands in 15(B) and
4 15(C) are off the road system. 15(A) is more roaded, you
5 know, there's a lot more road access and the moose are
6 real vulnerable right after the rut. The bulls are
7 conserving energy, trying to get back their energy
8 reserves from being in the rut and they're very
9 vulnerable at that time.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Dan.

12

13 MR. LAPLANT: I would just clarify my
14 earlier answer before. The proposal was from Ninilchik
15 Traditional Council, but if it was adopted by the Board
16 it would allow hunting for all rural residents that have
17 C&T for that hunt. In this case it would be residents of
18 Ninilchik, as well as residents of Seldovia, Port Graham
19 and Nanwalek. So those would be the eligible rural
20 residents.

21

22 A question came up earlier about what the
23 Federal harvest has been in the past. I've got a table
24 here that shows the harvest with the Federal permit
25 system under the current regulations since 1996 there's
26 been a total of 20 moose harvested in Unit 15(C), 15
27 harvested in Unit 15(B) and only two harvested in 15(A),
28 so it's throughout the three subunits. It's been three
29 to eight moose per year under the Federal permit system.
30 It's kind of hard to separate Federal qualified rural
31 residents in this hunt because I'm quite sure the only
32 people obtaining these Federal permits are those that
33 want to hunt early when the Federal season begins earlier
34 than the State season. Those folks that want to hunt
35 during the State season are probably hunting under the
36 State harvest ticket system. So they're probably
37 eligible rural residents that are not getting Federal
38 permits. So this isn't the total number of moose
39 harvested by Federally qualified rural residents.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Dan, can I ask you a
42 question while you're there then. If you figure that
43 most of the Federal permits are by a few Federal hunters
44 that would like to hunt the early season, if we had a
45 late hunting season which is more in concurrence with
46 what the people would like, do you feel that there would
47 be more Federal permits issued?

48

49 MR. LAPLANT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would
50 think so, yes, if it's beyond what the existing State

1 season is. Those people that would want to take
2 advantage of it would need a Federal permit and I would
3 expect that number to go up.

4
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug.

6
7 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman. Dan, I guess
8 I disagree with you. The subsistence people would not be
9 able to go into 15(B) east at all except getting a
10 Federal permit. So I think that permit is desirable
11 throughout the whole hunting season. I think you're
12 seeing a fair and accurate result that the subsistence
13 people are getting their permit because they want to hunt
14 and they are hunting and that is the result. I don't
15 think they prefer to hunt on State ground during the
16 normal time versus this early hunt. I think they desire
17 to go up there and hunt during the whole season and they
18 do and that is the result. Can we get a copy of that,
19 Pat, for all the Board members while we're deliberating.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Can I ask you another
22 question.

23
24 MR. SELINGER: Sure.

25
26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think that maybe when
27 Doug was asking you questions either I heard wrong or in
28 the confusion you answered it wrong. He asked you if
29 there was room for an extra subsistence hunt and you said
30 in Unit 15(A) and I think that would have been the
31 opposite from what I understand you've been saying.

32
33 MR. SELINGER: If I said that I meant
34 15(C) where we have increasing moose population. Sorry.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: My question is this hunt
37 that's taking place in 15(A) at the time they're asking
38 for a Federal subsistence hunt that's currently taking
39 place this year. That has been taking place, right?

40
41 MR. SELINGER: Yeah, it started in 1999
42 with season dates October 20 to November 20. It was
43 changed last Board meeting in March to October 10 through
44 November 10.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that season harvests
47 about 15 moose.

48
49 MR. SELINGER: No. That season on
50 average harvests about two moose a year. I can get the

1 exact number.
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Is this a bow and arrow
4 season?
5
6 MR. SELINGER: No. You can use a bow and
7 arrow in that hunt or it's rifle open. From '99 to 2004
8 a total of 10 moose have been harvested out of that hunt.
9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And this issues 50
11 permits a year.
12
13 MR. SELINGER: That one issues 25 a year.
14 That's DM5-22. The bench hunts are DM5-30 series.
15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So there's 25 permits in
17 Unit 15(A) currently.
18
19 MR. SELINGER: Correct.
20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And they average two
22 moose a year basically.
23
24 MR. SELINGER: Roughly, yeah. One to two
25 moose a year. Some years zero, other years four, but it
26 averages out. That hunt that occurs is on the eastern
27 edge of 15(A). It's in 15(A) and 7. It overlaps two
28 units. It's only in the far eastern portion of 15(A).
29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's not the whole
31 15(A).
32
33 MR. SELINGER: Correct. It's just the
34 far eastern segment of 15(A).
35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So it's just a
37 small portion then.
38
39 MR. SELINGER: Exactly. I mean its a
40 fairly large area, but this chunk 15(A) occurs in is
41 fairly small.
42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Doug.
44
45 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman, Jeff. The
46 subsistence hunters that are eligible can now hunt in the
47 total 15(A) area that's Federal land from August 10th to
48 September 20th.
49
50 MR. SELINGER: Correct.

1 MR. BLOSSOM: They're making copies for
2 everybody. If I remember right, one or two moose a year
3 is what's taken.

4
5 MR. SELINGER: Yeah, but you need to be
6 aware that's under the Federal system. I have data that
7 shows what the different subsistence areas, the
8 Ninilchik, Nanwalek, Port Graham and Seldovia harvests
9 are, the total harvest for those zip codes from hunting
10 licenses.

11
12 MR. BLOSSOM: Can you give it to us?

13
14 MR. SELINGER: Sure.

15
16 MR. BLOSSOM: If you could make copies,
17 that would be great. We're just trying to gather the
18 information now.

19
20 MR. SELINGER: There's some comments down
21 there that were kind of my own notes, but I don't care.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: There's nothing you need
24 to keep confidential.

25
26 MR. SELINGER: Nothing at all.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Dan.

29
30 MR. LAPLANT: Just to clarify a question
31 again that Mr. Blossom had about the number of Federal
32 permits and the number of participants. As I said, I
33 think a lot of Federally-qualified hunters are using
34 State harvest tickets to do their hunting and the
35 advantage of that is a State ticket is good on both
36 Federal and State land. So by getting that permit, and I
37 think we'll see from the data that Jeff has that there's
38 a lot of Federally-qualified hunters that are reporting
39 harvest under the State harvest ticket system. Those
40 tickets are good. The State regulations apply to both
41 Federal and State land.

42
43 MR. SELINGER: I would agree totally with
44 Dan's comments there. What you're really capturing with
45 the Federal permit system is those first 10 days of the
46 season prior to the general season kicking in because
47 then you're at a disadvantage using the Federal system
48 only during the regular season because you're restricted
49 to Federal lands.

50

1 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman. I would
2 agree except what I said earlier. Their desire is to go
3 on that 15(B) east area and hunt and I think they're
4 doing that and they get a permit for that, so in that
5 particular area they are trying and you're seeing the
6 results and the State will show us when we get the
7 copies.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Can I ask a question,
10 Doug. Oh, I don't need to ask you.

11
12 (Laughter)

13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Is 15(B) east then
15 closed to State hunters?

16
17 MR. SELINGER: Yes.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Is closed to State
20 hunters.

21
22 MR. SELINGER: It's by permit only. It's
23 a drawing permit. Anybody can apply for the drawing
24 permit. It's only for 50-inch or larger bulls. The
25 spike-fork component is out of that hunt.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But if you have a
28 Federal permit you can hunt that same area and it's any
29 bull.

30
31 MR. SELINGER: It's spike-fork or 50
32 inch.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Spike-fork or 50.

35
36 MR. SELINGER: Yeah. Or three brow tine.

37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So that's where you're
39 coming from. If you want to hunt 15(B) east, you have to
40 have a Federal permit unless you were drawn.

41
42 MR. SELINGER: Right.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So that would be another
45 incentive. So with what they were talking about before
46 if we leave 15(A) out right now just because of the
47 controversy over 15(A), we can work on that later. But
48 in 15(B) and 15(C) particularly, if there was some
49 protection for the large bulls, the idea of a later
50 subsistence hunt is palatable or can be worked out, put

1 it that way.

2

3 MR. SELINGER: From my perspective, yeah.
4 The spike-fork component, I don't think we're going to do
5 any damage to the herd if we take out the spike-fork
6 component of the bull segment. My concern, and I don't
7 have an exact number, I'm thinking a handful, if it's a
8 handful of large bulls late season, that's probably not a
9 concern, but if we start getting up into the 8 to 10 to
10 12 to 20 large bulls coming out late season, then I would
11 think that is a concern.

12

13 MR. KOMPKOFF: Did you mention on the
14 permit areas 522 or was it 532?

15

16 MR. SELINGER: The hunt in 15(A) and 7,
17 it overlaps those two units, is DM5-22 and then 5-30
18 series is for the bench. It's 15(B) east between
19 Tustumena and Skilak Lakes, and 30 and 31 are the same
20 area, but 30 is the early season and 31 would be the late
21 season and then it goes all the way up to 38, 39.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Just thinking. If we
24 did like we did on the caribou up in Unit 13 where we had
25 a short reporting period where the successful hunters
26 have to turn their permits in within five days or
27 something like that so you could keep track of it and set
28 a quota of large bulls, would that be a possibility to
29 operate a season like that? I mean if that's what the
30 big concern is. I, myself, don't think there's going to
31 be any problem because I don't think that many moose are
32 going to be taken, but if you had a safeguard like that
33 in there, would that make it more palatable to try to set
34 up some kind of late season like that?

35

36 MR. SELINGER: Yes, that would put my
37 mind at ease a lot more. I wouldn't want to see it
38 exceed probably eight big bulls or six big bull, and then
39 the spike-fork component is not a concern to me at this
40 time for the health of the herd.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So, Greg, maybe while
43 you're thinking about how to make a motion, talk with the
44 people and see if you can work out something that
45 includes some of the things we just talked about.

46

47 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Uh-huh.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that would be
50 acceptable. Okay. Any other questions by anybody else.

1 (No comments)

2

3

4 MR. SELINGER: I was asked to state my
5 name and position. For the record, my name is Jeff
6 Selinger and I'm the Kenai Area Wildlife Biologist with
7 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

8

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug.

11

12 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman. Jeff, we got
13 handed this. How do you tell the zip code? Explain
14 these last things to us.

15

16 MR. SELINGER: On our database that we
17 have generated through the Department for hunting
18 statistics we have a lot of categories that we list and
19 one of them is zip code and address for everybody and
20 their community of residence. So these are just sorted
21 by community of residence and what the harvests were for
22 moose for residents of the different communities you see
23 listed here.

24

25 So one cut is by zip and then the other
26 one is by community because Homer, Seldovia, Nanwalek all
27 have the same zip code, but they also have the city of
28 residence listed on the information we have in our
29 database.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So, as I read this,
32 Ninilchik, for instance, because that's what we're
33 talking about, in 2004 they got 35 moose in the general
34 season, six moose in other units, three in a registration
35 hunt.

36

37 MR. SELINGER: Correct. I would assume,
38 and I don't know that, but there's other registration
39 hunts throughout the state that people have participated
40 in. What you see is the general season, the columns that
41 you're talking about, and that's the entire Kenai
42 Peninsula, Units 7 and 15. Outside of the Kenai a total
43 of nine. Ninilchik residents harvested a moose off of
44 the Kenai in 2004. Six of them came from a general
45 season three from a registration season.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So when it says total
48 all harvest, that's total on the Kenai then, right?

49

50 MR. SELINGER: Yes. Well, that's what it
51 looks like. I think that's a typo, the bottom one, the
52 35. That should be 44. But I mean the other columns

1 appear to add up.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You're right.

4

5 MR. BLOSSOM: So where does subsistence
6 take show up in this?

7

8 MR. SELINGER: I believe that's the
9 Federal harvest, FM3-15. We didn't have reports for what
10 occurred in 2003 and 2004, so the most current data that
11 we had was from 2002 where five were taken, 2001 five,
12 2000 two.

13

14 MR. BLOSSOM: Okay. So that correlates,
15 I guess, to our other one we got from the Federal people
16 that shows in three and four there was one and two.
17 Okay, I see it now.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. If there's no
20 more questions for the Fish and Game, we'll go on to
21 Federal, State, Tribal Agency comments.

22

23 MR. SELINGER: Thank you.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

26

27 MR. WEST: I'm Robin West with the Kenai
28 National Wildlife Refuge. I guess in the interest of
29 time I won't speak to all the history, but what we're
30 looking at as the land manager here is trying to provide
31 for some additional opportunity to the proponent of this
32 proposal in a time when we have generally declining moose
33 populations. We think we've come up with a proposal that
34 we'll see the Council entertain here shortly that
35 definitely is a compromise, but it will look to be post-
36 rut when most of the breeding will have taken place and
37 we'll give an opportunity for some later hunting at a
38 cooler time of the year.

39

40 A little bit of background, and I did
41 mention this at the Federal Subsistence Board last year
42 when we met in the spring when I did apologize for not
43 working with this Council. When we saw the proposal come
44 forward from the Ninilchik Tribal Council looking for a
45 change in the season dates from early to a little bit
46 later in September, it was opposed by the Refuge and the
47 Department of Fish and Game and OSM Staff primarily
48 because of moving into that pre-rut and rut period. It
49 isn't an absolute sacrosanct kind of thing when you look
50 statewide and we can certainly see examples of rut

1 hunting, but it certainly is the exception rather than
2 the rule.

3
4 The hunts that are occurring on the
5 Kenai, whether they're in 15(B) or the one in 15(A) are
6 permit only, extremely poor chance of drawing, takes
7 about 20 years on average to draw one of the bench land
8 permits right now, so people don't count on going up
9 there. Fairly poor success rates and poor access. It's
10 kind of the thing that none of the managers now that I
11 know of support them, but they're on the books. We're
12 not looking to add additional of those kinds of things.
13 Maybe someday they'll go away. Did they make sense at
14 the time they were put in place, perhaps. You know, the
15 evolution of moose population on the Kenai was kind of a
16 boom and bust kind of thing. Because of habitat changes,
17 we're definitely on the down slope right now.

18
19 The good news, I think, and this will
20 play into effect hopefully for future opportunity,
21 although perhaps 10 percent of the subsistence need is
22 met on Federal public lands right now and State and
23 private lands are contributing the remainder of it. We
24 have had some good events in recent years and this year
25 in 15(B) and the bench land off of Skilak and Tustumena
26 we had about 35,000 acres burn that are going to be boat
27 accessible that had traditionally been '60s and '70s
28 great moose hunting habitat. So the future is a little
29 brighter.

30
31 Just to clarify a bit more of our concern
32 on the rut hunting and why this has kind of been the
33 focal point, and Jeff has stated primarily that when the
34 moose come into estrus it's kind of a bell-shaped curve
35 when most of the breeding occurs. It starts a little bit
36 in September, goes into mid-October, most of it occurring
37 in the first of October. But the harem formation, a bull
38 will have from one to eight or so cows. The cows are
39 only susceptible for breeding for about 24 hours plus or
40 minus and then they're not accepted and they can't be
41 bred for nearly another month.

42
43 Where you have a lot of bulls there's
44 still problems in that the dominant bull does most of the
45 breeding and sometimes even if it's removed from the
46 harem via hunting sometimes the cows won't accept a
47 lesser bull for a while, so they can lose the opportunity
48 to breed at that point in time. And the more accessible
49 areas it's not uncommon to have one young bull breeding
50 quite a few cows and if it's removed from the population

1 then the breeding doesn't occur.

2

3 So the long and short of it is, even with
4 a small amount of hunting, you can disrupt that breeding
5 behavior and end up with second estrus calves which have
6 poor survival and it's wasteful to the resource. That's
7 just kind of a foundational thing for conservation that
8 we're not trying to promote that kind of hunting in any
9 future opportunity, sport or subsistence, where we can
10 influence it. That's the principal we're looking at.

11

12 The proposal that we're coming forth with
13 hopefully here will be after peak breeding and will also
14 take into consideration where we have declining moose
15 populations in 15(A). So, getting ahead of myself a
16 little bit, I am supportive of that opportunity that
17 we're looking forward to.

18

19 Questions.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug.

22

23 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman. Thank you,
24 Robin. Last year we could have used you here. No one
25 showed.

26

27 MR. WEST: I appreciate that.

28

29 MR. BLOSSOM: The reason we picked that
30 time is because there was hunting going on in part of the
31 area during that period and I understand the rutting part
32 and all that. So that we took into account last year.
33 It's just that you did have hunting going on during that
34 period and that's why we picked it. But we appreciate
35 you being here.

36

37 MR. WEST: Thank you.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions.

40

41 (No comments)

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. We'll go on
44 to Darrel.

45

46 MR. WILLIAMS: Good morning everybody.
47 How are you. I'm Darrel Williams. I'm here representing
48 Ninilchik Traditional Council. There's a lot of
49 interesting points about this proposal that I'd like to
50 take a minute and talk about, just kind of stop a second

1 and give you an idea of where I come from. I'm an
2 environmental scientist, so I see things from several
3 disciplines and not just biology. When I sit and I look
4 at some of the things that's happening, I have to raise
5 some questions ecologically about trying to take care of
6 the moose population.

7
8 One of those questions is -- we sat down
9 and had a discussion yesterday about trying to make a
10 later moose season and I think it's a really good idea.
11 However, I also think that it was a good decision of the
12 Board in the first place to have the pre-season
13 subsistence and the post-season subsistence. The reason
14 for that is it gives subsistence users an opportunity to
15 get out and try to harvest what they need if they have
16 the chance. The later season would fall on the second
17 estrus cycle. Why would we sacrifice one estrus cycle
18 over another? I'm at a complete loss.

19
20 What we do at the tribe, particularly for
21 moose, we have our moose hunting program and we do a lot
22 of contribution back to the population. While the moose
23 hunting program is going, we're managing about 100,000
24 acres. We do everything from habitat work and we sit
25 down and we look at our own population surveys and the
26 success rate of hunters and we try to manage the actual
27 hunting pressure that is exerted in that area. When we
28 feel that the hunting pressure is too much, we reduce
29 that activity.

30
31 There's some things that need to be
32 considered in this proposal. Subsistence activities are
33 very important to us, of course. What I've read in the
34 proposal shows that we're talking probably about two
35 moose. If we were to extend that season, hopefully,
36 idealistically, one of those moose would be taken before
37 the season and one of them would be taken after.

38
39 Some of the other concerns were the
40 number of hunters would increase. Since the Federal
41 subsistence season has been in place for several years, I
42 believe the average is about 44 permits or so with about
43 two moose taken. That's a success rate of about
44 4.5 percent. Let's say for example those doubled. Let's
45 say you had the same amount of hunters and you doubled
46 the harvest, you're still talking about 9 percent success
47 rate over the overall success rate. That's a very small
48 number.

49
50 I understand nobody wants to see any

1 resource degraded. When we look at the trophy hunt,
2 which we put in a proposal to try to get it to go away,
3 and that was denied. I'll be really honest. When I hear
4 agencies say about we don't like the trophy hunt and we
5 want to see it go away, I haven't seen them do anything
6 to make it go away. It's very concerning for us as
7 members of the tribe to sit here and see this kind of
8 activity happen. I will say what I need to say on it.

9
10 The estrus cycles are undoubtedly very
11 important, but I don't think it's our decision to choose
12 one over another. There's a lot of examples of how this
13 would affect the population and I don't think we should
14 get into the technical stuff, but as far as the tribe is
15 concerned this is an important thing for the members of
16 the tribe who rely on subsistence. It was referenced to
17 yesterday when we were talking about the older folks
18 being able to harvest the things that they need and it
19 was part of their subsistence lifestyle.

20
21 The other part that's a very significant
22 impact to the tribe and the members of the tribe is that
23 economically there's not very much industry down in
24 Ninilchik. There's some fishing operations, cannery,
25 guide boats. It's a short work season and when folks
26 have to work to make money they have to and it
27 compromises their ability to be able to harvest moose. I
28 think it may be a real benefit to try to look at
29 extending that season not so much to make it more
30 accessible for hunters, but to try to allow for people
31 who can harvest away from the estrus cycle to go ahead
32 and harvest away from the estrus cycle, which will
33 actually increase your rates of success.

34
35 So, personally, just listening to
36 testimony this morning, that's something that I think is
37 very important that we should address. Ninilchik
38 Traditional Council would like to see this subsistence
39 season go through and be able to participate in that in
40 the future.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pete.

43
44 MR. KOMPKOFF: I have one question. What
45 do you attribute to the low catch during the subsistence
46 season for the Federal hunt?

47
48 MR. WILLIAMS: The low harvest?

49
50 MR. KOMPKOFF: Yes. It looks very low

1 for the amount of permits.

2

3 MR. WILLIAMS: It is very low and I'll be
4 honest with you, I'm a little perplexed on that. I would
5 say part of it is that the young bulls are still in
6 velvet and sometimes it's hard to identify them. There's
7 a lot more foliage on the trees and stuff. It's very
8 hard to see when you get out there and hunt. Down
9 particularly in the areas where we're talking about, you
10 go back in the Refuge and whatnot, there's a lot of, for
11 lack of a better term, emergent black spruce. Some
12 people call them a ghost forest where it's very dense,
13 hard to see through. We have a lot of beetle kill. I
14 think later in the season you're actually able to see
15 better than during the regular hunting season because we
16 have a lot of invasive grasses and they get pretty tall
17 and it's hard to see through them. Later in the season
18 those grasses start to fail and then it's easier for
19 hunters to see.

20

21 MR. KOMPKOFF: Thank you.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

24

25 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, I would agree with
26 your earlier comment. I've hunted a lot of that area.
27 It's very difficult to see in the early season. A
28 question. Certain parts of the state I've been in folks
29 do hunt during the rut and they take care of the animal a
30 little differently and I've had the meat, it's great.
31 What's the tradition for your area?

32

33 MR. WILLIAMS: Bob, that's kind of a
34 great question. That came up last year and I spent some
35 time on that because I wasn't as familiar as I should
36 have been. In Ninilchik the people have a built-in
37 calendar and clock essentially and they look over at the
38 Alaska Range and they see Mt. Redoubt and when the sun
39 sets on the south of Redoubt it's time to go hunting.
40 It's very unique and usually it's about this time of year
41 traditionally when they would hunt.

42

43 To try to avoid the argument of how
44 palatable the meat is, it's hard to do because these
45 folks have been doing this for a long time. Part of it
46 is they didn't have modern day freezers and stuff.
47 They'd use a lot of root cellars that they would dig in
48 the side of the hill and they'd store their food there,
49 so they'd try to harvest when it was colder, so you'd
50 probably have the rut affecting the meat in whatever way,

1 shape or form. But when you talk to folks who live down
2 there, that's not a concern for them and that's not an
3 issue.

4
5 MR. CHURCHILL: Are you saying it's not a
6 concern because they simply didn't hunt during the rut?

7
8 MR. WILLIAMS: No, that's not what I'm
9 saying. What I'm saying is that to the Native population
10 the meat was very palatable and actually some people
11 preferred it that way. That's what I was trying to say.

12
13 MR. CHURCHILL: And just for the benefit
14 of the Council, I know a fair number of Yupik and Cupik
15 folks, when they catch a moose they have a very distinct
16 way of skinning it and preparing it and the meat is
17 great. There just is not a problem with it at all. So
18 you're saying your area is fairly similar.

19
20 MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, I am. That's
21 actually a very good point. Sometimes it's hard to take
22 into consideration all the accounts of the Native
23 community. For instance, I think we were talking about
24 yesterday like harvesting the nose of the animal. For a
25 lot of hunters here on the Peninsula, that's generally
26 not done. For a lot of Native people that's a very big
27 deal. So we have this clash of cultures that's going on
28 and it makes it very hard.

29
30 It's the same thing like we put in a
31 proposal trying to get rid of the trophy hunt, for
32 example. It's a point of contention for the tribe. When
33 I hear agencies say, boy, they really don't like it and
34 want to see it go away, I don't see them doing anything
35 to make it go away.

36
37 MR. CHURCHILL: Just as a follow up,
38 there's more than one cookbook that still has the recipes
39 for all those things.

40
41 MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, absolutely.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
44 Darrel. Darrel, I do have one comment. I pretty much
45 agree with you on everything except one thing.

46
47 MR. WILLIAMS: Okay.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that's the
50 difference between the first estrus and second estrus.

1 If you're going to disrupt something, you'd rather
2 disrupt something that -- you know, it's just like in
3 Ontario. They found out that if they harvested all
4 yearling moose, they could harvest a lot more moose
5 because of the fact that those don't have as good a
6 tendency to survive anyhow. Once they've made it past
7 the first year, they have a better tendency to survive.
8 It's the same thing with first estrus and second estrus
9 calves. First estrus calves go into the following winter
10 much bigger. When I left home we ran across two little
11 second estrus calves and I didn't think they were much
12 bigger than our deer. Those calves aren't going to make
13 it
14 through the winter. If we have any kind of winter at
15 all, those calves are dead.

16
17 MR. WILLIAMS: Probably so.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Where the first estrus
20 calves that we saw you almost couldn't tell them from
21 yearlings, they're that size. And those might have been
22 third estrus calves. They were that small. That part, I
23 can understand that. If you're going to hunt in one rut
24 or the other, I'd much rather see a hunt where if the
25 calf is born it has less chance of surviving because
26 you're doing less damage to the overall herd.

27
28 MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, sir, absolutely. I
29 agree with what you're saying. Some of the factors that
30 I consider when I look at these things, is it genetic or
31 is it environmental. There's even some issues that come
32 up about addressing sex traits for harvest indicators and
33 it's the same thing. Is it a genetic expression of the
34 animal or is it an environmental expression of the
35 animal.

36
37 Here in the Peninsula we're going through
38 a rate of environmental succession that really has not
39 been well documented before. That's where I, as a
40 scientist, sit back and raise an eyebrow. This isn't the
41 '70s anymore, it's 2005. We can do electrophoretic type
42 tests and we can look at all kind of variables in the
43 population. The Kenai Peninsula is fairly unique and
44 it's almost treated as an island because most of these
45 populations do not connect with any other population. So
46 then you have to start considering things and worrying
47 about things like genetic drift and genetic depression
48 that occurs in these animals and we've seen this before
49 in other places.

50

1 I also understand genetic testing is a
2 very tedious project and it is very expensive. It is not
3 something you just run out and do and that's why aerial
4 surveys and line transects are very convenient technique.
5 The same thing, if it's designed properly, it's as
6 effective as a means of trying to do population surveys.

7
8 Really, the root of when it comes to the
9 estrus cycles,
10 my question is, is it genetic or is it environmental. Is
11 it an expression of the animal or is it an expression of
12 the environment. To me that's unclear.

13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But if you have -- I can
15 see that, too, but if you have a cow that goes into
16 estrus in the first estrus cycle, then it's obviously not
17 genetic. I mean genetically she's capable of breeding
18 the first estrus cycle.

19
20 MR. WILLIAMS: Absolutely.

21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If she doesn't get bred,
23 I mean it's automatic they go into the second estrus
24 cycle. In that case what we're dealing with is an
25 environmental factor, but the environmental factor is the
26 lack of bulls or the disruption of the bulls so that
27 there isn't the opportunity in the first cycle.

28
29 MR. WILLIAMS: Absolutely. it's a very
30 long, drawn-out subject. It can even get into things as
31 environmental indicators trigger the estrus cycle and
32 things like that. Personally, I don't know off the top
33 of the my head, so I can't really say, but I do know that
34 there are some pretty profound questions about what is
35 environmental and what is genetic in this population.
36 But I do believe what I thought was really a good thing
37 in the proposal was allowing the 10 days prior to the
38 moose season and then the later season. It might be a
39 real benefit to help break that up. If somebody is able
40 to harvest animals away from the estrus cycle, I think
41 that's the preference.

42
43 As far as my boss, they want to see the
44 later season too. So, to try to make a happy medium and
45 meet in the middle, which we're really trying to do, is
46 to try to address some of those issues. Personally, I
47 think it would be a good idea. I think we need to spend
48 more time as far as a tribe with the Refuge and Alaska
49 Department of Fish and Game and we need to address some
50 of these things together.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I know that all the
2 testimony we've gotten time after time after time in all
3 of our meetings is that traditionally moose season was
4 later.

5
6 MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah. When I was a boy, I
7 remember there was snow on the ground.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, I remember that
10 from my early moose hunts, too. There was snow on the
11 ground and it was 30 below zero. Thank you, Darrel. Any
12 other questions for Darrel.

13
14 (No comments)

15
16 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other Tribal or
19 State or Federal committees.

20
21 (No comments)

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Interagency Staff
24 Committee.

25
26 (No comments)

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fish and Game Advisory
29 Committees.

30
31 MR. STOCKWELL: Bill Stockwell, Cooper
32 Landing Fish and Game Advisory Committee. Good morning.
33 When this proposal first came up we discussed it at a
34 meeting. A couple of things. One is the early season
35 for subsistence, giving that up. We kind of wondered
36 about that because the first part of the season is when
37 the dumbest ones are out there and they should be the
38 easiest to harvest, so it seems that those would be the
39 ones that people that wanted subsistence early in the
40 season would want to continue to have and we didn't
41 understand why you were giving that up.

42
43 The other thing is, more important to the
44 discussion, we did discuss the part of not having the
45 season extended past September 20th. Our issue is not
46 whether meat during the rut is edible, we understand
47 people can handle that, that's not a problem. The
48 discussion we had and our feeling is that that's not a
49 good time to hunt because we don't want to disrupt the
50 breeding season by having extra people in the field

1 impacting the breeding. If you've got people out there,
2 then you're going to move the bulls and they aren't going
3 to be breeding, you know, all of that.

4
5 Of course, now I'm hearing a couple other
6 things. One is you're talking about adding a new season.
7 And I guess that would be October 20th to November 20th,
8 is that correct?

9
10 MR. ENCELEWSKI: (Nods affirmatively)

11
12 MR. STOCKWELL: Okay. And we also heard
13 Jeff discuss that during that time -- two things Ralph
14 brought up, maybe some kind of reporting process where
15 you'd know exactly how many big bulls were being taken or
16 the other proposal would be to limit that later season
17 strictly to spike fork and not harvest 50 inch. We'd
18 like to look at that. Obviously I can't make comments on
19 those right now because those are things that have not
20 been before our committee.

21
22 One other thing I'd like to add. It's
23 been 10 years since Cooper Landing has been looked at,
24 whether we want to participate in the subsistence hunting
25 season and I think it's about time we probably did it
26 again, so I'm going to try and take this back to the
27 community and find out. I think probably the early part
28 of the season is not a particular interest to the
29 community and it wasn't before, but having a possibility
30 of a later season and the spike-fork season late where a
31 person could get moose when it's cold and make it easy to
32 harvest, that might be of interest to some of the people
33 in our community. Whether the community would support it
34 or not, I can't tell you. Ralph went through the last
35 cycle on that and so did I, so I can't really say whether
36 that would be of interest or not, but it well could be.

37
38 The other thing that I'd like to bring up
39 is you talked about maybe eliminating 15(A) now. Of
40 course, if Cooper Landing is going to come back and
41 request to participate, which we can't do now, we'd have
42 to put in a proposal in the next hunting cycle. Unit
43 15(A) and 15(B) are basically in our area when you come
44 across into the Refuge and so we might question whether
45 15(A) should be eliminated. I'll just throw that out.
46 Like I say, I can't give you any definitive testimony
47 today because we haven't brought it up and we would like
48 to have a chance to bring it up. So whatever you decide
49 here, we'll take back to the committee. Thank you.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions. Bob.
2
3 MR. CHURCHILL: Just to put it in
4 perspective -- and, Bill, if you'd feel more comfortable
5 commenting as an individual rather than as an AC chair,
6 how long have you lived in Cooper Landing?
7
8 MR. STOCKWELL: I've had a place there
9 since 1972 and I've actually been a resident after I
10 retired since 1992.
11
12 MR. CHURCHILL: How long have you been on
13 your local AC?
14
15 MR. STOCKWELL: Since 1991 and I've been
16 the chair since 1995.
17
18 MR. CHURCHILL: Given that experience,
19 just speaking on your own, what do you think would be the
20 desire of the community for the hunt?
21
22 MR. STOCKWELL: That's kind of like
23 building a bypass around the community. I don't know
24 what it's going to be.
25
26 MR. CHURCHILL: What would you like to
27 see short of shots fired?
28
29 MR. STOCKWELL: No matter what happens
30 I'm going to see shots across the bow, so that's okay.
31 I'm a big boy. I've been shot at before.
32
33 (Laughter)
34
35 MR. STOCKWELL: I don't know. There are
36 some people that have come to me off the record and asked
37 to look at it again. There's other people that are going
38 to go ballistic. I don't know. It depends, you know,
39 where it's going to go in the press and all these other
40 things. I can't tell you. But I think it's worth
41 bringing up again and I intend to.
42
43 MR. CHURCHILL: As a follow up, if we
44 were to eliminate a hunt in A, yet retain one in B, do
45 you think that would be some middle ground on the late
46 hunt?
47
48 MR. STOCKWELL: For what you're talking
49 about here presently for Ninilchik, if that's what
50 they're happy with, that would probably be okay. If we

1 come back and we can see good information from the
2 Department that they don't want it in 15(A), then that
3 would give us something else. We could ask for B or we
4 could come back and ask for A later on. Those things are
5 all open. Once again, I'm going to have to go back and
6 talk. The people that are going to be hunting are the
7 ones that have to come forward and say what they want.

8

9 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you very much.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Bill. I
12 liked your comment right there. That's the thing that
13 people have to remember. Nothing gets set in stone. You
14 can always come back with another request to include, to
15 change, to modify, to reduce or expand. This cycle comes
16 around and around and around.

17

18 I do have one question for you though
19 because you did bring up your concern for hunting during
20 the breeding season and during the rut. We have two
21 State hunts right now that take place during the breeding
22 season and the rut. As an individual, would you be in
23 favor of closing these State seasons that takes place,
24 the trophy season and the season in 15(A), that take
25 place during the rut because they disrupt the breeding
26 season?

27

28 MR. STOCKWELL: Once again we'd have to
29 look at the biology on them. I'm not sure and I'd go to
30 the experts. There's people on our committee who are
31 game biologists and, of course, the Department comes and
32 participates with us and sometimes the Federal people
33 come and participate, so we'd listen to the best science
34 we could get and make a decision there. Generally, I
35 think our committee would be opposed to hunting during
36 the rut if it has any chance of disrupting breeding that
37 needs to take place. I'm just guessing how people are
38 going to vote.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I understand that, Bill.
41 It's just that we hear this concern, we hear it from the
42 State, from other people.

43

44 MR. STOCKWELL: My personal opinion is
45 that it's not a good idea.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Personally.

48

49 MR. STOCKWELL: Yeah, personally. But
50 I'm not a scientist. I'm just some guy that got elected

1 chair by mistake. You know how that goes.

2

3

(Laughter)

4

5

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: James.

6

7

MR. SHOWALTER: Yes. I guess mine is
8 more of a comment on hunting seasons. I could see where
9 both you coming from for a later season due to meat
10 spoilage. I guess I could get you for wanton waste if
11 you get your moose and it spoils on you. But also then
12 about subsistence hunting. I guess, for lack of words it
13 would be transportation. At years past same thing around
14 here, you wouldn't be able to get as far, but nowadays
15 you got the road system. Why should that limit you to
16 your subsistence hunting because you have a road system.
17 It's usable, use it. Thank you. That's my comment.

18

19

MR. STOCKWELL: The only thing I'd say.
20 You know, during that first 10 days it's open for
21 subsistence it's also a bow hunt in part of it, but if a
22 person is going to hunt then, they want to be where they
23 can get the moose very quickly so that it's not going to
24 spoil or not take it at all. But that's what I'm saying.
25 The dumb ones are going to be standing out where they're
26 easy to harvest. That was kind of the point we brought
27 up. Of course, the late season, like you say, then a
28 person can go back where they may want to hunt for that
29 season and stand a good chance of not having wanton waste
30 spoilage because of the temperatures.

31

32

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions. I
33 have one more comment because you brought it up a second
34 time. You brought up about the dumb animals. Possibly
35 subsistence hunters don't want to hunt dumb animals
36 because it might be catching.

37

38

(Laughter)

39

40

MR. STOCKWELL: Besides that, the dumb
41 animals are tougher.

42

43

(Laughter)

44

45

MR. KOMPKOFF: The lack of brain goes to
46 the muscle. I don't know, maybe.

47

48

(Laughter)

49

50

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you for your

1 candor and thank you for your information.

2

3 MR. STOCKWELL: We'll be back.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'm sure you will. Like
6 you said, I saw you 10 years ago. I guess we could take
7 a five-minute break.

8

9 (Off record)

10

11 (On record)

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We'll call this meeting
14 back in session. It's 10 minutes to 3:00 and we'd like
15 to get done by 5:00, so we're going to have to hurry.
16 Donald, at this time, can you give us the written
17 comments on this proposal.

18

19 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We
20 received written public comments from nine individuals
21 from Ninilchik and it's addressed to the Southcentral
22 Alaska Subsistence Resource Advisory Council. These are
23 all the same letter and I'll just read this letter once
24 and then.....

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And then just put the
27 names afterwards.

28

29 MR. MIKE: Right. Chairman Lohse and
30 Members of the Board. This letter is in support of the
31 deferred wildlife proposal WP05-07 requesting a later
32 subsistence hunting period to harvest moose on Federal
33 lands for rural residents of Ninilchik. This is from
34 Linda Painter. Lewis Kvasnikoff supports this proposal.
35 Annette Roberts, additional comments: I agree with the
36 above-mentioned letter and I do fully support this
37 action. Gene Steik, additional comments: I think all
38 road kill should be set aside for Native people only.
39 This was their food chain which they grew up on. All
40 Natives road kill moose then your -- I'm sorry, it's hard
41 to read -- non-profit organizations get it. That's from
42 Gene Steik. Leo Steik is in support of the proposal.
43 Alvin Steik is in support of the proposal. Matthew
44 Cooper, additional comments: As a subsistence user, I
45 need time after the season to harvest moose because of
46 fishing. Marianne Hostetter supports it. Additional
47 comments: Between fishing and moose, they have been our
48 mainstay as long as I can remember. Why tourists are
49 allowed to have priority over our traditional usage
50 because most of our Fish and Game employees are from

1 stateside. They are opposed to a Native way of life,
2 which has always been subsistence. Finally, from Gene
3 Steik, he is in support of the proposal. Thank you, Mr.
4 Chair.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Donald.
7 We'll now go on to our request for public testimony. We
8 have two of them. If anybody else wishes to publicly
9 testify, all you have to do is give Donald a green slip.
10 I have Sarah Dyrdaahl.

11
12 MS. DYRDAHL: My name is Sarah Dyrdaahl
13 with the Ninilchik Traditional Council. I'm the staff
14 biologist. I just have a couple additional comments on
15 this proposal. I think the Council has had some very
16 good questions and basically pointed out most of what I
17 was going to mention about this proposal today.

18
19 I worked a little bit with the folks on
20 drafting the proposal originally and the consensus that I
21 got from the hunters that really would like to see this
22 proposal go through is that it's just getting too hot
23 during that early season. Everything from bugs to
24 vegetation just makes it really difficult to find an
25 animal and also process it without wasting. So that was
26 the major one. Also that in line with tradition they've
27 all, as they were growing up, harvested later when
28 there's frost and so forth.

29
30 I'd also like to point out that there's
31 concern from Fish and Game about too much harvest of
32 large bulls. Ninilchik people are not trophy hunters.
33 They are interested in harvesting an animal for
34 subsistence purposes, not getting something to hang on
35 the wall, so I don't think there's going to be a
36 necessarily huge increase in targeting large trophy bulls
37 if a later season was approved.

38
39 Additionally, I agree with Mr. Chair's
40 comment on the second rut. I too have seen the
41 literature documenting that the first rut is the most
42 important for breeding. So I think it's a good idea to
43 go with the hunting season later after you've passed that
44 first rut and given ample opportunity for breeding.

45
46 That pretty much concludes what I have to
47 say. The Council has brought up most of the points that
48 I had and I think they're all already on the table.
49 That's about it. I'd be happy to answer any questions if
50 there are any.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.
2
3 MR. CHURCHILL: Just to comment, Sarah.
4 I don't think anybody was concerned that people were
5 going to be trophy hunting. But when you're out looking
6 for food, it's kind of like when the bar closes, if it's
7 there and it's available, sometimes you take it.
8
9 (Laughter)
10
11 MS. DYRDAHL: That's true.
12
13 MR. CHURCHILL: Just talking about from
14 what I've heard from other Council members.
15
16 (Laughter)
17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's interesting, Bob.
19 I wasn't going to use the same illustration.
20
21 (Laughter)
22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But we've always talked
24 about how subsistence hunting is opportunistic.
25
26 MS. DYRDAHL: Right.
27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The only thing that
29 would sway the take is if big bulls are more vulnerable
30 at that time of the year than the small spike forks
31 because I know for a fact hunting at that time of the
32 year you didn't bother to look to see whether it was a
33 big one or little one, you just bothered to look to see
34 if it was a legal one. And back in the days when it was
35 cows, bulls, anything, it really didn't matter if it was
36 a cow or a bull. At that time of the year when the days
37 are short and the weather is cold, the earlier you get
38 one and the first one you get is the one you're going to
39 take, you're not going to -- unless there is a reason and
40 that reason could be if a certain amount of big bulls
41 were taken and the season would have to be closed and it
42 would be up to the subsistence users if they want a
43 longer season to concentrate on the smaller ones, you
44 know, but even that I don't know would work because at
45 that time of the year it's awful hard to pass one up so
46 somebody else can have a longer season later. Maybe
47 we'll get testimony that they are more vulnerable and
48 it's not an equal mix at that time of the year. But I'm
49 like you, I don't think any of you are out there trophy
50 hunting. Not that time of year.

1 MS. DYRDAHL: Yeah.
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. John Dahman.
4
5 MR. DAHMAN: One, for the later hunt, I
6 subsistence hunt since it started here on the Peninsula.
7 With the early hunt being real hot and buggy like it is,
8 I spend a lot of the time soaking in the river because
9 it's too hot to hunt in the afternoon and the bugs are so
10 bad and everything.
11
12 It used to be there wasn't bow hunters
13 out there during the subsistence hunt, so now you've got
14 bow hunters out there. You go to go to your spot and
15 there's a couple bow hunters sitting there, which takes
16 away from the hunt.
17
18 Another thing is the brown bears. It
19 seems like there's getting more and more of them all the
20 time. You're out there, the brush is thick, the grass is
21 clear over your head. The next thing you know you think
22 you see a moose coming, you sit down and you hide and
23 wait for a little bit, stand up and it's a big brown bear
24 and they're not afraid of us anymore it seems. You can
25 shoot at them, beside them, and they'll just stand up and
26 look at you.
27
28 As far as the roads, to be able to go
29 hunt on roads on the Refuge, you can't even use a
30 wheelbarrow, so it's not a matter of just driving around
31 and finding a moose, you have to pack it out on your
32 back. So if the later hunt were to come on, at least
33 there might be some snow, maybe you could pull them out
34 with a sled or something like that.
35
36 I've never had one go bad on me in the
37 early hunt, but I end up butchering it like the next day
38 as quick as the animal heat comes out, where I'd like to
39 be able to hold them out longer, but you're not really
40 able to.
41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, John. Any
43 questions for John.
44
45 (No comments)
46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I have one and that's
48 something I didn't realize before. So it's no wheeled
49 thing.
50

1 MR. DAHMAN: No wheel. Wheelbarrow,
2 bicycle, anything.

3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

5
6 MR. DAHMAN: So if you want to hunt on
7 the Refuge, you carry them out on your back unless you've
8 got horses. Other than that it's all on your back, so
9 you can't really venture out any further than you think
10 you're capable of getting the animal out of there. As
11 far as me, I'm always hunting by myself because any of my
12 friends here in Ninilchik they're all commercial fishing
13 or something like that at the time, so I'm on my own.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: One other question.
16 Have you heard of anybody in that season that's had
17 problems with brown bear getting on their kill so fast
18 that they couldn't get their moose out?

19
20 MR. DAHMAN: No, I haven't heard of that.
21 The thing is, the minute you kill the moose, you gut him,
22 you skin him, you throw him in your meat sacks and you
23 start going. That's all you can do.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But nobody has come back
26 for their second load and found a brown bear.

27
28 MR. DAHMAN: I don't know of very many
29 people that even got a moose on the subsistence hunt. I
30 imagine there's years I'm one of the only people to get
31 one and that's only because I'm out there every day.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
34 John. Doug.

35
36 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman. I guess just
37 curiosity. What Federal lands do you hunt on?

38
39 MR. DAHMAN: 15(B) is where I hunt. No
40 roads to drive.

41
42 MR. BLOSSOM: Okay.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions.

45
46 (No comments)

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, John. That
49 was good testimony. Michelle Steik.

50

1 MS. STEIK: Again of the letter
2 testimony. A lot of my family. Hunting is very
3 important in our community and in my family as well. A
4 couple things I wanted to touch on. The discussion of
5 disrupting the breeding cycle. It's difficult to see
6 where that's a very valid point when there is already
7 other hunters out there, especially during this trophy
8 hunt, and that's been touched on before, but I just want
9 to reiterate. It's very hurtful to our tribal members
10 and to the people who've lived there for generations and
11 generations to know that there's allowances for people to
12 go out and trophy hunt and we're not allowed to go out
13 and subsistence hunt because of disrupting breeding
14 cycles, which one makes the other invalid.

15
16 Earlier versus the later season in the
17 hunt. The late season is more customary and traditional.
18 Not everybody has a walk-in cooler to keep their moose
19 hanging cool. Nobody that I know of even takes their
20 moose in to be processed. That's part of the whole
21 tradition. Let alone I don't know who could afford to
22 take it up and have it processed. That's very expensive.
23 So, therefore, we have to do it when the season is cool,
24 like now, when it's freezing out, not August 10th when
25 it's 80 degrees. Along with what other people are
26 saying, it's difficult to find them when the grass is
27 tall.

28
29 As far as the low take numbers,
30 historically, in these areas it's difficult to access,
31 which is why we probably -- we are expecting that there
32 wouldn't be a huge explosion in the numbers of moose that
33 are taken.

34
35 Then I also wanted to say in Unit 15(A)
36 in dropping that from our proposal, I think that's
37 important for us to go ahead and do because there's a
38 declining population there. Being part of the tribe, we
39 look toward the long term and we do respect the fact that
40 we don't want to harm the population and if they're
41 declining, then we need to preserve them. We look toward
42 the long term as well. We're not just out there to run
43 around and get as many moose as we can. The late season
44 is important customarily and traditionally for our
45 people.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Michelle.
48 Bob.

49
50 MR. CHURCHILL: Michelle, a couple

1 questions. Have you participated in these hunts?
2
3 MS. STEIK: The Federal hunts?
4
5 MR. CHURCHILL: No, for moose hunts.
6
7 MS. STEIK: At all? Ever?
8
9 MR. CHURCHILL: Yes.
10
11 MS. STEIK: Oh, yeah. I was out there
12 during the State season all season this year. I just got
13 a new rifle.
14
15 MR. CHURCHILL: Have you been part of the
16 harvesting of moose during the rut?
17
18 MS. STEIK: Not personally shot any, no.
19 In the past I can remember, I'm not sure if it's legal or
20 not, moose that were in the rut.
21
22 (Laughter)
23
24 MR. CHURCHILL: We'll assume the statutes
25 of limitations on anything you talk about are already
26 past. I was just curious on method of harvesting because
27 we were having some conversations about that.
28
29 MS. STEIK: Oh, yeah. Definitely.
30 Whether they're in rut or not in rut, we process them
31 traditionally in a way that you do when they're in rut
32 anyhow. We use the method for when they're in rut all
33 the time whether they're in rut or not. But there's
34 certain ways we go about it that are traditionally taught
35 by our parents and our elders that take us out and show
36 us when we're young.
37
38 MR. CHURCHILL: Okay. Thank you.
39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. I'm going to
41 ask you a question, Michelle.
42
43 MS. STEIK: Sure.
44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: As a tribal council or
46 as people from Ninilchik, we've heard we don't like the
47 trophy hunt, we don't like this and we've heard so many
48 times that there's already a hunt taking place during the
49 rut and I'm with you. That argument to me is not a valid
50 argument. But have you taken part in the State Board of

1 Game process and put proposals in to eliminate those
2 things that you don't like? I mean that's what's got to
3 happen to put them on the table so they get discussed and
4 talked about.

5
6 If the users don't go into that process,
7 we can't affect it as a Federal Board, but if you find
8 this distasteful or you find this is something that
9 should be changed, as a council or a village or just
10 residents of Alaska, put proposals into the Board of Game
11 and request these changes. At least then it has to come
12 up for discussion.

13
14 If enough people put those proposals in,
15 they have to discuss it very thoroughly and then they're
16 going to have to justify why they have a hunt during the
17 rut and then they're going to have to justify why they
18 can say they can have a hunt during the rut for sport but
19 they can't have a hunt during the rut for subsistence.
20 But until that's done we really have no complaints if we
21 haven't gone through the process and asked them to change
22 it.

23
24 MS. STEIK: We have. I believe we have.
25 We actually put in a proposal and we were turned down.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You have put proposals
28 in.

29
30 MS. STEIK: Our proposal to eliminate the
31 trophy hunt.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Then put it in again.

34
35 MS. STEIK: Okay.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

38
39 MR. CHURCHILL: To follow up on a couple
40 points. I absolutely agree and maybe your local Fish and
41 Game Advisory Committee would also be helpful. You
42 mentioned that access was extremely difficult. Can you
43 expand on that a little bit.

44
45 MS. STEIK: Well, with not being able to
46 use wheeled vehicles. If you don't have horses, you've
47 got to find somebody who has horses. And if they're not
48 going, when are they going or can you use their horses.
49 There are a few people who have horses, but borrowing and
50 sharing. It's just very difficult to get out there.

1 It's not impossible, but the point that I'm making is I
2 believe it's difficult enough that you're not going to
3 see a huge explosion of moose being taken out.

4
5 MR. CHURCHILL: How would we fix access
6 without endangering the herd or creating a conservation
7 issue in your opinion?

8
9 MS. STEIK: I'm not sure you could do it
10 without conservation issue because I'm not sure what the
11 conservation issues would be.

12
13 MR. CHURCHILL: Well, without creating a
14 situation where we'd have too many folks hunting the
15 resource but yet allow for -- you know, I've listened to
16 this gentleman talk and it seems like the quarters are
17 getting heavier every year I get older, so it must be the
18 moose getting bigger.

19
20 (Laughter)

21
22 MR. CHURCHILL: What would be some middle
23 ground in your opinion? If we created like non-motorized
24 vehicles because there's some pretty efficient ways to
25 haul animals without a motorized vehicle but would be
26 very helpful.

27
28 MS. STEIK: That's an option. You could
29 also go with motorized vehicles that are under a certain
30 weight so that you only have small vehicles out there and
31 you're not out there with huge pick-up trucks. There's a
32 lot of options to look at, but I definitely agree that's
33 something that could seriously be looked at.

34
35 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you very much.

36
37 MS. STEIK: Uh-huh.

38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions.

40
41 (No comments)

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Michelle.

44
45 MS. STEIK: Thank you.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That takes care of all
48 of the requests for public testimony that I have. Is
49 there anybody else that still wishes to speak that wants
50 to put a request in.

1 (No comments)
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none. We will
4 now go on to Regional Council deliberation. A motion to
5 accept Proposal WP05-07 is in order.
6
7 MR. CHURCHILL: So moved.
8
9 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Second.
10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
12 seconded. Discussion, amendments, changes, deletions,
13 anything. Greg.
14
15 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Mr. Chairman. I'd like
16 to make an amendment to this proposal. I want to get it
17 clear so we all understand it. The 10 days prior, I'd
18 like to see that stay as it was originally in our
19 proposal and I would like to amend the proposal for the
20 late season being October 20th to November 10th,
21 excluding 15(A). That would be the fork horn spike and
22 50 inch and over.
23
24 MR. CHURCHILL: Second.
25
26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Is there a brow tine
27 thing in there, too, or do you have a brow tine on the
28 Kenai?
29
30 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yes. It's three brow
31 tine one side or 50 inch.
32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So spike fork 50 three
34 brow tine or over.
35
36 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Correct. Thank you.
37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So I have an
39 amendment on the table to have the season from August
40 10th to September 20th and from October 20th to November
41 10th, excluding 15(A), spike fork 50 three brow tine or
42 over. Doug.
43
44 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman. I think this
45 is very reasonable. I am very happy to hear that now we
46 have the agencies supporting this. I mean last year we
47 kind of did it without knowing what they wanted. I'm
48 going to complain about 15(A). I think that should be
49 left in, but I'm willing to support it this way. I think
50 it's additional time for the people that asked it and

1 this time we have agency support for this season.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Doug. Any
4 other comments, discussion.

5

6 (No comments)

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I had a question for the
9 biologist and it kind of goes along with -- I don't know
10 that we can say what Doug said, that we have agency
11 support, but we have the willingness of the agency to
12 work with us. Is that more correct?

13

14 MR. SELINGER: Yes, I would prefer that
15 verbiage.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I didn't want to put you
18 on the spot that we said there was agency support and use
19 that for a reason if it wasn't actual support. If it's a
20 willingness to work with us, that's totally different.

21

22 MR. SELINGER: Yes, I'm more than willing
23 to work with you.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

26

27 MR. CHURCHILL: Again, for the record,
28 we've heard from the testifiers that harvesting during
29 the rut is customary and traditional, there's ways of
30 harvesting the meat to ensure the meat's edible and well
31 taken care of it and it's been a long-term practice. We
32 also heard from Cooper Landing that although they would
33 like to see A included, they could certainly live with a
34 proposal that included just B and C, so I think we've
35 considered the testifiers and local knowledge and
36 customary and traditional use.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug.

39

40 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman. I guess I
41 thought we had Fish and Game support. I thought they had
42 a meeting yesterday with Mr. Encelewski and agreed this
43 would be a proper procedure. I guess if I'm wrong, I'm
44 wrong. Of course, this late season now is out of the
45 rut, so that takes care of that problem if someone was
46 worried about it.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug, I don't know if
49 you were wrong as much as -- I, from listening to it, had
50 got that they'd worked together to come up with a

1 compromise. It wasn't so much that there was a support
2 for it. I think he corrected us enough or explained
3 enough that I think we -- we don't have their objection.
4 Pete.

5
6 MR. KOMPKOFF: I call for the question on
7 the amendment.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, we've got a couple
10 more questions, Pete.

11
12 MR. KOMPKOFF: Oh, I'm sorry.

13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Dean.

15
16 MR. WILSON: Just listening to all the
17 information that we're getting from the agencies and the
18 tribes and the people here, I think we're getting some
19 good, valid concerns that are coming out from the Staff
20 and from the Fish and Game on this one. I want to make
21 sure that these aren't ignored. Every time they come up
22 with these recommendations, whatever, that we don't
23 automatically fight them. That was done up in Unit 13
24 and look at the moose population, what happened up there.
25 So I want to make sure these things aren't automatically
26 overlooked and they're dove into deeper.

27
28 A lot of different things go on up here.
29 I know you have a lot of different harvest groups that
30 are diving into the same population of animals. It's a
31 lot more complicated, but it's kind of a microcosm of
32 what we have in Unit 13. So whether they have the
33 population in a given herd or a group to sustain it, I
34 want to make sure that these recommendations or
35 conservation concerns are looked at and I think that's
36 important, too.

37
38 When you're asking for more and more
39 hunts, I want to make sure you're careful what you ask
40 for in these proposals. I remember distinctly Bob Tobey,
41 I'm sure many of you guys were around when he was getting
42 inundated with a huge amount of requests for more and
43 more hunts and he almost couldn't say no to a lot of
44 these groups. Again, look what happened in Unit 13 as a
45 warning.

46
47 This proposal, from what I see, is for
48 the ability to give more priority to subsistence users
49 and that's important. We have it in our area and this
50 proposal really mimics some hunts we have in BLM lands

1 and I support that. It gives advantage to the locals to
2 get more meat. We do take advantage of the early hunt up
3 there. It's hot and there's a lot of flies around and
4 different things, but we do take advantage of it, so
5 don't overlook that either and I do ask that you guys
6 keep that on the table and work with Jeff on that.

7
8 It doesn't seem like right now that the
9 locals have the priority for hunting that we do up there
10 because of the Federal hunt, so maybe this would mimic
11 that or this would help give some of the locals
12 preference on hunting and I think that's good. I'm going
13 to support this proposal for that and I would ask if
14 things down the road start changing as far as
15 conservation concerns readily, that maybe we could back
16 off on some of the State hunts and allow the advantage to
17 be given to the locals if at all possible.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Jeff, I had one more
20 question I wanted to ask you. We have this proposal in
21 front of us. We discussed some safeguards and everything
22 else. Do they have to be in the proposal or is that
23 capable of being done within management as far as
24 reporting and keeping track of how many large bulls are
25 being taken and being able to close things down if
26 something like that happens or do we have to include that
27 in the proposal?

28
29 MR. SELINGER: Mr. Chairman. I'm used to
30 the State system, so I don't know all the workings of the
31 Federal system. However, through the State system, the
32 more precise we can put something in place, the less room
33 there is for questions or gray areas or confusion by the
34 public. That's one of the things I've noticed.

35
36 My personal preference would be to see a
37 limit put on the number of large bulls. We heard quite a
38 bit of testimony that they won't be targeted, we're
39 probably not going to see many moose harvested and I have
40 no reason to suspect that we're going to see 100 moose
41 come out of this opportunity if it's provided. If there
42 isn't a real thought or concern by the members who've
43 testified that there would be a lot of moose harvested, I
44 would be a lot more comfortable if there was a cap on the
45 number of big bulls.

46
47 If I could add one other brief little
48 thing, I wanted to get into the discussion here.
49 Currently there is a Tier II State season for moose south
50 of Kachemak Bay. We have very low moose populations down

1 there, so if you're going to include all of 15(C), that
2 may be a concern for that population down there if this
3 was to be extended down to the Seldovia/Port Graham area.

4
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It can't be because
6 there's no Federal land.

7
8 MR. SELINGER: Okay. then it's not a
9 concern by me. Thank you. And just for some
10 clarification. You have it on one of the handouts, the
11 copies you requested. Some of my confusion with all
12 this, and I'm getting more used to this system as time
13 goes on, they were just more of a curiosity for me than
14 anything, but if there was a shortage of animals to be
15 harvested for Ninilchik Traditional Council members, on
16 their lands they're issuing up 100 permits a year to non-
17 tribal members, and it was just a confusion if there was
18 a lack of moose to be harvested or a lack of opportunity,
19 how come 100 permits were issued. I know there's other
20 considerations, generating revenues and all those sort of
21 things, but that was a real confusion for me.

22
23 Then the late season part. This year
24 when they reserved their land for members only, it was
25 the first five days of the season, not the last five
26 days, so there was just some confusion that I had there.
27 I'm not making judgments of anything. They were just
28 confusion. I just wanted to bring those points up.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Jeff.

31
32 MR. SELINGER: And I guess, getting back
33 to your other question, I think we could work something
34 out that is reasonable. This particular proposal I think
35 is much more in the direction that would be feasible and
36 biologically sound than what we originally had before us.

37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The main thing that I'm
39 thinking of is we cannot at this meeting today logically
40 sit down and set a cap. We haven't got that. But this
41 is going to go before the Board and that's your
42 opportunity to present them with some good biological
43 data if you feel like a cap is necessary or some kind of
44 quick reporting is necessary to keep a cap on it, I think
45 they're more than willing to work in that direction. I
46 don't think that has to be part of our proposal because
47 we have stated in our discussion that we recognize that
48 something like that may be needed.

49
50 I'll ask Tom. He's putting his hands on

1 his head and shaking and thinking. Do you think that we
2 need to put a provision in there that, if necessary, a
3 cap could be put on?
4

5 MR. BOYD: Mr. Chair. Tom Boyd,
6 Subsistence Office and Fish and Wildlife Service in
7 Anchorage. I don't have a sense of what the level of
8 harvest of large bulls would be, so it's hard to know.
9 However, if we wanted to monitor it and I'm not talking
10 about a quick reaction. You know, it's a Federal
11 registration permit. I was just asking Dan if we had
12 collected that data and the indication was no, but we
13 could certainly design the permit so we could collect
14 that kind of information.
15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's what I was
17 wondering. The permit is going to have to be issued. As
18 a stipulation of the permit, we can put things like
19 reporting and monitor it. I was just wondering if we
20 need to put in here as a provision that in case of
21 conservation or biological necessity this season could be
22 closed by emergency order or if that could just be part
23 of the regulatory process.
24

25 MR. BOYD: Mr. Chair. that's already
26 inherent in our process.
27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.
29

30 MR. BOYD: We can close areas now if
31 they're a biological concern.
32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So we don't need
34 to touch that at this point in time.
35

36 MR. BOYD: That's correct, Mr. Chair.
37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's what I wanted to
39 know. Thank you. Robin. Now you're not going to
40 contradict him, I hope.
41

42 MR. WEST: No. I don't want to confuse
43 it either. I mean the reality is the reporting
44 requirements right now would help us design for the
45 future. There would be no in-season management changes.
46 With everything we know about this, we'd just watch it
47 real close for a year or two. If things start changing
48 where large bulls are being taken, then I think we should
49 expect some conservation measures. Or if the season
50 isn't working, it may be tweaked to provide more

1 opportunity or something. So I think this is a good stab
2 at it. I think there are some concerns all around. We
3 may want to start collecting additional information like
4 on antler spread or that kind of thing, but there
5 wouldn't be any in-season management opportunities unless
6 it was put in specifically in the proposal.

7
8
9

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

10 MR. CHURCHILL: Maybe we have an
11 opportunity with the testimony we got from Darrel
12 Williams. It sounds like there's a pretty sophisticated
13 in-season monitoring process the Ninilchik Traditional
14 Council is going. That might be a great cooperative
15 effort between all of us. I was very impressed with
16 that. And provide very good, accurate information where
17 we could all work together.

18
19
20

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Greg.

21 MR. ENCELEWSKI: That's correct. We
22 monitor this program for the State land. Just to answer
23 Jeff's question there on the five days early and the 100
24 permits. Actually those permits used to be 150. We cut
25 it back ourselves by 50. If we had it our way, we'd
26 probably cut it back more. But we're good neighbors and
27 we want everyone to have the chance. There's a lot of
28 hunters in the state and from all over the country has
29 hunted the area and we want to give them the opportunity,
30 plus generate some funds. That helps pay for our
31 monitoring and the biologist and everything else that
32 we're doing.

33
34
35

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

36 MR. CHURCHILL: Has the question been
37 called?

38
39
40

MR. KOMPKOFF: Yes, I called the

40 question.
41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
43 called. I guess I should read it. The proposal is moose
44 season season being August 10th through September 20th,
45 October 20th to November 10th, excluding 15(A). Spike
46 fork, 50, three brow tines or over. All in favor signify
47 by saying aye.

48
49
50

IN UNISON: Aye.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
2 saying nay.

3
4 (No opposing votes)

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Amended motion WP05-07
7 passes. Now everybody just has to work together. With
8 that, what time is it?

9
10 MR. MIKE: It's 10 to noon.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We obviously are not
13 going to get done before noon. I think we did a good
14 piece of work on this one here, so I don't feel quite so
15 bad about staying this long. Let's break until 1:00
16 o'clock. Donald, did you have something to say.

17
18 MR. MIKE: I was just trying to
19 coordinate a report, but if you want to go to lunch, we
20 can do that.

21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: After lunch we're going
23 to go into agency reports and some other business of the
24 Council. I thank all of you that came to testify. If
25 you're not going to stick around for the rest of it, I
26 thank you for coming. Bill, I thank you for coming for
27 the Advisory Committee. It's nice to see an Advisory
28 Committee here.

29
30 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair. An action item I
31 think the Council needs to address is the rural/nonrural
32 issue and Larry Buklis will be presenting that.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. The
35 rural/nonrural issue it is.

36
37 MR. MIKE: That's correct, Mr. Chair.
38 You can find it on Page 224. We can do it after lunch or
39 whenever it's convenient.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. I guess that's
42 what we'll be on.

43
44 (Off record)

45
46 (On record)

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Get this meeting back in
49 session, even if everybody's not here, so that we could
50 get out sometime between now and 10 minute 'til three.

1 After I clean up the mess.

2

3 Okay. Our next thing on the agenda is
4 the Native Village of Eyak. We're on agency and
5 organization reports.

6

7 MR. van den BROEK: Good afternoon. I'm
8 Keith van den Broek, representing the Native Village of
9 Eyak here today.

10

11 I'm just going to be giving a brief
12 overview of all of our projects on the Copper River which
13 were funded through the Fisheries Resource Monitoring
14 Program. So we currently have projects under this, and
15 the chinook salmon escapement monitoring which we've been
16 running since 2001. The lower Copper River abundance
17 estimate, that's our sonar project which has been going
18 since 2002. And then new in 2005 we have a sockeye
19 salmon radio telemetry study and a steelhead trout radio
20 telemetry study, and we've also continued working with
21 ADF&G on the chinook salmon genetics mapping. And we
22 started a feasibility study in 2005 that is funded by
23 ADF&G for a sockeye salmon escapement monitoring program,
24 using mark/recapture techniques. And this is the
25 proposal that you already considered and has now gone to
26 the Federal Subsistence Board for final approval.

27

28 So this year on the lower Copper River
29 abundance estimate study, we continued to use acoustics
30 to estimate the abundance of passing salmon early in the
31 season. We actually mobilized this project about a week
32 earlier than normal on May 4th. And this helped ADF&G
33 commercial fishery managers set their first commercial
34 opener using our data. And I think next year is going to
35 be the final year on this project funded by the FRMP.

36

37 The chinook salmon escapement monitoring
38 program continues as normal in 2005. We had a much
39 easier mobilization than you saw last year. We only had
40 about a foot of snow to clear off the weirs this year,
41 and we were actually able to mobilize the entire camp in
42 one day.

43

44 We started operating a third fish weir at
45 Baird Canyon. This is another smaller subsistence wheel
46 which was built by Johnny Guglatah (ph), similar to the
47 one that we had up at Canyon Creek.

48

49 We also completed repairs on the second
50 wheel at Canyon Creek and had both wheels operational in

1 '05.

2

3

4 We found that the site dynamics have
5 changed considerably at Canyon Creek. This follows the
6 high water events that were in 2004. So our prime
7 fishing spot that you saw the subsistence wheel up there,
8 you know, doubling the catch of both wheels combined down
9 at Baird, that wasn't actually there any more. That
10 banks washed away completely and has been replaced by
11 snags, so we explored several new fishing sites this
12 year, and found a couple that are suitable, not nearly as
13 good, but because we had two wheels we were able to catch
14 sufficient numbers of fish.

15

16 You can see at Baird Canyon we've
17 continued to increase our catches, and Canyon Creek
18 stayed steady to 2004. In 2004 the escapement estimate
19 was 40,564. We do not have an escapement estimate for
20 2005 yet. We're still doing preliminary data analysis,
21 but we did capture and mark 3,885 chinook salmon at Baird
22 Canyon and recaptured up at Canyon Creek. Out of 3,359
23 examined, we had I think 357 recaptures. I hesitate to
24 draw any conclusions from that yet. And we haven't gone
25 through for any censorships in the data. We haven't
26 taken into account catch per unit effort yet, or any sort
27 of stratification by time or sex or size of fish, but a
28 very, very preliminary estimate, we'd be looking at
29 probably 35,000 fish, just looking at straight numbers
30 there, but I'd urge you not to take that any further than
31 it needs to be taken.

32

33

34 So starting this year, we also had the
35 sockeye radio telemetry study. We intended to deploy 500
36 tags, but because we had tag returns from the fishery
37 during the season, we were actually to deploy 521 tags.
38 There were 49 of these known to be removed by the
39 fishery. These are tags that were returned to us by the
40 fishery.

41

42

43 Fifty of these tags were never detected
44 after release. We have a tower at Baird Canyon, about a
45 half a mile above where the fish are being tagged, so 50
46 of them never made it to that tower. And 145 of those
47 tags were last detected in the main stem Copper, six at
48 Baird Canyon, 24 between Baird and lower Haley Creek, 48
49 between lower Haley Creek and the Chitina Bridge, and 67
50 between the Chitina Bridge and the upper Copper. Now,
51 some of these could have been fishery removals which
52 weren't returned to us, and it's also possible that some
53 of these fish were spawning in tributaries very close to

1 the main stem and couldn't be distinguished from the main
2 stem.

3

4 279 of the tags were last detected in
5 spawning tributaries. You can see that a majority of
6 them were in the Klutina, and upper Copper, Gulkana and
7 Tazlina, and the Slana. And then lesser numbers in the
8 Tonsina, Chitina, Bremner and Taznina Rivers. These are
9 also preliminary numbers. We'll have our final analyses
10 available at our January workshop in Cordova.

11

12 Some known problems that we had with this
13 study in its first year. When we ordered our radio tags,
14 we weren't informed that there's two different tags
15 available for the same price. One had a two-stage
16 transmitter, which is a weaker signal, and the other one,
17 which we've been using on the chinook study in the past
18 was a three-stage transmitter. So we ended with a two-
19 stage transmitter. It provides a weaker signal. They
20 were detected by all of the towers on the Copper, but we
21 had trouble detecting these tags using the aerial
22 surveys. So that will account for some of our high
23 number of tags which weren't detected in the spawning
24 tributaries, that were last seen on the main stem. And
25 we're still doing some work. We have one aerial survey
26 which wasn't included yet in these data.

27

28 We also found, because we didn't have a
29 secondary mark on tagged fish, I think there was a
30 problem. A lot of the fish that were captured in fish
31 wheels or dipnets, they didn't see the tag. They simply
32 filleted out the fish and threw the carcass back in the
33 river without noticing that there was a tag in the
34 stomach. I'm going to fix this next year by putting a
35 spaghetti tag through the dorsal musculature of all radio
36 tagged fish that says, you know, essentially look in the
37 stomach, and get our radio tag back for us.

38

39 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Please see inside.

40

41 (Laughter)

42

43 MR. van den BROEK: We also had some
44 equipment failure which led to no radio tower being
45 present at O'Brien Creek. This is an important site. It
46 was used in the chinook study, you can look at signal
47 strength and determine a lot of fish that are removed by
48 the fishery that are never reported. Unfortunately we
49 weren't able to do this in 2005, but we'll definitely be
50 able to do this in the future. The problem's been

1 addressed.

2

3 Steelhead radio telemetry study was
4 actually run primarily by ADF&G Sport Fish, but we
5 provided two technicians in the Canning Creek Camp, and
6 all of the equipment and fish wheels and technical
7 support that they needed. I don't have any sort of
8 information yet from them about where the tags went, but
9 I know that they tagged 54 steelhead and 121 coho. The
10 coho were I think funded by ADF&G. The steelhead was the
11 only part of this that was funded by the FRMP.

12

13 I'll jump now into the feasibility work
14 that we did for the sockeye mark/recapture. Because of
15 the huge numbers of fish that we would need to be
16 tagging, we were primarily interested in investigating
17 new technologies that are available for conducting this
18 study.

19

20 I show here the old spaghetti tagging
21 procedure that we've been using on the chinook salmon
22 whereby you put the monofilament through the dorsal
23 musculature and crimp on a spaghetti tag. It's then
24 visible for.....

25

26 So a new tagging procedure that we're
27 investigating is called PIT tagging. This stands for
28 passive integrated transponder. It's essentially a very
29 small radio tag, but it's a passive radio tag. In order
30 to be detected, they need to pass through an antenna And
31 you see that this tag is just injected into the body
32 cavity through the belly flesh. And we try to avoid the
33 belly flesh for those people that do use it for smoking
34 and what not, and we don't want anyone breaking their
35 teeth on this. So it's intended to go into the body
36 cavity. And you can see there the size of the tag is
37 about half an inch long. It's basically the size of a
38 large grain of rice.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that's the radio
41 tag.

42

43 MR. van den BROEK: That is the tag
44 there, yes.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I mean, that's is the
47 radio transmitter?

48

49 MR. van den BROEK: It's not a
50 transmitter. It's a transponder. It's passive. So what

1 happens is when it passes through an antenna on the
2 recovery fish wheel, a signal is sent back through the
3 tag and back out to the receiver, so there's no battery
4 or anything inside the tag. It's not constantly
5 transmitting. It simply relays a signal that's sent to
6 it.

7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Like when these - is
9 this going to be used also when it passes the radio
10 towers? This is the -- this is tagging the fish for
11 identification -- oops. This is just tagging the fish
12 for identification?

13
14 MR. van den BROEK: This is tagging the
15 fish for a mark/recapture study, so these are used in
16 lieu of a spaghetti tag. They're numerically sequenced,
17 and when they pass through the antenna, then the reader
18 can tell us what number's on the tag without every
19 handling or looking at the fish.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So this isn't
22 going to be then for identification on the radio tags so
23 that people don't miss the radio tags then?

24
25 MR. van den BROEK: Correct.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

28
29 MR. van den BROEK: This is going to be
30 used for a mark recapture study only.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

33
34 MR. van den BROEK: These are going to be
35 invisible in the body cavity. Most people won't even
36 know that it's there.

37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

39
40 MR. van den BROEK: So then, of course
41 the old recovery effort, they had to dip every king
42 salmon up at Canyon Creek and investigate it for that tag
43 and write down the tag number. It requires considerable
44 effort by the technicians, and further handling of the
45 fish.

46
47 The new recovery effort, we've got this
48 rigged up on our subsistence wheel now. We've got all
49 the solar panels and video cameras and the antenna you
50 see is mounted on the slide, so the fish are still

1 captured by the fish wheel and they drop down the slide
2 and go through that antenna, which is able to read the
3 PIT tag, and then using the video camera, we're able to
4 go back then and count the number of fish that are going
5 through in total.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So they don't even stop
8 at the fish wheel, they just go down the slide.....

9
10 MR. van den BROEK: So they don't even
11 stop at the fish wheel.

12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:and go right back
14 into the water.

15
16 MR. van den BROEK: Go down the slide, go
17 down as a live tank. We still have the live tank in
18 place, but with the excluders open. That way if we do
19 need to investigate the fish for any other purposes, we
20 can drop the excluders and still look at those fish.

21
22 So that was the final slide.

23
24 I'll just show you, I've got a.....

25
26 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's the Million
27 Dollar Bridge?

28
29 (Laughter)

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No.

32
33 MR. van den BROEK: Not quite. It's
34 actually the Booby Island Bridge in Kuwait.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's a new bridge over
37 Alaganik Slough.

38
39 MR. van den BROEK: So this is just
40 showing you a video feed, and the camera that's mounted
41 above the slides.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Let's see, it's in
44 reverse.

45
46 (Laughter)

47
48 MR. van den BROEK: This is actually
49 slowed down, it's in slow motion just for ease of seeing
50 them. You can see that it's pretty easy to identify the

1 species of fish, and pretty easy to get a total count.
2 We've got it set up with motion sensing technology, so as
3 they start to go through that curtain there, the camera
4 is turned on, and it's not running constantly.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pretty neat.

7
8 MR. van den BROEK: So that's -- the way
9 it's going to work I think is twice a day the technicians
10 will just go out and swap a hard drive and take it back
11 to camp and plug it into their computer and be able to go
12 through and do their counts off the computer screen. And
13 it's all digital.

14
15 So I'll just leave that playing. If
16 anyone wants to ask any questions.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I have just a couple,
19 Keith, and I think you kind of answered it. When you
20 were talking about tags that weren't recovered, my
21 instant thought was how people -- how I've watched people
22 take care of fish down at the Copper River bridge, and
23 unless there was a pretty visible outside mark, there
24 would be no way that they would have any idea at all that
25 there was a tag inside those fish. So if you're going to
26 do something next year, are you thinking like putting a
27 spaghetti tag on there that they can.....

28
29 MR. van den BROEK: That's the idea,
30 yeah. We'll just put our address and phone number and a
31 note on the spaghetti tag, asking people to return that
32 fish, or if they choose not to, to at least return the
33 tag to us.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And I noticed that when
36 you put your spaghetti tags in those king salmon, when
37 you were making that loop with the monofilament, so
38 you're not just using the gun any more that just injects
39 it, and has the crossed piece at the end of the spaghetti
40 tag?

41
42 MR. van den BROEK: No. We've actually
43 never used that type of tag. We've always used the
44 spaghetti tags with the monofilament.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh. That explains to me
47 why -- I saw one of your -- your tags were yellow,
48 weren't they?

49
50 MR. van den BROEK: Yeah.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I saw one of your king
2 salmon in a little creek at home, and I decided to get
3 you the tags, so my boys went on one side of the creek so
4 it swam up underneath the bank, and I just reached over
5 the bank ticked him until I could get up and get ahold of
6 the spaghetti tag, and I tried to pull it out, because I
7 thought it was one of those that just went in with the T
8 on the of it.

9
10 (Laughter)

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It was about a 25, 27-
13 pound king, and I found out you could not pull the
14 spaghetti tag out. So next time I'll use a knife and
15 clip it off, but.....

16
17 MR. van den BROEK: Right.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But you had one up
20 there.

21
22 MR. van den BROEK: Yeah.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And I was going to get
25 one just to prove to you I had one, but I couldn't.

26
27 MR. van den BROEK: Yeah.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So they're -- you've
30 always used where they've gone all the way through?

31
32 MR. van den BROEK: Yeah, we have. And
33 I'll make a note, with this PIT tagging technology, we
34 intend to use PIT tags and spaghetti tags on king salmon
35 next year just to test the equipment up at Canyon Creek.
36 Get a validation on that. And if it does prove to be as
37 effective as we want it to be, then we're going to go to
38 PIT tagging on king salmon and sockeye. Which, you know,
39 it dramatically reduces the handling on the fish, and I
40 think that's.....

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, yeah.

43
44 MR. van den BROEK:that's
45 beneficial for the stock. The cost, of the tags, the PIT
46 tags are worth about four times as much as the spaghetti
47 tags. We're looking about \$3.90 apiece for those PIT
48 tags.

49
50 MR. CHURCHILL: That's just amazing

1 technology.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And so the -- there
4 hasn't been any work done on the steelhead yet as far as
5 where they ended up or anything like that?

6

7 MR. van den BROEK: I haven't seen any of
8 their analyses yet.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that will come from
11 Fish and Game, not from Native Village of Eyak.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's James Severide,
14 that's Sport Fish in Fairbanks is responsible for doing
15 those.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
18 him.

19

20 (No comments)

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Keith.

23

24 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's always amazing to
27 me how far you guys have come in doing this.

28

29 MR. van den BROEK: I was amazed at how
30 far we've come in one year. Just getting those PIT tags
31 and stuff set up (indiscernible, away from microphone).

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

34

35 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I wondered what that
36 solar panel and everything was. I buzzed right over next
37 to it a couple times. I had to get a couple pictures of
38 it.

39

40 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With that, unless
43 Donald's got something else I should take care of, we go
44 to the Bureau of Land Management. They're not last this
45 time.

46

47 MS. ROGERS: Chairman and Council. I am
48 Kari Rogers with the BLM in Glennallen.

49

50 And first off, I just wanted to say in

1 case any of your weren't aware, I'm replacing temporarily
2 Elijah Waters who is our Glennallen Field Office
3 subsistence biologist. He's recently called up on active
4 duty for National Guard and being sent over to Iraq. In
5 fact, we don't know if he's there already or still in the
6 States being trained and prepared for going over. But
7 they are estimating he'd be gone for about 12 months in
8 country and Iraq, so we don't expect him back to work at
9 the office until probably January of '07. So I am his
10 replacement until that time.

11

12 And based on what Barbara Cellarius and
13 Eric Veach offered to you for the park report, I wanted
14 to let you know that for our Federal subsistence moose
15 hunt this year we issued a total of 948 permits for Unit
16 13, and of those since the season closed we have received
17 back reports that indicate 48 moose were harvested, and
18 we have 84 percent of harvest reports returned to date.

19

20 And for our caribou season, the second
21 season just opened recently on October 21st. And because
22 the population was estimated by Fish and Game recently to
23 be about 37,000 animals, in consultation with Fish and
24 Game, Bob Toby and Becky Kellyhouse, we agreed that we
25 would continue to have an either sex harvest into the
26 winter season, and so that's ongoing. And we have to
27 date issued 2,123 permits, and as of this morning we have
28 reports returned on 99 successful caribou harvests, and
29 of those 88 are males and 11 cows.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, have any of those
32 been in this winter season, or were those all from the --
33 they were all from the early season?

34

35 MS. ROGERS: No, actually within the last
36 week we have an increase of about -- it would be 39 or
37 so. So, yeah, the caribou actually moved across Denali
38 Highway, across Federal subsistence lands right at the
39 time of the re-opening of the season, so people took
40 advantage of it and got up there.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So you had about 60
43 caribou taken in the early season?

44

45 MS. ROGERS: Yeah, that's correct.

46

47 And as far as fisheries that our office
48 has been involved with, Tom Taube's going to speak to
49 that when he gives his Fish and Game report.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any
2 questions.

3
4 (No comments)

5
6 MS. ROGERS: Okay.

7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

9
10 MR. ROGERS: All right. Good afternoon,
11 Mr. Chairman and Council. My name is Bruce Rogers, and
12 I'm with the BLM out of the Glennallen Field Office also.

13
14 And the reason I'm here is to follow up
15 on something that we're working on, which is the East
16 Alaska Resource Management Plan out of the Glennallen
17 Field Office. This planning effort -- we just released a
18 draft resource management plan, environmental impact
19 statement, in July of last year -- this year. And it
20 analyzed alternatives which had proposals that would
21 significantly affect subsistence in the area and I'll get
22 into that in a little more detail. But as a consequence
23 of that, we had seven hearings in the area to collect
24 testimony, and then we had a special session where you
25 guys got together and you actually passed some
26 resolutions regarding that proposal.

27
28 And so I'm here today to follow up on
29 that and to tell you where the process has gone since
30 then, and to summarize some of the public comment that
31 was received both at those testimonies and the special
32 meeting that was held at Kluti-Kaah in Copper Center. So
33 I'm going to go through this presentation, and then I'll
34 field any questions that you have.

35
36 Okay. So the purpose of this
37 presentation is to present a brief overview of this
38 planning area and where we are in this planning process,
39 and then to summarize what public comment that we've
40 gotten on the important issues, and to explain where we
41 go from here.

42
43 And here's the schedule. EARMP is East
44 Alaska Resource Management Plan. And you can see that we
45 started in March of 2003, so it's a pretty long process.
46 And we had some very extensive public scoping where we
47 developed issues, lots of public meetings really focused
48 on the Copper Valley. We had about 30 meetings.

49
50 And then we went on to developing

1 alternatives. We put out the draft resource management
2 plan and environmental impact statement in April of 2005,
3 and that was open for a 90-day comment period which ended
4 on July 28th. And as part of that, like I mentioned, we
5 had those Section .810 hearings in seven different
6 communities and collected testimony. And right now we
7 are responding to public comments and the final Resource
8 Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement is
9 scheduled to be released in January, this coming January.
10 Okay. So that gives you an idea of where we're at in
11 this process.

12
13 Very briefly as kind of a review, this is
14 what the planning area is. We call it East Alaska, but
15 it really stretches from the Alaska Range down to Valdez.
16 Basically we've also got a large chunk down on the Bering
17 Glacier down to the lower right in the slide there.

18
19 You can see -- one of the things that
20 jumps out at you here is the mixed land status in this
21 area. It's predominantly State lands and then the
22 Wrangell-St. Elias National Park off to the right there.
23 The plan actually covers 7.1 million acres that are
24 currently BLM managed. That includes State and native
25 selected lands up to the point that they're actually
26 conveyed. So this plan provides kind of an interim
27 management for those lands until such time as they're
28 conveyed.

29
30 It also includes unencumbered or non-
31 selected lands within the Pipeline Utility Corridor,
32 within the wild and scenic rivers, the Delta and Gulkana,
33 and that big chunk of the Bering Glacier there.

34
35 Okay. The issues that were identified
36 through scoping including travel management. OHV use was
37 a big issue in this area. Recreation management,
38 protection of resource values, lands and realty, which
39 included some issues with Slana. We did a review of the
40 ANCSA d(1) withdrawals in this process. And also the
41 Pipeline Utility Corridor which I'll get into in more
42 detail. Vegetation management and fire management,
43 mineral exploration and development. And then, of
44 course, subsistence and the effects that some of these
45 things being proposed would have on subsistence.

46
47 Okay. To get right to this thing, and
48 talk about really a specific proposal within
49 consideration here that would have a significant effect
50 on subsistence, this document analyzed four different

1 alternative, A, B, C, and D. And under those, we dealt
2 with Public Land Order 5150, which was the withdrawal
3 that set aside the Pipeline Utility Corridor through this
4 area in the early 70s. Under all the alternatives, A, C,
5 and D, that thing would be left as is. It would be left
6 in place.

7
8 Under alternative B, which is kind of a
9 development-oriented alternative, we would revoke PLO
10 5150 to allow top filings that exist on that to fall into
11 place and subsequent conveyance to the State of Alaska.
12 Now, this is based on a request we had a year or so ago
13 from the Governor to do just that, and to allow
14 conveyance to the State of that pipeline utility
15 corridor. Okay. So as part of our -- BLM's response to
16 that request, we considered that within this planning
17 document. Okay. And I'll get into what effects that
18 would have.

19
20 Now, something to recognize right now is
21 that within this range of alternatives, the one that was
22 identified as BLM's preferred alternative is alternative
23 D as in dog, so alternative B where this proposal takes
24 place is not our preferred alternative at this time.
25 Okay.

26
27 So the effects of doing that, like I
28 said, the top filings that ANILCA allowed the State to
29 make on the Pipeline Utility Corridor would fall into
30 place, and so those lands would be conveyed to the State
31 of Alaska. Why it's so important to us today is that
32 right now our Federal subsistence hunting program, only
33 the unencumbered or the nonselected lands are under the
34 jurisdiction of the Federal Subsistence Board and thus
35 they are open to hunting under Federal regulations.
36 Okay. And right now there are 547,000 acres of those in
37 Unit 13, and those include the Gulkana and the Delta Wild
38 and Scenic Rivers, the Pipeline Utility Corridor, and
39 some small areas around Slana and around Paxson Lake.

40
41 Okay. So if we were to revoke PLO 5150,
42 the effect would be that we would lose 337,000 of those
43 acres, which is a 63 percent reduction in acres available
44 for that Federal subsistence hunt. And now what that
45 means in terms of harvest, and this is -- we're just
46 talking harvest here, is that we would lose 80 percent of
47 what has -- I think this is based on about 10 years of
48 data, 80 percent of the moose and caribou harvest has
49 occurred within that area. So obviously our .810
50 analysis that we did as part of this draft RMPEIS said,

1 hey, this proposal would have a significant effect on
2 subsistence in this area. Okay. So that drove the need
3 under ANILCA to have these hearings.

4
5 And these are the -- these were where the
6 hearings were held and the dates that they were held,
7 Chistochina, Glennallen, Valdez, Cordova, Anchorage,
8 Fairbanks, and Delta Junction. And we also had the
9 special session for you guys which involved a tremendous
10 amount of public testimony. So we did all that.

11
12 And that's -- everything I've provided so
13 far is kind of a summary to get you to this point.

14
15 So what we're doing now is going through
16 public comments, and I'll provide a quick summary for you
17 there. We received about 4,500 comments on this draft
18 resource management plan, environmental impact statement.
19 Obviously those weren't all relative to the PLO 5150.
20 About 4,100 of those were generated through a Lower 48
21 email campaign. They were kind of a form letter that was
22 generated actually off of a Wilderness Advocacy website.

23
24 So what we have to do is we go through
25 and we reply to all those. And then we go through and
26 categorize all the comments. We separate out those that
27 we can reply to, and reply to those. Those replies are
28 contained in an appendix to the final that's coming out
29 in January. So initially anyone who sends us a letter,
30 or we get comments from, they get kind of a form letter
31 that says, we got your comment, we'll respond to it, and
32 you will see it in the appendix. Okay. So, yeah, those
33 will come out in the final RMPEIS.

34
35 So let me get a little more specific
36 here.

37
38 Basically what folks said relative to
39 this alternative B proposal on the revocation of PLO 5150
40 was they were overwhelmingly opposed to doing that. And
41 primary reason was obviously impacts on subsistence. Out
42 of the responses that we're replying to, 83 out of the 86
43 were opposed. The action was opposed by Southcentral
44 Regional Advisory Council, the Southeast Regional
45 Advisory Council, AHTNA, Incorporated, National Park
46 Service, the EPA, the local village corporations and
47 village councils, they all opposed it.

48
49 The action was supported by State of
50 Alaska, Alaska Miners Association and the Alaska Outdoor

1 Council.

2

3 Okay. What I'm going to do here is as I
4 touch on each of these issues, I'm going to tell you then
5 the suggested change that we're going to pursue based on
6 thee public comments. Okay.

7

8 For this particular issue, we're
9 suggesting no change, because this action is not in our
10 preferred alternative. And so our State Director is
11 committed to staying the course, continuing with the
12 preferred action on this particular issue, not revoking
13 PLO 5150 and maintaining that Pipeline Utility Corridor.
14 Now, I say that, that's going to be his recommendation to
15 the Secretary of Interior. This is really a Department
16 of Interior decision. So this is one of those kind of
17 things where you make the recommendation, it goes up the
18 chain and, you know, beyond that it's speculation. But
19 our State Director is very committed to maintaining a
20 manageable and accessible subsistence unit in Unit 13.

21

22 Okay. Some other issues, and I'm trying
23 to address issues that the Council passed a resolution
24 on. Off-highway vehicle management, just a summary of
25 what the comments were. This is very general. We got a
26 lot of comments on this issue.

27

28 But I would say that a slight majority
29 are in favor of more intensive off-highway vehicle
30 management, because of resource impacts, including
31 impacts to subsistence, or concerns about impacts to
32 subsistence.

33

34 There, were, of course, a lot of comments
35 that were opposed to more intensive management. They
36 would like to see things left the way they are, because
37 in general they feel there are no significant resource
38 problems associated with off-highway vehicles, and
39 they're concerned about a loss of access to public lands.

40

41 Okay. So that's a very brief synopsis of
42 public comment there. It's a very diverse issue, and the
43 public comment reflects that.

44

45 Then just to go into what suggested
46 change between the draft and final is, again we're really
47 not going to suggest any change from the preferred,
48 because the preferred alternative sets the stage for more
49 intensive management of off-highway vehicles, and we're
50 going to stay that course. We do that -- our goal is

1 also to provide long-term access, so it's a balance, but
2 we do feel that more intensive management is needed, that
3 we can no longer condone a wide open scenario for off-
4 highway vehicles, and this -- the preferred alternative
5 would go that direction.

6
7 Okay. Another issue that came up is
8 Slana disposal. There's a lot of background here, I'm
9 not going to get into detail, as part of our preferred
10 alternative that was analyzed, we considered one facet of
11 that was at some point to make all the remaining BLM land
12 up there available for disposal. And that one part of
13 that was to make it available for disposal to the general
14 public on a competitive on a competitive bid system. We
15 got very strong comment on that, and all comments were
16 opposed to doing that for the following reasons.

17
18 People felt that BLM needed to focus its
19 management on cleaning up some of the unauthorized use
20 and associated resource impacts from the 1980 settlement
21 that occurred in that area.

22
23 And then number 2, there's a lack of
24 infrastructure and resources in the area to support more
25 of an influx of folks into the area.

26
27 That's the comment that we received, and
28 again as stated there, it was pretty overwhelming. So as
29 a consequence, as a suggested change there, we're going
30 to alter our preferred alternative and kind of back off
31 that third priority, and just use disposal selectively to
32 focus on cleaning up unauthorized use, in the Slana area.
33 And then also to work closely with the community and with
34 AHTNA in any disposals that we carry out up there.

35
36 Okay. 17(b) easements. If you guys
37 recall, there was a lot of testimony on 17(b) easements,
38 and those comments encourage BLM to take a more active
39 role in management of 17(b) easement. And that was based
40 on trespass that right now occurs onto private, mostly
41 native land, and to resource impacts associated with the
42 easement use. And some comments encouraged development
43 of cooperative agreements to help in addressing that
44 issue. And then, of course, we had some comments that
45 favored, you know, keeping all those easements open for
46 what they're intended to do, which is provide continued
47 access to public lands.

48
49 As far as change there, what we are going
50 to do is to clarify what we've currently got in the

1 draft, to make it very clear what BLM's legal
2 requirements are for 17(b) easement management,
3 particularly related to enforcement. Right now what
4 we've got in there does allow discretion for us to
5 cooperate in education and interpretation, some
6 cooperative maintenance on trails. We've got a priority
7 system set up for that. And as far as cooperative
8 agreements -- as part of this planning process, we've
9 already begun -- we've already entered into several MOUs
10 and we intend to keep going with that. It's been
11 productive, and certainly on this issue it's going to be
12 really helpful to do that. And so our intent is to
13 continue down that path. So that won't change.
14

15 Okay. And then subsistence. Most
16 commenters felt that we left out some information on
17 subsistence, mostly to do with just background
18 information on what the resources and some of the use
19 patterns. And some -- a few commenters felt that the
20 .810 analysis was inadequate. As far as change there, we
21 do intend to go back in and beefed up our chapter 3,
22 which is the background information, and provide more
23 information on the subsistence resource and on user
24 patterns. So there is more work to be done there.
25

26 Okay. So that's a quick summary of
27 public comment and some of the changes that we're going
28 to make between the draft and the final.
29

30 So what happens now. We've responded to
31 all substantive comments as I stated. Folks will be able
32 to see those responses in the appendix, the final. And
33 then as we responded to those, we noted where changes
34 were needed. And basically the time line on this thing
35 is that right now our responses to the comments and our
36 suggested changes are being reviewed by the State office,
37 so this is still a process that's subject to some change.
38 But then we go on and incorporate these changes from
39 public comments in the final RMP, and that's scheduled to
40 be published in January of 2006. Then after that,
41 there's a 30-day protest, there's a 60-day Governor's
42 review, and then prepare a final Resource Management
43 Plan.
44

45 So that gives you an idea of how we
46 incorporate public comments into this thing and come out
47 on the other end with a changed document.
48

49 And frankly I've been impressed in this
50 planning process, the difference that's it made. It's

1 restored my faith in the public process.

2

3 With that, I would open it up for
4 questions.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug.

7

8 MR. BLOSSOM: Yeah, Mr. Chair. Did I
9 hear you say 4500 responses and 4100 came from the South
10 48?

11

12 MR. ROGERS: That's correct.

13

14 MR. BLOSSOM: So of the local responses,
15 were they in line with what the South 48 said, or were
16 they clear different?

17

18 MR. ROGERS: It varied, but I would say
19 -- see, the 41 that came from the Lower 48, every one of
20 them was generated through that email campaign, so what
21 it was was there was a wilderness -- I couldn't tell you
22 the exact web side, but it was a wilderness advocacy
23 group, and someone out surfing the web would stumble
24 across this web site, and there would be East Alaska RFP,
25 do you want to comment? Click on this thing. It's as
26 easy as that. And then we receive the form letter and we
27 have to respond to it.

28

29 But basically what the form letter said
30 was -- actually it opposed the revocation of 5150. It
31 also supported very strong protective measures for
32 resources. It supported very intensive OHV management,
33 and it pushed for more wilderness consideration. That
34 was kind of it in a nutshell.

35

36 So when we respond to that in the
37 appendix to this document, we just have to respond to
38 that letter once. The substantive points within that
39 letter we respond to once, so we don't have to do it 4100
40 times.

41

42 So this is not like a vote, so that's how
43 we handled that.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.

46

47 MS. STICKWAN: I was wondering who you
48 got the -- you said you entered into MOAs, Who were the
49 MOAs that you entered into?

50

1 MR. ROGERS: So far, Gloria, we've got
2 Tazlina Village, We've got Cheesna -- I'm probably going
3 to miss one or two. We're working on the one with Ahtna,
4 and I think there's one other. But anyway, that's --
5 we've got three or four.
6
7 MS. ROGERS: Isn't it Chickaloon?
8
9 MR. ROGERS: Yeah, we've got one with
10 Chickaloon. See, they're outside the area kind of, but
11 some of their culturally traditional areas are in the
12 area, so we've got one with them, too.
13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions.
15 Thank you. That was a very good presentation, and.....
16
17 MR. ROGERS: Gloria.
18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.
20
21 MS. STICKWAN: So you say you don't have
22 any idea what's going to happen with this, what the
23 director's going to say, or what she thinks? I mean, the
24 -- what do you call, the DOI -- Secretary of Interior?
25
26 MR. ROGERS: Yeah. No, I don't. Like I
27 say, our State director is very committed to maintaining
28 a manageable and accessible Federal subsistence unit, and
29 that's the recommendation that he's taken forward to the
30 Secretary. Beyond that, it's a crap shoot.
31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions?
33
34 MS. STICKWAN: Oh, yeah. When you said
35 intensive management, what do you mean by that for the
36 ORVs?
37
38 MR. ROGERS: Could you repeat, Gloria?
39
40 MS. STICKWAN: When you said intensive
41 management for ORVs, what did you mean by that?
42
43 MR. ROGERS: That's kind of a detailed
44 answer, but basically for lands that we retain long term,
45 we're really looking at designated trails. That's really
46 the -- to summar -- that's the best way to summarize.
47
48 MS. STICKWAN: Okay.
49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Greg.

1 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I've just got a
2 question. I'm interested if this was revoked, 5150,
3 would anyone other than the State be able to top file on
4 that?

5
6 MR. ROGERS: That's a great question, no,
7 not at this point, because that -- you know, ANILCA
8 allowed the State to top file. It did not allow the
9 native corporations or village corporations to do that.
10 Yeah.

11
12 MS. STICKWAN: You said this process is
13 still subject to change. I was wondering what you meant
14 by that.

15
16 MR. ROGERS: Basically what I summarized
17 today was field office review and recommendations. Some
18 of that we've already briefed the State Director on.
19 What I would anticipate during State Office review is
20 some minor adjustments in what I presented possibly, but
21 nothing major from what I've presented. So like his
22 commitment to -- the State Director's commitment to the
23 big ticket item there is not going to change based on
24 State Office review. I think we'll -- basically what I
25 presented I think is going to come out on the other end
26 of this review very similar.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think what you were
29 trying to get across though is that it's just a review
30 and it's just a recommendation. The final decision is
31 still made some place else, and that final decision could
32 go totally against the recommendation?

33
34 MR. ROGERS: That's correct. On the
35 revocation of 5150 in particular. These other issues are
36 more at a local scale, and so BLM will ask the State
37 Director, that's going to be kind of where the buck
38 stops. But the PLO 5150, that's more of a national
39 issue, and so I can't speculate.

40
41 MS. STICKWAN: I was just trying to -- I
42 was just interested in what you said in your report.
43 That's what I was talking about, whether that would
44 change or not.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Dean.

47
48 MR. WILSON: The final decision for this,
49 is that going to be made with the Secretary of Interior?
50 Or does it just go from there? She makes her final

1 recommendation, and then it could end up in court or do
2 you know?

3
4 MR. ROGERS: On that particular issue, I
5 believe it's the Secretary of Interior. Now, for this --
6 and they're closely intertwined, but the record of
7 decision for this resource management plan is signed by
8 the State Director. Obviously he's not going to sign
9 something that's completely counter to what the Secretary
10 of Interior wants. So his recommendation to her is going
11 to be to maintain the pipeline utility corridor. If he
12 gets told, no, we're not going to do that, we're going to
13 -- it's going to go to the State, then it's not going to
14 sign a record of decision that says we're going to
15 maintain it. I don't know if that answers your question,
16 but.....

17
18 MR. WILSON: Yes, it does.

19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions.

21
22 (No comments)

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Basically
25 what you're saying is we're dealing with political
26 realities, and it can be a political decision between the
27 State Government and the Federal Government.

28
29 MR. ROGERS: Yeah, correct.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria, one more?

32
33 MS. STICKWAN: Could I get a copy of your
34 -- what.....

35
36 MR. ROGERS: You bet. Yeah.

37
38 MS. STICKWAN: Okay.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Taylor.

41
42 MR. BRELSFORD: Thank you very much, Mr.
43 Chairman. Taylor Brelsford from the State Office of the
44 BLM.

45
46 We've got two other land use plans that I
47 want to just draw to your attention very briefly, and
48 without a lengthy -- without a PowerPoint presentation.

49
50 We've been dealing with a land use plan

1 in the East Alaska area that is an enormous priority in
2 terms of potential impacts to subsistence. And I want to
3 underscore one comment that Bruce made about watching the
4 public process have an influence. I want to say that the
5 level of organized participation in the Section .810
6 hearings in the communities was obviously high and
7 heartfelt. And the testimony that you heard at the
8 special meeting of the Southcentral Regional Council,
9 that's the first time that a Federal Subsistence Regional
10 Council has met on a land use plan in the Department of
11 Interior. This is sort of breaking new ground in terms
12 of a council like you all taking a direct, active role in
13 an area where a significant subsistence opportunity is at
14 risk. All of that is making a very big impact.

15
16 I think our Director's public comments
17 committing the BLM Alaska to maintaining a land base for
18 Federal subsistence priority in Southcentral Alaska is in
19 part a result of the organized and very strong effort by
20 the local communities.

21
22 So I don't want anybody to lose faith in
23 this for a minute. There's still a couple of innings
24 left in this baseball game. I hope we don't go 14.

25
26 (Laughter)

27
28 MR. BRELSFORD: But, Dean, I think your
29 point that this could be decided technically in Alaska,
30 it's a signature in Alaska, but it is a national level
31 issue. The Governor is able to talk to people at the
32 national level about the pipeline corridor. There is
33 some of that that we don't have control over, but I
34 really want to underscore the continuing importance of
35 the local communities raising your point of view, raising
36 the kinds of concerns, monitoring these last couple of
37 steps in finalizing the East Alaska Resource Management
38 Plan.

39
40 Now, turning to another one, the Ring of
41 -- what the BLM is referring to as the Ring of Fire
42 Resource Management Plan, you've got a very brief flyer
43 in front of you. And the first thing I want to emphasize
44 to you is that there are no significant resource --
45 subsistence use areas in Southcentral Alaska affected by
46 this land use plan. Broadly speaking the Ring of Fire
47 Land Use Plan covers a vast part of -- portion of Alaska
48 from Southeast to Southcentral to Kodiak to the Alaska
49 Peninsula and the Aleutian Islands, but it's a very, very
50 small amount of land across that landscape.

1 As it happens, State selections and
2 native selections in this kind of North Pacific Rim have
3 taken up most of the land, actually the forests and so
4 on, but there's relatively little BLM Alaska-managed land
5 in the Ring of Fire area.

6
7 And more specifically in the Southcentral
8 area, there are two major blocks of BLM land. One of
9 these is in the Neacola Mountains along the boundary with
10 the Lake Clark National Preserve west of Tyonek. There's
11 about 450,000 acres of land managed by the BLM in
12 Southcentral Alaska. Almost 400,000 of that is in this
13 high mountain area west of Tyonek. It's actually beyond
14 the mapped traditional use areas of the village of
15 Tyonek.

16
17 So the reason you haven't heard the same
18 kind of outpouring, the same kind of alarm bells about
19 potential impacts to subsistence is because it's a fairly
20 small amount of land and in Southcentral, it is very
21 remote to current subsistence use areas.

22
23 So you'll read in the flyer that there's
24 a proposal for a conservation status for the Neacola
25 Mountains in Western Cook Inlet. The ACEC refers to an
26 area of.....

27
28 MR. ROGERS: Critical environmental
29 concern.

30
31 MR. BRELSFORD:critical
32 environmental Concern. So there's come effort to sort of
33 avoid resource impacts through development or other
34 activities, but generally that's the only activity -- the
35 only action in Southcentral Alaska that is noteworthy at
36 a real summary level.

37
38 The plan itself was released in June, and
39 the public comment period extends through the end of this
40 calendar year, through December 29th of 2005. So I'm
41 sort of suggesting to you that when the subsistence alarm
42 is up and running, we're going to bring it up to you and
43 take it into very close detail with you as a Council. In
44 this case, I don't think it meets that same priority, so
45 this is just a summary overview. If there are any
46 members on the Council who have an interest in a closer
47 look at this, let me invite you to either let me know,
48 and I'll make sure that you get a copy of the plan, or to
49 contact Bob Lloyd at the to of the flyer.

50

1 So let me stop and see if that's
2 sufficient for your level of interest at this stage.

3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anybody have any more
5 that they'd like to say on this, or is that sufficient
6 for right now.

7
8 (No comments)

9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It must be. I don't
11 hear anybody yelling.

12
13 MR. BRELSFORD: Okay. Great. A little
14 bit further afield to the west, some of you have perhaps
15 read about another BLM land use planning exercise in the
16 Bristol Bay region, and that is not within the purview of
17 the Southcentral Council, but some villages in
18 Southcentral, in Cook Inlet do have some use patterns
19 extending into or neighboring the Bristol Bay area. Some
20 of the resource issues in the Bristol Bay and the plan,
21 notably the Pebble copper prospect, are not on BLM land,
22 but some of the transportation corridors would come into
23 Cook Inlet.

24
25 So there's a distant and remote
26 possibility that this might have some effects in Cook
27 Inlet, and Pat McClenahan, who some of you will recall as
28 a former staffer and colleague for us in the Office of
29 Subsistence Management, she's now the team lead for the
30 BLM's plan in Bristol Bay. She's got a flyer here with a
31 map inside, and some follow-up information if anybody
32 wants to look a little bit further into it.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that's the flyer
35 right there?

36
37 MR. BRELSFORD: The flyer looks like
38 this, and it's found on the table here.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

41
42 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, I, for one, would
43 really like to be kept informed. I was talking to Tryfon
44 Ingason about this same issue, and although it's not
45 directly in our area, if this goes awry, it would
46 certainly -- it has a high potential for having a
47 dramatic impact on our area by users having to find other
48 areas. I mean, you know find people migrating into an
49 area we have. I mean, it's just huge in its potential,
50 and I know the communities out there, the subsistence

1 communities are very, very concerned about its impact,
2 Pebble Mines in particular. So I for one would really
3 like to be kept informed. And it may be something that
4 our RAC could work with the other RACs on in support,
5 because there's a very high interest in it, and a very
6 high level of concern in its potential damage to the
7 fisheries and wildlife resources.

8
9 MR. BRELSFORD: Let me take a note and
10 contact Pat and ask her to provide you on-going
11 information in the form of newsletters and documents when
12 they're ready.

13
14 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you very much.

15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob, would you be
17 willing to take it on as the member of the Council to
18 keep up on, to inform us if you see things that we should
19 be -- you know, you seem to have -- you seem to have.....

20
21 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:more knowledge of
24 it at this point than anybody else on the Council,
25 and.....

26
27 MR. CHURCHILL: I would.....

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:just keep us up to
30 date, and if you see anything that you think we need to
31 do something on, let us know.

32
33 MR. CHURCHILL: I would be happy to.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

36
37 MR. BRELSFORD: Well, thank you, Mr.
38 Chairman. That concludes the items from the BLM.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Any questions for
41 Taylor.

42
43 (No comments)

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Taylor.

46
47 Okay. We are now going on to the Office
48 of Subsistence Management, and we have the review of the
49 rural determination. And, Larry, will you kind of direct
50 us in what is expected of us at this point in time to us

1 as we go through it.

2

3 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman. My name is
4 Larry Buklis. I'm with the Office of Subsistence
5 Management.

6

7 And this is a briefing on the rural
8 review process. The briefing can be found on Page 224 of
9 your Council books. And I believe separately your
10 coordinator, Donald Mike, mailed you copies of this
11 report that I'm holding up. It was prepared in July of
12 2005. Mr. Chairman.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes.

15

16 MR. BUKLIS: I believe Donald Mike, your
17 coordinator, sent you copies of this report that I'm
18 holding up. And if you don't have your copy, he may have
19 a few spare copies remaining. And when the meeting
20 opened two days ago in the other site, we had a few
21 copies on the back table for the public. I think they're
22 gone now.

23

24 But that report that I help up, the title
25 of it is Decennial Review of Rural Determinations: A
26 Report to the Federal Subsistence Board on Initial
27 Comments Received and Considerations for Further
28 Analysis, July 15th, 2005, by the Office of Subsistence
29 Management. That's also available on our web site.

30

31 Secondly, you may have received from
32 Donald, but there are many copies on the back table of a
33 two-sided, one piece of paper summary of the rural review
34 process to date, and this current call for comments.

35

36 So those are resources for you, as well
37 as the briefing in your book.

38

39 Mr. Chairman, this is an action item for
40 the Council. The Federal Subsistence Board is seeking
41 comments through October 28th, 2005, that's tomorrow of
42 this week, from Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory
43 Councils and the public on communities and areas proposed
44 for further analysis in the 10-year review of rural
45 determinations. The Board is seeking comments on whether
46 communities or areas should be added to, or removed from
47 the Board's proposed list, and on the rural or nonrural
48 status and characteristics of these communities.

49

50 Just to remind you, the regulations do

1 require such a review of rural determinations on a 10-
2 year cycle. So this is the first such review in this
3 program.

4
5 The council may choose to make a formal
6 recommendation to the Board, or simply have comments on
7 the record.

8
9 Under Federal subsistence regulations, a
10 community with a population below 2,500 is considered
11 rural, unless it possesses significant characteristics of
12 a nonrural nature, or is considered to be part of a
13 nonrural area, which gets into the issue of grouping of
14 communities. Secondly, a community with a population of
15 more than 7,000 is considered nonrural unless it
16 possesses significant characteristics of a rural nature.
17 Thirdly, a community with a population between those
18 levels, between 2,500 and 7,000, is evaluated to
19 determine its rural or nonrural status.

20
21 The characteristics considered in such an
22 evaluation may include, but are not limited to, the
23 diversity and development of the local economy, the use
24 of fish and wildlife, community infrastructure,
25 transportation and educational institutions.

26
27 Communities that are economically,
28 socially or communally integrated are to be grouped
29 evaluation for purposes.

30
31 Earlier this year, an initial review of
32 the rural/nonrural status of all Alaska communities was
33 conducted by the Federal Subsistence Management Program,
34 with an emphasis on what has changed since 1990,
35 realizing that we do have current rural determinations
36 that were made when the program began. And this is the
37 required review.

38
39 This review found that the status of most
40 Alaska communities should remain unchanged. However, the
41 following are proposed by the Board for further analysis.
42 And I'll highlight the 10 communities or areas that the
43 Board has found warrant further analysis. It's a
44 proposed list, and what we are about here now is taking
45 comment on Council and public views on that list, and
46 additional information that might have a bearing on the
47 Board finalizing the list.

48
49 This list is not communities or areas
50 that will necessarily change in status. It's simply a

1 list of sort of a scope of work for further analysis, and
2 that outcome of that analysis would contribute to further
3 decision making.

4
5 Okay. The list is first Kodiak,
6 currently considered rural, Kodiak is proposed for
7 further analysis because its population increased further
8 above 7,000 between 1990 and 2000. And for all these
9 points, we're using the U.S. census data.

10
11 Secondly, Sitka. Currently considered
12 rural, Sitka is proposed for further analysis, because
13 its population increased further above 7,000 between 1990
14 and 2000.

15
16 Adak. currently considered nonrural,
17 Adak is proposed for further analysis, because it's
18 population decreased, and is now below the 2,500
19 threshold. In fact, it's only a few hundred people.

20
21 For the three nonrural groupings further
22 analysis is proposed as to exclude places, and examine
23 the rural/nonrural status of those places independently.
24 I'm emphasizing that point, because the proposal on these
25 communities is not to revisit the grouping's status,
26 simply looking at whether some place should in fact be
27 excluded from the central grouping. Those three places
28 are:

29
30 The Fairbanks North Star Borough, whether
31 to continue using the entire Borough as the nonrural area
32 or separate some outlying areas.

33
34 The Kenai area, evaluate whether to
35 exclude Clam Gulch.

36
37 The Seward area, evaluate whether to
38 exclude Moose Pass.

39
40 Now, for the next three nonrural
41 groupings, further analysis is proposed as to whether to
42 include additional places into the grouping, in which
43 case those places would lose their rural status. They
44 would become a part of the larger nonrural area. Those
45 three type -- situations are:

46
47 The Wasilla area. Evaluate whether to
48 now include Willow and Point McKenzie into the Wasilla
49 area.

50

1 Homer area. Evaluate whether to now
2 include Fox River and Happy Valley.

3
4 And, finally, the Ketchikan area.
5 Evaluate whether to now include Saxman and areas of
6 further growth and development outside of the current
7 nonrural boundary of the Ketchikan area.

8
9 Finally, in this setting -- this group of
10 10, this list of 10 one potential new grouping is
11 proposed for further analysis. And that to look at the
12 Delta Junction vicinity, specifically Delta Junction, Big
13 Delta, Deltana and Fort Greely, and to evaluate whether
14 some or all of these places, currently considered rural
15 and not grouped should instead be grouped and their
16 rural/nonrural evaluated collectively.

17
18 Now a little background. The criteria
19 that will now be used to address the grouping issue are
20 three-fold. First, do 30 percent or more of the working
21 people commute from one place to another. Secondly, do
22 they share a common high school attendance area. And,
23 third, are the places in proximity and road accessible to
24 one another. Those are the criteria that we intend to
25 use to evaluate the questions about grouping.

26
27 During the initial review that led up to
28 that proposed list of 10 places I went over with you, the
29 commuting data needed for this approach was not yet
30 available. As a result if questions could not be
31 resolved on whether to include or exclude places from a
32 grouping, the grouping was proposed for further analysis.
33 We intend to fully apply the new criteria in the next
34 step of the review process for those groupings approved
35 by the Board on the final list of work.

36
37 In addition to the grouping questions,
38 other changes were reviewed. And those centered on
39 population changes. For a community considered, or
40 grouping considered rural, the initial review I described
41 examined whether the population increased above or
42 further above 7,000. For a community or grouping
43 considered nonrural, the review examined whether the
44 population of that place dropped below 2500.

45
46 And for communities or groupings with
47 populations between those levels, between 2500 and 7,000,
48 the initial review considered whether changes in
49 community characteristics were known that may warrant a
50 change in status.

1 This is a two-step process being used for
2 this review. This call for comment, and your current
3 meeting on this issue is part of the first step. This
4 step concludes in December when the Federal Subsistence
5 Board will approve a final list of communities for
6 further analysis at a public meeting in Anchorage.
7 Council Chairs are invited to attend that Board meeting,
8 and that is scheduled for December 6th and 7th.

9
10 During the second step of the process in
11 2006, detailed analyses will be on the Board-approved
12 communities, and there will be additional opportunities
13 for Council and public comment. The Board is expected to
14 decide on any changes to the rural or nonrural status of
15 communities in December 2006 a little over a year from
16 now.

17
18 I've already highlighted where you may
19 find more information. The more lengthy staff report
20 available on the web, and this little brochure that I
21 pointed out.

22
23 Once again, Mr. Chairman, this is an
24 action item for the Council to comment or make a
25 recommendation, and you as Chair, or your designee is
26 invited to the Board meeting in Anchorage on December 6th
27 and 7th.

28
29 Mr. Chairman, that concludes my prepared
30 comments.

31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Comments.
33 Discussion. Or action that the rest of the Council would
34 like to take on this.

35
36 If I understand correct, what we -- one
37 the things -- one of the actions we can do is we could
38 decide that these are valid communities for further
39 study, right?

40
41 MR. BUKLIS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Your
42 comment or recommendation could be an endorsement of the
43 proposed list for further analysis.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And we don't at this
46 time need to make any evaluation as to whether any of
47 these places should or should not be excluded or
48 included, just that they should be studied?

49
50 MR. BUKLIS: That's correct, Mr.

1 Chairman. If you want to also express a view on the
2 status of those communities and how they're grouped,
3 that's also an option for you, but we are simply at a
4 stage of trying to define the scope of work.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

7
8 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, it -- that's -- if
9 I'm clear, too, a valid decision from us or direction for
10 us is in fact they just need further study. And I
11 understanding that?

12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That these are valid
14 communities for study.

15
16 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah. The other question
17 I had is like, using Kodiak as an example, on the map,
18 just so I understand what's being asked, it has Ouzinkie
19 and Port Lions and Chiniak, and the question appears to
20 me that's being asked here, does Kodiak proper, which
21 would be Kodiak and like the population out at the Coast
22 Guard, do we consider that now urban, because of the
23 tremendous population growth. If we made that decision,
24 let's say just hypothetically we make that
25 recommendation, that would still leave Port Lions and
26 Ouzinkie and Chiniak as rural, would it not, or --
27 because those are such dramatically different
28 communities. I've been to all of them.

29
30 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman.
31 The -- it would be premature for me to speculate on how
32 the census designated places would be grouped in an
33 analysis of Kodiak area. Currently that area is rural,
34 and so there aren't boundaries defining what we mean by
35 Kodiak, because it's part of the rural part of Alaska.
36 So Aleneva, Port Lions, Ouzinkie, Kodiak City, Kodiak
37 Station, Womens Bay, Chiniak and the area that don't have
38 census designated units by the Census Bureau, that whole
39 region is rural.

40
41 If Kodiak advances for further analysis
42 and the Board charges us to look at that area, part of
43 the analysis would be to look at the commuting patterns,
44 the road connectedness, the shared high school.

45
46 MR. CHURCHILL: No, I mean, I understand,
47 but I'm trying to be real direct about my question. Is
48 -- we could conceivably then make a decision to say
49 Kodiak, including the Coast Guard Station we consider now
50 nonrural, and an area unto itself, and leave the outlying

1 communities as rural. That would be within the scope of
2 option we have available to us.

3

4 MR. BUKLIS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. This
5 Council could express its views on how Kodiak should be
6 addressed.

7

8 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you so much.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other comments,
11 discussion, anybody want to make a motion. Bob.

12

13 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, I'd like to move
14 that the Council endorse or support that these
15 communities are worthy of further study and that we take
16 an active role in that, and attend the meeting, either
17 the Chair or the Chair's designee. I've travelled to
18 nearly all of these areas, and I think they could really
19 help us do some defining on this sort of thing.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second.

22

23 MR. BLOSSOM: I'll second.

24

25 MS. STICKWAN: Did you say these places
26 are rural that are in Kodiak area?

27

28 MR. BUKLIS: Mr. Chairman. Yes,
29 currently the Kodiak area is considered rural, but it's
30 proposed for further analysis as to its rural/nonrural
31 status.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We have a second
34 on our motion to endorse further study of these 10
35 places, that we think that it's valid, and also that
36 either the Chair or his designee will attend the meeting.
37 You said December 6th?

38

39 MR. BUKLIS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We've
40 reserved two days for the meeting in case it's needed.
41 It would begin on the 6th and continue on the 7th of
42 December if needed. And it's being held at the downtown
43 Marriott Hotel in Anchorage.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have any
46 discussion on this.

47

48 (No comments)

49

50 MR. CHURCHILL: Call the question.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question's been
2 called. All in favor signify by saying aye.
3
4 IN UNISON: Aye.
5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Opposed signify by
7 saying nay.
8
9 (No opposing votes)
10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. Okay.
12 So either I will be there, and if I can't be there, I
13 will find somebody that can.
14
15 MR. BUKLIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And we don't have a lot
18 of time to decide that. Is anybody on this -- when it
19 comes time for me to look for somebody if I can't make
20 it.....
21
22 MR. CHURCHILL: I can.
23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob. Anybody else
25 interested in attending this. Don't everybody yell at
26 once.
27
28 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Possibly.
29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Possibly, Greg?
31
32 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah.
33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So we should be
35 able to find somebody that can do it then. Okay.
36
37 Is that all, Larry?
38
39 MR. BUKLIS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. That
40 concludes that agenda item.
41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you muchly.
43
44 MR. CHURCHILL: Larry, thanks a million.
45
46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Marine jurisdiction, a
48 written briefing. You'll find it on Page 235. Basically
49 if you take a look on Page 235 real quick, and the next
50 one's of interest to all of us, we aren't going to read

1 it into the minutes, unless somebody wishes us to, but
2 it's talking about marine jurisdiction on the Alaska
3 Peninsula, Izembek National Wildlife Refuge, Yukon Delta
4 National Wildlife Refuge, and Togiak National Wildlife
5 Refuge. And it says it must it's that the Federal
6 Subsistence Program must be crafted to reach waters in
7 which the United States has an interest by virtue of the
8 Reserve Water Right Doctrine. And so this is to clarify
9 and revise jurisdiction in coastal water.

10

11 I'd advise each of you to read it. It's
12 worth reading. It doesn't really have -- it has effect
13 on something like what we just did with Toczin -- anyhow,
14 that bay over there. In this case, it doesn't right
15 here, but it's the same kind of an issue that we're
16 dealing with when we deal with those kind of places.

17

18 The next one, on Page 236, failure to
19 return State hunt report carries penalties. In 40-some
20 of the Federal subsistence hunts, including some in our
21 area, but I don't think our caribou hunt is that way, we
22 use State hunting permits to do it instead of Federal
23 hunting permits. And in that case, if you don't --
24 especially like a tier II permit, if you don't return
25 them in time, you could lose your eligibility for next
26 year, and some of them carry the ability to have a fine
27 connected with them also. I think you have a two-week
28 grace period, and you have 180 days to plead your case.
29 And that's a rough -- but I'd advise anybody that deals
30 with those kind of permits to read that.

31

32 The next letter as long as we've got
33 letters sitting right here, we've got one from the
34 National Park -- oops, National Park Service is coming
35 up. They'll explain their letter to us. So I won't say
36 anything on that.

37

38 U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest
39 Service report. Chugach National Forest.

40

41 If anybody has to take a break at this
42 point in time, just take a break one at a time.

43

44 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How about two at a
45 time.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Or two.

48

49 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No more than five.

50

1 (Laughter)

2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No more than five at one
4 time.

5
6 MR. ZEMKE: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair and
7 Council.

8
9 It's actually only 2:30 so we actually
10 have 20 minutes to talk now.

11
12 We'll be giving a -- I'll be giving a
13 short brief on Chugach activities primarily related to
14 the kind of land management activities. It's called --
15 normally I pass out our schedule of proposed actions, and
16 I have passed out a copy to each one of the Council
17 members, and you should also have a copy. I put some
18 extra copies out on the table in case anybody needs to
19 look and see what it is. It's about a 13-page document,
20 double-sided, and it basically describes current and
21 upcoming foreseeable actions on the Chugach National
22 Forest. And a lot of those actions probably don't have
23 direct impact on subsistence activities on the forest,
24 but some may.

25
26 And if you look in kind of brevity, this
27 summary of those activities kind of fall into four major
28 groups, at least the way I see them.

29
30 One is kind of recreation developments,
31 and that could be trail developments, campground
32 infrastructure developments. There's an example of one
33 where there's construction and deconstruction of
34 campground that's.....

35
36 There's also one thing that's called hut
37 to hut. It's a proposal to be able to bring people into
38 a backcountry situation that maybe not be capable of
39 carrying full supported activities, such as large
40 backpack to cover large scale backcountry experiences, so
41 potentially there would be -- it's more maybe something
42 like an alpine -- a Swiss alpine experience where there's
43 huts located at basically a day's hike so that you could
44 hike from one hut to another without having to carry a
45 tent and cooking infrastructure and that kind of thing.

46
47 Another example is what's called the
48 whistle stop campground, which would be the railroad
49 going from -- up the Placer drainage in the eastern Kenai
50 Peninsula up through around the Spencer Glacier area, and

1 there would be potentially a Forest Service campground
2 constructed there to provide for people to get off the
3 railroad to be able to camp. There's also in conjunction
4 with that kind of a potential for a lodge development on
5 State lands further down.

6
7 But again, those are just in the planning
8 stages, and so there's nothing predecisional about those
9 yet.

10
11 Okay. The other, one other major
12 category is what I call outfitter and guide application
13 processes, and there's about six of those. And the ones
14 that are listed are primarily done, but there is somewhat
15 a temporary moratorium on outfitter/guide application
16 kind of increases in Prince William Sound to take a look
17 at overall use capacity. And Tom Carpenter on this
18 Council has been somewhat involved with that. And we're
19 probably looking at kind of a spin-off activity which
20 I'll discuss a little bit after the end of this
21 discussion on the schedule of proposed action.

22
23 Kind of going back, I think there was
24 actually about 15 different type of recreational
25 developments on that list.

26
27 And the next category are special uses,
28 and that would be things like power corridors, maybe a
29 road development to mines. And there's about eight of
30 those listed.

31
32 And then finally there's probably, maybe
33 of more interest to subsistence users, is the kind of
34 habitat improvement activities, and it's kind of divided
35 into two categories. One is probably providing better
36 access for anadromous fish on kind of transportation
37 infrastructure maybe where there's old culverts and
38 bridges that need to be reconstructed to provide or
39 ensure better access upstream of those areas for
40 anadromous fish.

41
42 And then the other one is prescribed burn
43 or habitat manipulations, primarily on the Kenai
44 Peninsula, generally looking at the spruce bark beetle
45 impact at areas generally around community infrastructure
46 or there are some more remote sites specifically designed
47 more for wildlife habitat improvement. We've started a
48 little bit on that. There's been some machine,
49 mechanical treatment piles burned in the -- around the
50 Hope area, but the larger scale prescribed fires, you

1 know, 300, 500 or plus acres, that we're probably looking
2 at 2006 and beyond to be able to get into those. It
3 takes quite a bit more infrastructure to be able to plan
4 and then implement prescribed fire. So we're probably
5 looking at more of a large scale program in 2006 and
6 beyond.

7
8 And so that's kind of the schedule of
9 proposed action items. Again, those are normally smaller
10 scale projects.

11
12 In addition to that, kind of the
13 outfitter/guide capacity analysis in Prince William Sound
14 has been a big concern. I know Tom Carpenter on this
15 Council has expressed considerable concern about that.
16 And one of the things the Forest is looking at is trying
17 to do what we call maybe a needs assessment where we're
18 going to take a look at the social, cultural, economic
19 and then kind of recreational potential of the area, kind
20 of what needs there are, and then what information is
21 available for all those to be able to take a look at
22 maybe allocating the outfitter/guide use pattern, and
23 other use patterns in a more equitable manner. One of
24 the things that we're looking at is being able to maybe
25 do a wisdom keeper workshop, in potentially it would be
26 Newcheck (ph) Island in probably April or early May to be
27 able to get elders from the various tribes in the area,
28 maybe Elders from Cordova and then resource managers and
29 scientists together to be able to learn from one another
30 about what the important call either biological or social
31 hot spots are out in Prince William Sound, so that when
32 future actions do come up, such as the schedule of
33 proposed actions, we have a better idea about what
34 potential impacts could be out there, how we could
35 mitigate them or maybe how we can improve the situation.
36 And so that we're looking at as probably a two-year
37 process. Whether it actually formally comes out with a
38 record of decision and environmental impact statement or
39 an environmental assessment, we're not positive at this
40 time. We're still more in the formative stage of that.

41
42 And so, you know, I guess that's about,
43 for brevity, probably I'll discuss on that right now
44 unless -- are there any questions on either the schedule
45 of proposed action or that needs assessment for Prince
46 William Sound. I'd be glad to answer a question.

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I've just got one
49 question, and it probably doesn't apply to subsistence,
50 so I don't know if I should even ask it here, but this

1 Granite Mine adit closures. And I notice this has been
2 done by the Park Service up in our area, and it's being
3 done by the Forest Service I see out on Prince William
4 Sound. And most of these kind of places are very, very
5 inaccessible, so the only people that get there are
6 people who put in a lot of effort to get there. And
7 these are kind of historical sites. I mean, these are
8 things that our young people would never get to see unless
9 they do the work to go see them. And I just happen to
10 know a bunch of young people that have been to a lot of
11 these mine adits, and very interested in what they see
12 there, and have learned a lot from what they see there.
13

14 And I just think it's a real shame that
15 we take these historical sites and close them down so
16 that future generations don't have a chance to see what
17 kind of work that past generation did that we can't even
18 figure out how did they even get the stuff up there, let
19 alone do the work. And we can't figure out how we would
20 ever do it today. And unless there's a large liability
21 with it or -- I mean, there must be something behind it
22 other than the fact that somebody wants to go up and
23 close a mine entrance.
24

25 But I've seen that loss in the Wrangell-
26 St. Elias, and I really hate to see that loss on the
27 Sound. Most of the ones in the Sound aren't that, most
28 of the ones in the Sound aren't that big, but they have
29 some very interesting mineralogy and stuff that the kids
30 can learn from. And it's going to take very young people
31 with a lot of energy to get up to them and look at them.
32 I mean, it's not your -- your common ordinary tourist is
33 not going to stumble into them, that's for sure.
34

35 And I'll specifically speak to the
36 Granite Bay one, because I got to see some very nice
37 photographs of that this summer, and I know a whole bunch
38 of kids that came back very excited from what they saw.
39 And they got back with only one sprained ankle.
40

41 MR. ZEMKE: So is there a specific
42 question or.....
43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, the question is
45 why is it necessary to close this?
46

47 MR. ZEMKE: Okay. Looking at that,
48 actually what they're looking at is doing an
49 environmental assessment, and maybe one of the options
50 would be to keep it open. You know, it's not

1 predecisioned to actually.....

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, it's not a
4 predecision for an adit closure?

5

6 MR. ZEMKE: Yeah. That's probably -- the
7 idea about what to do with it, probably right now the
8 option is to either keep it open or keep it closed, you
9 know, but there may be through public comment other
10 options that do come available. The Granite Mine,
11 there's also kind of a tailings pile that has hazardous
12 materials potential, and there's some other health and
13 safety factors, but at the same time, there may be some
14 actions that could happen and through public comment, an
15 example, is, you know, I could say the BLM in a larger
16 scale proposal, you know, there certainly is time to be
17 able to do something in that, you know. And this one's
18 in progress, and so the expected implementation's 8/2006,
19 and it has a contact person that if you're specifically
20 interested in it, that you probably need to get ahold of
21 that contact person relatively soon to be able to tell us
22 -- see what the pro -- or, you know, the actual status us
23 of the project, and what the alternatives that they have
24 looked at are.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, I can see taking
27 care of the environmental problems, but most of them have
28 been to close the adit. It doesn't normally take care of
29 any environmental problems. All it does is closes access
30 to the mine tunnels themselves. It doesn't address the
31 tailing pile. And these are things -- I mean, when I
32 read this, it says in progress, it's a -- they're not
33 asking to take care of the environmental problems,
34 they're not asking to take care of tailing piles.
35 They're talking about the granite mine adit closure, you
36 know. And I was just -- and like I said, I've been it in
37 Wrangell-St. Elias, and we've lost a lot of very
38 interesting places for the next generation to go look at
39 already. And it's just interesting to me to see that the
40 Forest Service is doing that in Prince William Sound
41 also.

42

43 MR. ZEMKE: Again, primarily I think it's
44 primarily to deal with the health and safety issue. And
45 again I think it's a national program to take a look at
46 those sites. And so in the -- so I guess if you're
47 interested, I'll make sure that Betty gets ahold of you
48 and tells you -- and can kind of inform you what the
49 progress is that -- and where they're at at this point.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Okay.
2
3 MR. ZEMKE: I guess one of the other
4 things I guess, we hadn't -- the other agencies kind of
5 reported on where their wildlife permits are. We do have
6 one out in Cordova, and the cow hunt and bull hunt
7 permits, and I was trying to get ahold of Milo to find
8 out what the actual numbers are. But normally there's
9 six to seven hunter applications for the two hunts, one's
10 the cow permit hunt for five animals, and then there's a
11 35 permit hunt which 26 of those, or 75 percent, are
12 Forest Service, and both of those hunts, the cow permit
13 hunt I think was through this month, through the 31st,
14 and the bull goes through the first of the year. We
15 don't have those numbers tabulated yet, though Tim did
16 inform me that there is actually kind of a first where
17 somebody did not fulfill -- or did not fill out their
18 permit on a bull, and, you know, I guess Milo called to
19 say, well, you forgot to fill out, you know, the
20 biological information on the bull that you shot, and
21 they said, no, they didn't get one, and actually they're
22 turning it in early. So it's kind of a first where they
23 -- normally there's 100 percent success on those hunts.
24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, they turned in their
26 permit without taking.....
27
28 MR. ZEMKE: Yeah.
29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:taking a moose?
31
32 MR. ZEMKE: That's correct.
33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Impossible. Okay.
35
36 MR. ZEMKE: And that would be all I have,
37 and Tim's going to come and describe -- primarily his
38 discussion would be on the Cordova fishing permits and
39 what the status of those are. Thank you.
40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And you say that is a
42 first for Cordova?
43
44 MR. ZEMKE: At least within the current
45 past, yes.
46
47 MR. JOYCE: Mr. Chairman and members of
48 the Council. Tim Joyce with the Forest Service.
49
50 I'm going to give you a little brief

1 PowerPoint on our permits. We talked to you a little bit
2 about these last year, about what the new issues that
3 were coming up in Cordova, and as a result of that was
4 the subsistence fishery that was starting to find some
5 interest in, Federal subsistence fishery. And so we
6 ended up with a permit.

7
8 In 1999 obviously the Federal Subsistence
9 Fisheries Program was established, and in the Chugach
10 National Forest and the waters of the Copper River below
11 Haley Creek fell under general provision rules as no
12 other regulations had been established. There were
13 regulations for the waters of the Copper River above
14 Haley Creek. Those were adopted pretty much straight
15 across from the State regulations, and then later
16 modified by the Council and the Board. But for the lower
17 river there weren't really any regulations, and as a
18 result of that, they fell under general provisions which
19 were quite broad in nature and didn't provide much
20 guidance.

21
22 So in 2004 there was an interest that was
23 expressed by some users for fishing, subsistence fishing
24 in Cordova, and we also found what part of that impetus
25 was. There was an administrative error that had
26 occurred, what we later found was an administrative error
27 in the regulations that were adopted the previous year,
28 that basically opened up the lower Copper River to
29 subsistence fishing. Prior to that time it had always
30 been closed, even shortly after statehood it had been
31 closed. It had not historically been open since
32 statehood. And so that was another area of concern that
33 we had to address.

34
35 So we had a public meeting in December of
36 last year. We had members of different agencies there.
37 We had members of the public, two members of the Regional
38 Advisory Council, Ms. Stickwan and Mr. Carpenter were
39 there, and again Native Village of Eyak persons were
40 there, the regional -- or the fish and game advisory
41 council members. There were a variety of people who were
42 all there. We sat down and looked at some of the
43 provisions that were there and what would be acceptable
44 for people within Cordova and Prince William Sound for
45 harvesting fish.

46
47 And as a result of that, we came out with
48 somewhat of a consensus of how things should be operated
49 at least for this season that we just went through. And
50 I'm going to run through what we ended up with just

1 briefly so you'll have an idea of where we were, and also
2 that generated some of the proposals that as you saw here
3 this year.

4
5 First of all, on the permit itself, it
6 was only valid in the freshwaters of the Chugach National
7 Forest, in the Prince William Sound area. So it did not
8 include Cook Inlet area. There's part of the forest
9 that's on the Cook Inlet side, this did not include that.
10 It was just the Prince William Sound area.

11
12 And only Prince William Sound area
13 residents could get this permit. One of the reasons was
14 there was a C&T for Prince William Sound area residents
15 for salmon, and this permit was also for salmon. It was
16 also for freshwater. Residents outside the Prince
17 William Sound area, rural residents, could apply for the
18 freshwater portion, but they could not apply for the
19 salmon portion because of the C&T finding.

20
21 Part of the -- the permit must be in your
22 possession while fishing, and the harvest had to be
23 recorded on the permit before you left the fishing site.
24 That's similar to the regulations you have for the upper
25 Copper River, that you could not leave the site without
26 recording what your harvest was. Excuse me.

27
28 Only one permit was going to be issued
29 per household, and you could not harvest -- by
30 regulation, you could not harvest or add the harvest
31 limits of the State and Federal permits to increase your
32 harvest limit. So basically if you had a harvest limit
33 on this permit, you could not harvest this, go get a
34 State subsistence permit, and continue to harvest using
35 the State permit. These were not cumulative. You only
36 got what you were issued.

37
38 And on our permit, it had to be returned
39 by December 31st of this year. So they're still out. I
40 do have some of them that have been returned. Excuse me.
41 But most -- for the most part, most of them are still
42 out.

43
44 In addition to that, for freshwater fish,
45 we allow -- you could not retain a rainbow or steelhead
46 trout. If you did catch a rainbow or a steelhead trout,
47 you had to return it to the water alive, unless it was
48 taken incidentally in a net fishery. And I'll get into
49 the net fishery here in just a bit.

50

1 You could not harvest trout from April
2 15th to June 15th. That was their spawning period. And
3 it was -- they're quite vulnerable at that time in
4 shallow waters, and so we had a closure. The State had
5 that same closure to protect the spawning trout.

6
7 The annual harvest limit of trout was
8 five per person, with a household limit of 30 trout. So
9 in a year, an individual could go catch five trout. And
10 by trout, I'm talking about cutthroat trout and their
11 hybrids, because you cannot keep rainbow trout by
12 definition. So these would be mostly cutthroat trout.
13 And so a household would have a 30-fish limit. They
14 could go catch -- if there was a family of six, they
15 would be allowed to catch 30. If it was a family of
16 seven, they would still be allowed 30, but if they were a
17 family of three, it would only be 15, because individuals
18 could only keep five.

19
20 You could -- for trout or freshwater
21 fish, you could use rod and reel and spears to harvest
22 these fish. And you could use a gillnet from January 1
23 to March 31st. That's for under the ice fishing for
24 whitefish or anything like that. We did have, excuse me,
25 an incidental harvest limit of 10 trout while you were
26 fishing with a gillnet, because most places, if you're
27 under the ice, there's trout in those systems as well.
28 Thank you. And that would allow you to harvest
29 whitefish, for example, but still retain the ability to
30 retain some trout, or keep trout, because they're going
31 to be in a gillnet, they're probably going to be dead by
32 the time you pull them out. So we did have an incidental
33 harvest limit of 10 fish.

34
35 For salmon you were allowed rod and reel,
36 dip nets, spears and gaffs were the legal types. And no
37 harvest was allowed from Eyak Lake and its tributaries,
38 nor from the Copper River and its tributaries. And as I
39 said at the time we were putting this together, there was
40 a concern about the lower Copper River, and so on the
41 permit stipulation, we closed the lower Copper River, at
42 least that part within the Chugach Forest. It was later
43 identified as an administrative error, and it was by the
44 Board of Fish closed it at their last meeting, or in the
45 January meeting of last year, they closed that anyway.

46
47 And only rod and reel is allowed -- was
48 allowed within that 200 yards of the Eyak Dam. That was
49 a proposal that came before you regarding that area. But
50 we did have a rod and reel only in effect in that area,

1 so anybody that would have been in there with a dipnet
2 would have been in violation of their permit.

3
4 We did require that both tips of the tail
5 be clipped prior to leaving the fishing site. That is
6 very -- exactly the same requirement that occurs in the
7 State subsistence fishery when they're in marine waters.
8 This was an effort to keep the salmon from entering into
9 the commercial catch, or any means of going into a
10 nonregulated harvest if you will i that regard. Because
11 this would distinguish the subsistence fish from any
12 other kind of caught fish, whether it be sport or
13 commercial.

14
15 You could not use rod and reel to snag.
16 That is again within the CFRs, that's identified as not a
17 legal means when you're using rod and reel.

18
19 And we had the same harvest limit on
20 these permits for salmon as what the State harvest limit
21 was for their subsistence permit, and that was 15 fish
22 for a household of one, 30 for a household of two, and 10
23 additional fish for each additional member of the
24 household.

25
26 We have had some preliminary harvest
27 information. We had 46 permits that were issued this
28 year. I telephone interviewed back earlier this month 24
29 of those people. I just went through the list of people
30 that issued a permit and just called them, and just -- if
31 they answered the phone, they got interviewed, if they
32 didn't then they didn't. But I ended up talking to about
33 24 of the people. Out of those 24 people that I talked
34 to, 10 of them actually fished, so 14 did not fish. They
35 just got a permit, but they didn't use it. Seven of
36 those 10 that did fish used a dipnet, and three of them
37 used rod and reel. Now, again, I haven't got all the
38 permits, this is just a sample. And out of that, there
39 was 104 salmon were harvested and no trout.

40
41 And as far as next year's permits, these
42 permit conditions maybe modified from the public input
43 during the winter of 2006. So we will have another
44 meeting probably after the Federal Subsistence Board
45 meets in January to determine what we will be doing this
46 following year. Considering the proposals that are being
47 put forth, we'll have to see what actions are taken
48 there.

49
50 And, for example, you know, we do have

1 the sport harvest bag and possession limits for
2 freshwater fish that are being put forward, and whatever
3 action the Board takes we will then incorporate that into
4 the permit. We may restrict the use of the dipnets on
5 the Alaganik and Eyak River as well as we can now -- you
6 know, again if these all go through, then this will also
7 allow the accumulation of the harvest limits with the
8 sport limits, but not on the same day.

9
10 I did have -- just as anecdotal
11 information, I did have quite a few people come in and
12 inquire about the permit, but refused to get the permit
13 when they found out that they would be limited to those
14 numbers that are on the permit when they wanted to go,
15 say, sport fishing. They wanted to go catch red salmon,
16 get red salmon for their freezers or smokehouse, and then
17 find out that they could not go sport fishing for silver
18 salmon later in the year if they had already reached
19 their harvest limit with red salmon. So that was a bit
20 of a problem for some people.

21
22 And nearly every person that did come in
23 and ask for a permit was asking for the permit for salmon
24 harvest. I only had one individual that made an inquiry
25 for trout, and again he was -- decided it would be much
26 easier to go trout fishing under the sport fish
27 regulation, so he did not want it.

28
29 And nearly -- again, one of the other
30 interesting things is nearly -- a lot of the people that
31 came in were curious about using a dipnet, just because
32 they hadn't had the opportunity to try using dipnet
33 before. They all knew that they could not harvest
34 sockeye salmon with a rod and reel. They'd tried and
35 were not successful fly fishermen, and so as a result of
36 that they wanted to try. But again they found out that
37 in clear water it's very difficult using a dip net trying
38 to harvest salmon. So the success rate was pretty low.

39
40 And that's pretty much what I had to
41 offer. If you have any questions.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions. So the
44 dipnet use was mostly in Alaganik and Eyak?

45
46 MR. JOYCE: It was all in the Alaganik
47 and Eyak.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It was all in Alaganik?
50

1 MR. JOYCE: Right. Well, Alaganik and
2 Eyak, yeah.
3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And Eyak. Okay. Bob.
5
6 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah. Thank you. Do you
7 have any reason to believe the results for the remaining
8 folks is going to be any different than what your
9 telephone sample is? I.....
10
11 MR. JOYCE: I have no reason to believe.
12 It was a pretty random sample as far as I was concerned.
13 Looking at the names on there, I had people that
14 obviously had fished, and those that had not fished, and
15 there are still people out there that I know that did
16 fish, and there's a lot that didn't, so.....
17
18 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah. Really
19 interesting. Thank you.
20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Gloria.
22
23 MS. STICKWAN: When you said you're going
24 to have a meeting, it's that same group of people you're
25 talking about that was down there last year?
26
27 MR. JOYCE: Yeah, we'll certainly make it
28 know to everybody that was at the last meeting that we're
29 having another meeting, and we haven't set a date yet, of
30 course. It will probably be after the Federal
31 Subsistence Board meeting, and we'll advertise it to the
32 public, you know, that we're having that meeting, so, you
33 know -- but for certain those people that were there last
34 time will certainly be notified that it's going to be
35 occurring.
36
37 MS. STICKWAN: Could you work with us on
38 a date, because we really want to be at the Board of
39 Game.....
40
41 MR. JOYCE: Sure.
42
43 MS. STICKWAN:meeting in January,
44 there's a tier II issue.....
45
46 MR. JOYCE: Okay.
47
48 MS. STICKWAN:that concerns us. We
49 want to be there.
50

1 MR. JOYCE: Sure. We can work that as
2 far as what dates would be convenient for most. Sure.
3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Thank you muchly.
5
6
7 Alaska Department of Field and Game
8 (sic).
9
10 MR. KESSLER: We're not done with the
11 Forest Service.
12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, we're not done with
14 the Forest Service. Okay. You're right, Steve. I see
15 your name down there. Maybe you can answer my question
16 on the mine adits.
17
18 MR. KESSLER: Mr. Chair and members of
19 the Council. I'm Steve Kessler with the Forest Service.
20 And with me is Dennis Chester, also with the Forest
21 Service.
22
23 What we want to do is give you a brief
24 update on what's happening with the Wildlife Resource
25 Monitoring Program, which is the program which is the
26 program that we started this year complementary to the
27 Fisheries Information Services, the fisheries monitoring
28 that is done through the Office of Subsistence
29 Management.
30
31 Dennis is here. We hired Dennis to
32 manage this program for us on a temporary basis, and I
33 think we started -- Dennis started about last March or
34 April, and has been working through now and he'll be
35 working on the program through January, and then maybe
36 even part time after that.
37
38 Just to remind you, the reason that we
39 started this program is last year the Forest Service
40 received \$500,000 additional of subsistence funds from
41 the U.S. Congress, and with those dollars decided that
42 the best use for that -- for those funds was to begin a
43 wildlife monitoring program similar to the fisheries.
44
45 That's going to change a little bit,
46 because although for fiscal year '05 we received that
47 \$500,000 increase, for fiscal year '06, which we are in
48 right now, we received about a \$900,000 decrease. So
49 that was not only the \$500,000 increase, but we received
50 even less money than that. So that's going to influence

1 what we're going to be able to do in this program. And
2 you might remember that Doug McBride mentioned when he
3 was talking about the fisheries, is that we were having
4 some funding difficulties. It's all related.

5
6 Anyway, with that, unless you have any
7 specific questions for me, I'm going to let Dennis go
8 into what we've done, where we've been with the program,
9 and what you can expect for the future.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Steve.
12 Dennis.

13
14 MR. CHESTER: Good afternoon, Mr.
15 Chairman. Members of the Council. My name was Dennis
16 Chester. I work for the Forest Service, and as Steve
17 mentioned, I was hired in about April of this year, late
18 April actually, to kind of manage the Wildlife Resource
19 Managing Program.

20
21 My first duty on the job was to put out a
22 request for proposals to spend some of that money, which
23 we got that request out in June 2004. We had four
24 priority items that we were wanting to address. Those
25 included Prince of Wales deer population and trends
26 information, Prince of Wales deer traditional ecological
27 knowledge, Prince William Sound bear traditional
28 ecological knowledge, and a request for information on
29 methods for tracking the nonedible bear parts in
30 handicrafts issue.

31
32 In response, we received eight proposals
33 that addressed three of the issues. We did not receive
34 anything on the bear parts issue.

35
36 So as a process, part of our process in
37 reviewing these proposals for funding, we identified
38 independent peer reviewers for these proposals that were
39 recognized for their expertise in the specific issues,
40 but were not in any other way part of the -- of our
41 program. So we did that basically to try and maintain a
42 fair evaluation.

43
44 So we sent those out for peer review and
45 in the meantime we also formed a steering committee
46 composed of agency folks from the Forest Service, the
47 Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Fish and Wildlife Service's
48 Office of Subsistence Management, as well as the Alaska
49 Department of Fish and Game. And we based our review of
50 those proposals on the same criteria that the FIS program

1 uses, which is technical merit, how well the proposals
2 met the priority issues that we identified, the proven
3 performance of the principal investigators in past
4 projects, and partnerships and capacity building.

5
6 And we recommended -- or the committee
7 recommended for funding two of those projects as well as
8 continued work on a couple of others to combine them into
9 one. And the Regional Forester who is the decision-maker
10 on this parallels kind of the FIS program again in that
11 the Regional Forester is the decision-maker, paralleling
12 the Subsistence Board.

13
14 So to date basically two studies have
15 been funded out of this request for proposals. And as I
16 mentioned, we're working with two principal investigators
17 on combining for a third study. And that's in progress
18 as well. They've indicated their desire to do it, and we
19 just haven't got a final product for review again.

20
21 The two that were funded were the Prince
22 William bear, black bear -- Prince William Sound black
23 bear TEK study. This proposal was submitted by the
24 Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Subsistence Division,
25 with a subcontract to the Chugach Regional Resource
26 Corporation -- or Commission, excuse me. And that one
27 was for about \$57,000.

28
29 The second one that was funded was on
30 Prince of Wales deer population and trends study, and
31 it's basically to develop better population estimate
32 methods using pellet group counts and DNA technology.
33 And again this one was to the Alaska Department of Fish
34 and Game, but the Division of Wildlife Conservation this
35 time. And they have subcontracts with the University of
36 Alaska Fairbanks, the Institute of Arctic Biology, and
37 the Hydaburg Cooperative Association. And that one was
38 funded only for fiscal years '05 and '06. And that was
39 about \$81,000, and we'll review that one again before we
40 fund for 2007.

41
42 And the third one that we hope to fund is
43 on Prince of Wales deer subsistence uses and needs study.
44 The principal investigator at this point looks like it
45 will be the Craig Community Association and the
46 subcontractor with -- who's a private, does -- is a
47 private subcontractor called Applied Sociocultural
48 Research out of Anchorage here. And we expect that one
49 to come in at about \$200,000.

50

1 So the first two that I mentioned, the
2 contracts have been awarded already. The third will
3 require further review by the steering committee and
4 recommendation to the Regional Forester for his decision.
5

6 So that pretty much completed the 2005
7 process. And we're working on -- so the next step, which
8 we started pretty much at the beginning of this month
9 after we finished with that was what we're calling our
10 strategic planning effort. This is an effort basically
11 to do a better job of identifying what the priority
12 issues are, and get those into future RFPs. We didn't
13 have a whole lot of time to do that for '05, so that we
14 could meet our fiscal year constraints.
15

16 So this year we're trying to involve
17 about 20 people from Southeast and Southcentral, which is
18 the regions of concern for this program. And on this
19 group will be some Forest Service people, some Fish and
20 Game, and University of Alaska personnel, representatives
21 of the Southeast and Southcentral Regional Advisory
22 Councils, and representatives from Southeast and
23 Southcentral tribes. And we're looking for people with
24 knowledge of the Federal Subsistence Program, of course,
25 as well as knowledge of subsistence issues and some
26 knowledge of, you know, what's already been done and --
27 related to those issues.
28

29 From the Southcentral Council, I believe
30 it was at your last meeting, but it might have been prior
31 to that even, you folks identified two members and they
32 were here earlier, but they've left, but Pete Kompkoff
33 and Tom Carpenter. And we've been in contact with them
34 and working with them actually throughout this process.
35 So we appreciate your contributions there.
36

37 This strategic planning process we hope
38 to conclude by about mid January 2006. It's not as long
39 or as rigorous as the FIS project or strategic planning
40 that they did. And that's basically a reflection of the
41 work force and money that we have.
42

43 And at this point we're conducting
44 interviews and we -- with the folks we've identified, and
45 we were hoping in late November we would have a two-day
46 meeting with these folks. It looks like the BIA beat us
47 to the week that we identified, so it looks like we're
48 going to have to move that back to mid December, or
49 possibly even January. As you all know, it gets tight
50 around that time to -- there's a lot of other things

1 going on in November and December, so right now we're
2 hoping for a mid December meeting with the folks to meet
3 face-to-face and come up with the -- prioritize the
4 issues that are identified in some of the interviews.

5
6 Basically the work itself is contracted
7 out to Sheinberg Associates of Juneau to do the
8 interviews and facilitate the meeting and write up the
9 report.

10
11 So the most immediate thing we'll see out
12 of this planning effort is a prioritized list of issues
13 that then the steering committee will take and issue the
14 request for proposals for 2006. Will probably be quite
15 limited in 2006 based on current budget estimates.

16
17 And that's my report.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

20
21 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, I just didn't quite
22 catch the title of the third study area. I know it was
23 Prince William Sound deer, traditional -- would you
24 repeat that?

25
26 MR. CHESTER: It was actually Prince --
27 the three are Prince William Sound back bear.....

28
29 MR. CHURCHILL: Right.

30
31 MR. CHESTER:Prince of Wales deer
32 population and trends, and the third one that we're
33 working on know is Prince of Wales deer subsistence
34 uses.....

35
36 MR. CHURCHILL: Oh, POW.

37
38 MR. CHESTER:and needs.

39
40 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Steve.

43
44 MR. CHURCHILL: Just one other thing.

45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

47
48 MR. CHURCHILL: On the POW study, are you
49 taking a look at the, and I don't know if this has
50 actually been established, elk populations. One if they

1 exist and possible impact on the deer populations on POW?

2

3 MR. CHESTER: No, that's not part of
4 these studies. I suspect it will -- that -- not just
5 elk, but various issues related to deer productivity will
6 probably show up in this process that we're going through
7 right now. But it's not currently part of our study.

8

9 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I have only one
12 question, and if it would take a long answer, don't
13 answer me, but how do you use DNA to evaluate population,
14 did you -- was it status or was it population size? Is
15 it status?

16

17 MR. CHESTER: It's -- basically it -- the
18 technique relates to an older technique with is the mark
19 recapture technique. And basically with the technology
20 we have today, we can identify individual deer by their
21 pellets. And so you collect.....

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You can get the DNA out
24 of the pellets?

25

26 MR. CHESTER: Correct.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, okay. Okay.

29

30 MR. CHESTER: Does that answer? I can go
31 into more detail, but.....

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That answers my question
34 exactly, because I can understand the pellet counts, and
35 if you can make DNA readings on the pellets, then that
36 would give you an idea of how many different deer are
37 making the pellets. Okay.

38

39 I was just wondering how you were going
40 to take DNA samples and then correlate them to the size
41 of the population, whether if you had the -- the wider
42 the DNA variation, the bigger population or -- but you're
43 actually using it to identify individuals. The same as
44 you can use it on poached game or something like that.
45 Okay. That sounds like fun.

46

47 (laughter)

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Going out and taking DNA
50 samples out of deer pellets. Any other questions.

1 (No comments)
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. And I didn't
4 mean that as totally humorous, but.....
5
6 (Laughter)
7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Alaska Department
9 of Fish and Game. Tom.
10
11 MR. TAUBE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For
12 the record, Tom Taube, Upper Copper, Upper Susitna Area
13 management biologist for the Department of Fish and Game.
14
15 There's several handouts that I've
16 provided, and I'll try to keep it brief, seeing on the
17 time restraints here. But there's.....
18
19 I'll just start out with what research we
20 conducted within Federal waters this year. Part of this
21 was covered already by Native Village of Eyak,
22 cooperative projects for the sockeye and steelhead and
23 coho distribution. And if the Council's interested, we
24 could probably have one of our researchers come in and
25 update you with the results of that at the spring meeting
26 for the steelhead and coho. I know Ralph's interested in
27 that, so I'll mention that to them, and we'll see if we
28 can't get someone at the spring meeting to cover that,
29 what we found out the first year.
30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I imagine Dean would
32 be.....
33
34 MR. TAUBE: Yeah.
35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:interested in it
37 also.
38
39 MR. TAUBE: In addition to that, we had
40 two cooperative projects with BLM on the Gulkana River.
41 One was our counting tower for chinook salmon. And this
42 was the fourth year of operation in that. We passed 2600
43 chinook salmon passed the tower. That was actually the
44 lowest number we've seen in the four years that we have
45 had that tower in operation.
46
47 Overall it looked like, you know,
48 probably the king return was a little lower than normal
49 this year, you know, based on some of the preliminary
50 harvest estimates and what was seen in the commercial

1 fishery and that.

2

3 Sockeye numbers were also pretty low. We
4 don't operate the tower during the whole duration of the
5 sockeye return, so it's just -- it was 13,000 at that
6 point, and that was actually the lowest we've seen. But
7 there was a push of sockeye that came in later that
8 apparently were primarily the hatchery return. The
9 hatchery did achieve their egg-take goal this year for
10 the first time in five years. So it looks like the
11 sockeye were a little bit early and they were a little
12 bit late. And overall I think the sockeye return was
13 pretty strong this year.

14

15 The second project on the Gulkana was a
16 rainbow trout project. We did a mark/recapture study.
17 The results aren't finalized on that, but preliminary
18 estimates are around about 10,000 rainbow trout between
19 the Sourdough area and the Paxson Lake area, which is
20 substantially higher than we originally had thought.
21 Sport fishing regulations are catch and release only for
22 rainbow trout, and so the population has been observed
23 expanding its range throughout the Gulkana. So right now
24 it look like the population's pretty healthy. I doubt
25 we'll see any change in the sport fishing regulations,
26 but it gives a getter idea that there really isn't a
27 concern for any -- you know, if there's hooking mortality
28 associated with the king salmon fishery. Rainbow trout
29 are real susceptible to the bait, eggs and stuff there.
30 We do see some mortality associated with that, but bait's
31 only allowed in the Gulkana River during the king salmon
32 season, and then it's single hook, artificial lure only.

33

34 With that, there was a single-page hand-
35 out that has State of Alaska letterhead that was provided
36 by Commercial Fisheries Division with the preliminary
37 commercial salmon for the Cook Inlet and Prince William
38 Sound area. I guess I won't go through that specifically
39 unless there's somebody having some questions on that.
40 I'm not very familiar with some of the Cook Inlet
41 fisheries, so I don't know if I'd be able to answer your
42 questions on that anyway.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug.

45

46 MR. BLOSSOM: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. One
47 question.

48

49 What's a sport fish derby sales?

50

1 MR. TAUBE: That I'm not totally certain
2 on, but I don't know if they're -- there may be some
3 hatchery returns that they're selling the fish or if
4 there's -- they -- that people aren't allowed to keep the
5 fish, and then they're actually sold commercially. That
6 I'm not certain of. I should have probably asked someone
7 at the Soldotna here to find out.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: This is in Cook Inlet?

10
11 MR. TAUBE: Yes, it's under the lower
12 Cook Inlet portion.

13
14 MR. BLOSSOM: I was just curious. I just
15 thought maybe you knew the answer.

16
17 MR. TAUBE: That's the first time I've
18 seen it. We don't have anything like that on the Copper
19 River that I'm aware of.

20
21 So with that, there's a -- the second
22 handout was a -- it's a summary data for the 2005 State
23 of Alaska Upper Copper River District subsistence and
24 personal use fisheries. Again, I'd already touched on
25 the sockeye, the escapement goal. On Page 2 there, the
26 escapement goal for the Miles Lake sonar is listed there
27 just for your reference. The goal for 2005 was
28 approximately 578,000 salmon past the sonar. When it was
29 pulled on July 31st, 854,000 had passed. And, you know,
30 there's been some belief that there's probably a fair
31 number that came on afterwards, that the sonar being
32 pulled on that time.

33
34 Below that, there's a table with the
35 Chitina, the State Chitina Subdistrict fishing schedule.
36 As Eric Veach had mentioned early in his report, the
37 Federal Chitina Subdistrict schedule mimicked this. The
38 only difference with this is that during the second
39 period and the sixth period, under State regulations, if
40 there's a surplus of 5,000 that passes the Miles Lake
41 sonar in a given week, that we are authorized to issue a
42 supplemental period where permit holders can harvest an
43 additional 10 sockeye salmon during the week those fish
44 will be present in the subdistrict. This year we had two
45 of those supplemental periods, as I mentioned on the
46 second week and then later on in the season in the sixth
47 week.

48
49 Basically the fishery opened June 1st and
50 remained open until August 2nd, and then -- or until July

1 31st. There was a drop in the sonar counts at that
2 point. It was closed for two days and then re-opened on
3 August 2nd, and then remained open for the rest of the
4 season.

5
6 With that, the preliminary results for
7 the Chitina Subdistrict, we issued approximately 8,000
8 permits in 2005. The harvest estimates in table 2 are
9 based upon roughly 57 percent of the permits returned.
10 Chinook harvests were slightly below 2000. That's down
11 from the recent five-year average. Sockeye was almost
12 120,000 which is above the recent five-year average. And
13 coho was down. It appeared that at least overall the
14 coho return might have been a little lower than normal in
15 there, and that's probably reflected in those harvests.

16
17 Table 3 just shows what we've had for
18 supplemental periods for your reference in there.

19
20 On table 4 we'll shift to the Glennallen
21 subdistrict. We issued approximately 960 permits. The
22 harvest information on here is -- it says from 52
23 percent. I think I updated it. It was closer to 60
24 percent permit return that these harvest information's
25 based on.

26
27 The king harvests were down in the
28 Glennallen Subdistrict also. It's just around 2400 king
29 salmon. That would be table 4 is what I'm looking at.
30 Sockeye nearly 70,000 which is up from recent averages.
31 And coho was a pretty small amount, only 26.

32
33 I suspect the coho numbers will increase
34 here. Generally what we get for these first half of
35 permits coming in are people that fished early, didn't
36 fish later, so I'm anticipating that we'll see an
37 increase in the coho harvest for the Glennallen
38 Subdistrict.

39
40 The next two tables, table 5 just shows
41 the distribution of gear type between the Glennallen
42 Subdistrict. We're still around 30 to 40 percent dipnets
43 being used and about 60 percent fish wheels. We did have
44 a few less fish wheels registered this year. Generally
45 it averages about 125, 130. This year we only registered
46 119. And both Federal and State fish wheel owners have
47 to register fish wheels with the Department.

48
49 The permits issued by area for the
50 Glennallen Subdistrict, there was decline in the Copper

1 River Basin permits. I don't know if that can be
2 attributed to the Park Service 36 CFR regulation that
3 restricted use up by the Slana area, but that was only 10
4 permits, so I'm not certain why there was somewhat of a
5 decline in Copper River Basin permits this year. The
6 number of permits really didn't change from the previous
7 year.

8
9 Anchorage was up. Fairbanks was up. And
10 Mat-Su was up. So it might have just been that we might
11 have had a little shift in -- yeah, maybe we had some
12 out-migration of people to the urban areas. I'm not
13 certain.

14
15 The Chitina Subdistrict again has stayed
16 pretty stable, just basically one percent of Copper River
17 residents getting permits. Anchorage is around 30
18 percent. Fairbanks is the majority, around 45 percent.
19 And the Mat-Su and other communities make up the
20 remaining quarter.

21
22 The back page of this is just a
23 separation of harvest by gear type for the Glennallen
24 District. Dipnet users -- under State regulations you
25 have to decide when you get your permit what gear type
26 you'll be using, either dipnet or fish wheel, and you
27 cannot shift from one to the other, so if you choose
28 dipnet, you're using a dipnet for the entire season. So
29 dipnet harvest represents about 10 percent of the total
30 harvest, and fish wheels about 90 percent of the total
31 harvest.

32
33 The other two handouts I have are related
34 to the Board of Fisheries meeting this December. There's
35 one, the thickest batch of that has actually the
36 proposals primarily for the Copper River and a few Prince
37 William Sound proposals that the Board of Fisheries will
38 be taking up in December 1st through 6th in Valdez.

39
40 There are four proposals that are -- that
41 were addressed by -- that will be addressed by the
42 Federal Subsistence Board that were discussed earlier in
43 this meeting that the Board of Fisheries will take up.
44 Four and 5, Proposal 4 and 5 are the requirement to check
45 the fish wheel every 24 hours. Proposal 6 is to allow
46 the use of fyke nets in Tanada Creek, and Proposal 8 is
47 the live box requirement for fish wheels, or they must be
48 checked every four hours.

49
50 There are a total of seven proposals for

1 the subsistence fishery for the Glennallen Subdistrict.
2 Those four and then there's also a proposal to ask the
3 Board to reconsider the subsistence ruling for the
4 Chitina Subdistrict.

5
6 In 1999 the Board of Fish ruled that the
7 Chitina Subdistrict in our State regulations was a
8 subsistence fishery. They reversed that decision at the
9 2003 meeting. There's another proposal that's been
10 submitted by I believe it's the Fairbanks Advisory
11 Council or Advisory Committee to ask the Board to
12 reconsider their decision again to change it from
13 personal use back to subsistence.

14
15 The other two, there's one for allowing
16 only 25 households per fish wheel. Right now there is no
17 limit on the number of households that can use a fish
18 wheel. The fish wheel owners are required to submit to
19 the State when they register their fish wheel a list of
20 authorized users.

21
22 Just for some background information of
23 that, of -- about 10 percent of the fish wheels actually
24 have a list of more than 25 households. Of those that
25 actually use the fish wheel, only three percent of the
26 fish wheels actually had more than 25 households use the
27 fish wheel.

28
29 And then Proposal 9 is requesting a
30 mandatory check station at Chitina to verify the harvests
31 and reporting of the State permits as they leave that
32 area around the Glennallen Subdistrict from the Chitina
33 airport down to the bridge.

34
35 There are six proposals for the personal
36 use fishery. I won't go through those specifically
37 unless there's some interest in that. Eight for the
38 sport fishery for the Copper River. Eight proposals for
39 resident species. There are -- there's one specific for
40 Prince William Sound sport salmon. One for Prince
41 William Sound resident species. One for groundfish.
42 Approximately 33 for Prince William Sound commercial.
43 And three proposals for Copper River commercial.

44
45 There is a comment period, if the Council
46 would like to comment on some of these joint proposals.
47 The deadline is November 17th if you want the written
48 comments to be included in the Board notebook that the
49 Board members read prior to the meeting. And then
50 there's also opportunity for written comments any time

1 during the meeting or up to the meeting process, and
2 there's also public testimony time at the beginning of
3 the meeting. And then there's a separate committee
4 process that if stakeholders can get included in the
5 committee process, and that basically comes with a
6 preliminary decision for the proposals, that then the
7 committee chair, which is a member of the Board takes to
8 the Board back for deliberation.

9
10 And with that, I'll -- if there's
11 anything specifically on any of these proposals, you want
12 me to go into more detail, I can, or I'll just take any
13 questions at this time.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Dean.

16
17 MR. WILSON: The fish wheel one you're
18 talking about. Those people who have Federal permits
19 with fish wheels right now, you said they had to also
20 check in with the Department?

21
22 MR. TAUBE: The -- if it's a -- they have
23 to register the fish wheel with the Department. That's
24 when you get your fish wheel number, provide the list of
25 authorized users for that fish wheel, and that's -- you
26 can either do that at the Park Service office or Fish and
27 Game, and then Park Service provides the information to
28 Fish and Game. It's basically more of a centralized
29 information source, is that the Department does that.

30
31 MR. WILSON: Okay. That's what I -- I
32 didn't know if the.....

33
34 MR. TAUBE: Yeah.

35
36 MR. WILSON: Most of us have been just
37 going to them and doing it. I didn't know that they'd
38 been sharing every with you. Okay.

39
40 MR. TAUBE: Right. Yeah, it's a
41 cooperative effort to gather the information and get the
42 registration out to make it simpler for the users, but
43 then the final -- they pass the information on to us, we
44 consolidate it and then actually we send out daily or
45 weekly reports to the protection officers and back to
46 Park Service, so that list is updated, and if there's any
47 new users put on, that way people can come to the office,
48 get their permit without having us to call the owner to
49 verify that they have permission to use the wheel.

50

1 MR. WILSON: Okay.
2
3 MS. STICKWAN: I have a question. Are
4 you sure the meeting is still going to be in Valdez?
5
6 MR. TAUBE: At the work session here in
7 October it wasn't changed. It's still set for Valdez on
8 the 1st through the 6th of December. There was some
9 discussion about Fairbanks trying to get it relocated to
10 Fairbanks, but there's more issues at this meeting than
11 pertain just to Fairbanks, so I think the Board's been
12 always pretty reluctant to relocate it to Fairbanks.
13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions.
15
16 (No comments)
17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tom.
19
20 MR. TAUBE: Okay.
21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Just one comment. Your
23 low numbers on cohos both in catch and in count, the coho
24 run was at least 10 days to two weeks late down on the
25 coast. So that would affect the upper end.
26
27 MR. TAUBE: Yeah, we observed it with our
28 fish wheel, trying to put the radio tags out that we were
29 catching more sockeye, you know, well into September.
30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I was going to say well
32 until the 1st of September.
33
34 MR. TAUBE: Yeah. In fact, I think the
35 day they pulled the fish wheel, they still caught sockeye
36 which was October 10th or 11th.....
37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right.
39
40 MR. TAUBE:below Haley Creek,
41 so.....
42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Yeah. So you
44 might end up with higher counts than you expect, or at
45 least you would have ended with a higher catch, just it
46 just would have been later.
47
48 MR. TAUBE: Yeah.
49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other comments,

1 questions for Tom.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tom.

6

7 MR. TAUBE: Thank you.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. National Park
10 Service. at this point in time it says Wrangell-St.
11 Elias, but I don't see a Wrangell -- oh, there is a
12 Wrangell-St. Elias. That's right, they spoke early this
13 morning, so we have Hollis. They snuck out.

14

15 MR. TWITCHELL: Chair and Council
16 members. I'm Hollis Twitchell with Denali National Park.

17

18

19 With me is Scott Hayden. Scott Hayden
20 has been hired as a subsistence assistant for Denali.
21 Scott is from Lake Minchumina where he grew up on the
22 north side of the park, went to college at Fairbanks,
23 University of Alaska-Fairbanks. And just did several
24 seasons of research actually over in Siberia. Background
25 in biological science. So just wanted you -- to have a
26 chance to introduce Scott to you. Hopefully he'll be
27 interested in staying on and working on a longer term for
28 subsistence management at Denali.

29

30 I only have one agenda item that requires
31 action from the Council, and that's for an appoint to
32 Denali's SRC. As you know, our charter for the Denali
33 SRC identified two appointees from Southcentral to our
34 commission. Vernon Carlson is your other appointee, and
35 he's in good standing in terms of his appointment.

36

37 The position that's up for either
38 reappointment or appointment is Gilbert Dementi's
39 position. And I have heard through Donald that Gilbert
40 is interested in continuing to serve on the commission.
41 So I hope that you would consider him as a candidate for
42 appointing to the commission.

43

44 I only have one other name that I would
45 advance to you for consideration and we did this at the
46 last two rounds of appointments to the commission. And
47 that individual is in Cantwell, his name is Marty Caress.
48 He's the chair of the Denali Fish and Game Advisory
49 Committee. In my conversations with him in the past,
50 he's always said that he does not wish to compete against

1 the current people from Cantwell who serve on the
2 commission, and would only advance his name if they
3 declined to serve. So with that, I would again put that
4 forward as an individual who would be qualified to serve
5 as an appointed member. But those were the conditions
6 that he has articulated to me before.

7
8 So with that I'll hope that you would
9 consider Gilbert. He's served well on the commission.
10 He missed the last meeting due to his health problem, but
11 he's been an active participant on the commission, and
12 he's been on for a long time, and brings a good liaison
13 between not only Ahtna, since he serves in Ahtna in
14 various capacities, but also for the community of
15 Cantwell. So please consider him for reappointment.

16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hollis, can we just take
18 a second right now probably. I think Bob wants to.....

19
20 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, I'd like to
21 nominate that we continue Gilbert in the service. It's
22 been of value. He's always reported back well, and
23 participated. I'd like to see us reappoint him.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second.

26
27 MR. ENCELEWSKI: I'll second it.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's seconded. Is it
30 unanimous? All opposed signify by saying nay.

31
32 (No opposing votes)

33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's unanimous.

35
36 MR. TWITCHELL: Thank you.

37
38 The other two items that I have are
39 primarily just for your information. I guess we'll take
40 the letter first. I didn't realize it was in your
41 notebook, and oversight on my part, but obviously it is
42 some -- of interest to you.

43
44 Gordon Haber is a private researcher.
45 He's not affiliated with Denali. He is actively involved
46 in research up in the Denali and other areas for quite a
47 number of years. He advanced a letter to the
48 superintendent in midsummer asking for an emergency
49 closure in the Kantishna Hills area to the harvest of
50 wolves. And his concern originated out of a rendezvous

1 site that was being used in the Kantishna Hills area, and
2 the potential that that pack could experience high
3 harvest as a result of subsistence hunting in the area.

4
5 Subsequently the Park Service through the
6 superintendent declined that request for emergency
7 closure, as it's stated in the letter in paragraph four.
8 It identifies the 36 CFR which is a park regulation that
9 would allow the superintendent to make such a decision.
10 It has to has to meet one of three reasons, which are
11 stated there. Public safety, administration or to assure
12 the continued viability of a population. And on the
13 grounds of the health of the wolf population in Denali
14 and with the harvest records for the last 20 years
15 indicating only one wolf being harvested in August and
16 one wolf in September, plus a limited amount of
17 subsistence activity that actually goes out into the
18 Kantishna Hills, we didn't feel there was any warranted
19 reason for closure, and it was denied.

20
21 He then appealed to the Regional Director
22 to override the superintendent's decision, and the
23 Regional Director declined to act on that request.

24
25 Subsequently he has petitioned to the
26 Federal Subsistence Board for a special action asking for
27 closure in that area for hunting of wolves, and the
28 Federal Subsistence Board declined to take any action on
29 that, there being no extenuating situation that would
30 warrant a special action.

31
32 So that's the sequence of events that's
33 happened in the area.

34
35 As a note in terms of the hunt itself,
36 there were nine parties that travelled to Kantishna for
37 subsistence activities. Two of them were not hunting, so
38 that left seven parties that went in to actually hunt in
39 the area. There were no harvest of wolves this year, nor
40 were there any harvest of moose this year out of the
41 Kantishna.

42
43 So it turns out to be not an issue in
44 terms of the potential of wolf pack being removed from
45 that particular area. I don't know whether a proposal
46 will come forward to you in the winter cycle. I guess
47 we'll wait and see. I haven't heard of any that have
48 reached the Federal Subsistence Board yet.

49
50 So with that, I'll try to answer any

1 questions that you might have on that issue.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions. Thank --
4 Dean.

5

6 MR. WILSON: Just a real quick comment.
7 It's good to see that you hired a local person to help
8 out with you. It's a big move that I think I'd like to
9 see a lot of agencies do also. Many of them do already,
10 but it's good to see there.

11

12 MR. TWITCHELL: Thank you.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'll make one comment on
15 the letter. I'd like you to thank the superintendent for
16 his third paragraph.

17

18 MR. TWITCHELL: Yes. That became quite
19 an issue with us, because as a general practice we don't
20 try to disclose where particular populations are, whether
21 they're wolves or caribou, or moose, or whatever the
22 species. And we were a bit concerned that in his
23 interest in trying to raise attention to this issue he
24 actually potentially raised an even bigger problem by
25 identifying the locations of a particular pack. I heard
26 through Gordon that he was quite concerned about that,
27 and felt it was a significant enough issue that he was
28 going to take that chance. We don't approve of that, but
29 that's the decision that he made.

30

31 And in response, we were very interested
32 in trying to locate someone locally who was familiar with
33 the communities, the subsistence use as Scott has done
34 along with his family on the north side of the range,
35 familiarity with the cultures, and also with the
36 subsistence programs, the Federal subsistence program.
37 So we're just extremely delighted that he has interest in
38 coming and working for us.

39

40 The next issue, if we can move on, deals
41 with a fairly long-standing issue. It's probably been
42 before most members of this Council before. It deals
43 with Cantwell, and their request to have a determination
44 that ORVs were used as a traditional means of access for
45 subsistence in the Cantwell area.

46

47 I do have some notes here, and I can keep
48 it fairly short considering the time, so I don't know to
49 what depth that you really want me to go into this. So
50 I'll sort of take the cue from yourselves.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What kind of decision
2 did they come to?

3
4 MR. TWITCHELL: It was a positive
5 determination for Cantwell for the use of ORVs in the
6 Windy Creek, Cantwell Creek, and the Bull -- portions of
7 the Bull River drainage, which were areas that had a long
8 history of use by the Cantwell area. And if you want me
9 to go into details I can describe that as well as the
10 historical access for the community as well as into the
11 park areas. The determination is what I handed out to
12 you, which is the determination itself based on the
13 research that was gathered through the course of this
14 past year. And that included a pretty extensive body of
15 material. The report, compilation report and the
16 appendices that went with it is over 500 pages long of
17 material. So what you're seeing is just the
18 determination itself and the analysis based on the
19 compilation report.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Hollis. And
22 I'll just make one comment on it. I'm glad to see that
23 -- you know, I'm sure there was a lot of pressure to come
24 up with a none determination. I mean, a non -- to not
25 come up with a positive finding since it's a park. And
26 I'm real glad to see that for the people of Cantwell that
27 you actually did come up with a positive finding for them.

28
29 MR. TWITCHELL: It was a substantial
30 effort by a number of researchers in gathering the
31 material. You will probably be familiar as well that in
32 '86 the park made a determination that ORVs were not a
33 traditional means of Denali, and it was applied across
34 the whole park.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right.

37
38 MR. TWITCHELL: The GMB also identified
39 that in the future is that if additional information is
40 brought forward, we would reconsider that, which is the
41 case that's happened in Cantwell.

42
43 And we went through a long deliberative
44 process. I believe I handed out the process paper in
45 your last winter meeting that sort of laid out how we
46 were going to approach this, and we subsequently held
47 four meetings within Cantwell community itself, several
48 SRC meetings in addition to those four community
49 meetings, two of them held in Cantwell, and so we tried
50 to work fairly closely with the community, with the State

1 and also with the conservation groups so that they knew
2 what we were doing as we were moving along.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

5

6 MR. TWITCHELL: Maybe if there isn't any
7 interest in going into the depths of the criteria and how
8 we came to that, it's spelled out very well in that
9 report.

10

11 Then to close on that topic, then since
12 that determination would open that area to any qualified
13 subsistence user for hunting in that area, we were
14 obviously as the Park Service concerned about resources
15 and impacts to the park lands and waters and soils.
16 Subsequently the Park immediately created a temporary
17 closure for this particular hunting season identifying
18 three routes that we felt comfortable that we can allow
19 ORV use on without any significant degradation to the
20 park resources. And that's the maps that is the second
21 handout that you have. Those areas were opened to
22 Cantwell subsistence users use of ORVs.

23

24 The remaining area we went in this summer
25 with field studies, with biological staff to evaluate the
26 soils, water, vegetation, and that will be used in an
27 environmental assessment that's being prepared this
28 winter. And we'll be working very closely with the
29 community of Cantwell again through scoping meetings and
30 the whole process. That is intended to identify other
31 areas beyond the areas that were authorized that could
32 sustain or could allow ORV use without causing
33 significant impacts to the resources.

34

35 So there is a good potential there's
36 going to be other areas that will be identified, and
37 subsequently opened up with some sort of a management
38 protocol that will be put in place there. There will
39 certainly be areas that we won't allow any ORV use at
40 all, because of the marsh, wetlands, grass and boggy
41 areas. So that will be developed in the EA, opened for
42 full public comment and review through the NEPA process.

43

44 So you can expect to probably hear more
45 about this in your winter meeting as the alternatives are
46 further developed, and the analysis prepared. So it will
47 be coming back around to the Council.

48

49 The final step in this will be selection
50 of one of the alternatives from the EA. And with that,

1 it would be necessary for us to promulgate a regulation
2 that would allow us to implement that man -- whatever
3 management program that's identified.

4
5 So that's the steps that are going to be
6 coming this year.

7
8 To get an NPS regulation through is not
9 an easy thing, so to think that we'll accomplish all this
10 by the next hunting season is a pretty aggressive
11 thought. So we may very well end up with a similar sort
12 of closure next year. But our intention and the
13 commitment of the superintendent is to resolve this
14 issue, to provide reasonable access to resources where we
15 can, and to close and protect the areas that it would be
16 a significant impact to.

17
18 So with that, I'll try to answer any
19 questions you might have.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anybody have any
22 questions for Hollis. I think you did a pretty good job
23 on getting it across to us where we're at, and I know
24 Gilbert would have a lot more interest in it than most of
25 the people that are here. But just the fact that you
26 were able to move that fast enough that you had something
27 in place for this season is amazing to me.

28
29 MR. TWITCHELL: It was not easy.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I wouldn't think so.

32
33 MR. TWITCHELL: I'll just -- I'll leave
34 it at that. It was a significant effort of Scott and
35 myself and other researchers, and it wouldn't have
36 happened if there hadn't been real close coordination and
37 communications between the State and the conservation
38 groups. So that's the way it went.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Hollis. Any
41 other questions for Hollis.

42
43 (No comments)

44
45 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do you have anything
48 else for us that you wanted to give us.

49
50 MR. TWITCHELL: Just two things. I'll

1 mention them real quickly. Several years ago we through
2 an SRC recommendation, a request that we gather
3 historical information on fisheries through funding that
4 came from the fisheries program as well as NPS. We just
5 have received the draft report on historical fisheries
6 for our resident zone communities. Although there wasn't
7 any new research done beyond the community harvest
8 assessments that was done in Cantwell in 2000, most of
9 the traditional knowledge and historical fisheries work
10 was done in the villages of Nikoli, Telida, and Lake
11 Minchumina. But there is a recap of historical fisheries
12 use for Cantwell within this publication. And hopefully
13 that will be finalized and we'll have copies for you at
14 your next winter meeting of that report. It would be a
15 good companion to the community use harvest assessments
16 that were done in 2000.

17
18 And the final thing is we have made an
19 effort to normalize our consultation with our tribes
20 associated with Denali, and we entered into the formal
21 government-to-government recognition through MOUs with
22 the Cantwell Tribe, Nikoli, Telida and the Nenana tribes.
23 So that was a welcome chance to get us into a real
24 formula format of communication and consultation.

25
26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Hollis. No
27 other questions for Hollis.

28
29 (No comments)

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

32
33 MR. TWITCHELL: Thank you.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With that, we
36 have other business. We have another thing -- a few
37 things to so. Council topics for the January 2006 Board
38 meeting. We've got 2005 annual topic reports, nomination
39 for Council members, future meeting plans, and I have a
40 letter that I need to read into the minutes from Bruce
41 Cain on what we -- on the action we took on Proposal 19.

42
43
44 So Council topics for the January 2006
45 Board meeting. One of those I think should be the --
46 well, that's for the Board meeting, not for -- that's not
47 for our meeting, that's the Board meeting. Okay. My
48 fault.

49
50 Anybody have any Council topics they'd

1 like to see me carry to the Board for the 2006 Board
2 meeting. Nothing? Nothing driving?
3
4 MR. CHURCHILL: I don't know if we'd have
5 anything on Pebble, but if we do, I'd like to kind of
6 reserve the right to throw something in there.
7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.
9
10 MS. STICKWAN: What was that?
11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: On the mine operation on
13 the -- up by -- is that by Lake Clark area?
14
15 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah.
16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Up by Lake Clark area
18 that affects the hunt -- Southcentral at that side, if we
19 have any information on that, he thought we could carry
20 that to the Board for the Board meeting in 2006.
21
22 Gloria, have you something you would like
23 me to take there?
24
25 MS. STICKWAN: They probably won't have a
26 decision by the time the Board's meeting about the BLM
27 report, PLO 5150. It probably won't be finished, right?
28 I mean, a decision won't have been made?
29
30 MS. SWANTON: He said the decision would
31 be made this spring.
32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.
34
35 MS. STICKWAN: In the spring?
36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.
38
39 MS. SWANTON: (Indiscernible, away from
40 microphone) for the final EIS completed in January
41 (indiscernible, away from microphone)
42
43 MS. STICKWAN: So could that -- that will
44 be brought up at the Board then? The final EIS?
45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I don't think that that
47 will -- I don't think our Board will have anything to do
48 with that EIS, because I think that part of it's -- the
49 comment periods all done. I think that's all going to be
50 done inside the BLM. I think. But one thing we could do

1 is we have BLM Staff on the Board meeting, and I will
2 again reiterate how important that 5150 is to the
3 subsistence users in our area, because we'll have -- we
4 have a BLM, you know, head on the Board itself, and so I
5 will bring that topic to them then.

6
7 MS. STICKWAN: It probably won't be on
8 the agenda though, will it, do you know?

9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, it won't be on the
11 agenda. No, these are just Board topics that we want to
12 take to the Board for them to, you know, consider and to
13 think about. So, I mean, we can't put this on their
14 agenda, but this is just topics that we as a Council see
15 as important to us as a Council. And so I will do that.
16 That was a good one, Gloria, because we do have the head
17 of the BLM on that.

18
19 So any other ones.

20
21 (No comments)

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Donald, remember to
24 remind me of those two.

25
26 Okay. Now we have 2005 annual report
27 topics. We need to make our -- is this where we make
28 our annual report, Donald?

29
30 MR. MIKE: You can bring up the annual
31 report topics, and I can draft the letter out. And once
32 we get all the topics together and all the issues on the
33 letter, we can bring it back in the winter meeting and
34 finalize it there.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Both of these
37 topics I think should go into the annual report.

38
39 Any other topics that you can think of
40 that we would like to put into our annual report. Do we
41 have any burning issues or anything like that? Gloria, do
42 you have.....

43
44 MS. STICKWAN: I don't know. I just
45 don't know if this is -- if it's right for me to ask this
46 question, but I'd like support from this Council on the
47 C&T determin -- to try and get C&T for personal use.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: For who?

50

1 MS. STICKWAN: Personal use. Just trying
2 to get to being in subsistence. I don't know if that's
3 right for me to ask, to get support from this Council to
4 object to that, or.....
5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, I don't know. Is
7 that -- is.....
8
9 MS. STICKWAN: Is that out of our purview
10 of what we're supposed to do?
11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think as a Council we
13 can express an opinion. I don't see where we can't
14 express an opinion on it. You know, it's -- we're
15 dealing with the Board of Fish, but as a Council, we can
16 make a resolution to give to them, and whether or
17 not.....
18
19 MS. STICKWAN: Well, I would just like
20 this.....
21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:they pay any
23 attention to it, you know, that's their choice. So if
24 you have a resolution or an idea on the resolution that
25 you'd like to present to the Council. And then
26 basically if I understand right, what you would like to
27 do is you would like the Council to resolve to support
28 the current personal use status and not have it as
29 subsistence.....
30
31 MS. STICKWAN: Yes.
32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:in the Chitina
34 Subdistrict?
35
36 MS. STICKWAN: Yes.
37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: A motion to that effect
39 would be in order, and then we can make a resolution to
40 that effect if the rest of the Council is in agreement.
41
42 MS. STICKWAN: I would make that motion.
43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Make a motion that we
45 submit a resolution on behalf of the Council to the Fish
46 Board supporting the idea that, and this is a rough, very
47 rough way of putting it, supporting the idea that the
48 Chitina Subdistrict should remain a personal use
49 subdistrict, and not a subsistence subdistrict, right?
50

1 MS. STICKWAN: (Nods affirmatively)
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second.
4 Dean.
5
6 MR. WILSON: I will after I get a little
7 more information from that. I was kind of unaware of
8 this, but is this a new resolution that's being put in
9 right now?
10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's a proposal. Tom.
12
13 MR. WILSON: Okay.
14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's a proposal before
16 the Board of Fish.
17
18 MR. TAUBE: Mr. chairman. Yes, Proposal
19 3, and it's in that handout of proposals I handed you,
20 that's asking for the Board to reconsider the status of
21 the Chitina Subdistrict under State regulations. It's
22 currently personal use, they'd like to see it go back to
23 subsistence.
24
25 MR. WILSON: Okay. It's gone back and
26 forth now already one time. Yeah.
27
28 MR. TAUBE: Yeah. Yeah.
29
30 MR. WILSON: Okay. I'll second that.
31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. It's been moved
33 and seconded that we as a Council submit a resolution to
34 the Board of Fish supporting the idea that it should
35 remain a personal use fishery in the Chitina Subdistrict.
36
37
38 Any discussion. James.
39
40 MR. SHOWALTER: Yes. Why do they want a
41 personal use instead of subsistence.
42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.
44
45 MS. STICKWAN: I don't understand his
46 question. What is he asking?
47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: He's asking why would
49 Ahtna, or why would we want it to remain personal use
50 instead of subsistence.

1 MS. STICKWAN: Because we don't want them
2 to be subsistence, to be categorized as subsistence.
3 We'd rather keep them as personal use. I mean, we have
4 more of a priority under subsistence than personal use,
5 so we want to keep it that way.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The Chitina Subdistrict
8 is used mostly by people who are not Copper Basin
9 residents, and they're mostly -- that's actually -- the
10 truth of the matter is about 50 percent of it's used by
11 Fairbanks, and 30-some percent's used by Anchorage. And
12 Ahtna would like that to remain a personal use fishery,
13 and not give them subsistence recognition.

14
15 Tom.

16
17 MR. TAUBE: I could probably add why that
18 it was submitted by the Fairbanks user is that
19 subsistence under State as you well know has a higher
20 priority. And as a personal use fishery, it becomes very
21 allocative. It's allocated between the commercial
22 fishery, the personal use fishery and the sport fishery.
23 Yeah, subsistence as a higher priority, they -- the last
24 time it increased their allocation from a flat 100,000 to
25 a range from 100 to 150,000, and that was just because it
26 was a subsistence fishery. They looked at what the
27 harvest had been the last few years, and it had been
28 nearly 150,000. So it was much easier for them to get
29 that increase in the allocation than it had been as a
30 personal use fishery. In the past they've gone from an
31 allocation of 60,000 to 100,000, but it took much more,
32 and that's why they're asking for this change.

33
34 And it's much more involved. I mean, the
35 Fairbanksans feel that they've, you know, they've got a
36 history since the 40s and 50s of people going down there
37 dipnetting. That's their argument. And the Board just
38 weighs the report from Subsistence Division and
39 determines whether or not it meets the eight criteria in
40 the State and they'll make their decision based on that.
41 But public input is very important in that process, just
42 like it is in the Federal Board process.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Is that understandable,
45 James?

46
47 MR. SHOWALTER: Yes. As long as they
48 requested the personal use instead of subsistence,
49 correct.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: James, no. They
2 requested subsistence rather than personal use. The
3 local Copper River Basin people would like to see them
4 stay personal use. Fairbanks requested subsistence.
5 They requested a change from personal use to subsistence.

6
7 MR. TAUBE: For the Chitina Subdistrict.

8
9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: For the Chitina
11 Subdistrict. Most of the Copper River Basin residents
12 would like them to remain personal use instead of
13 subsistence, because like Tom says they have a lower
14 priority that way.

15
16 MR. SHOWALTER: Oh, okay. That personal
17 use be for Fairbanks then.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, the personal use
20 would be for Fairbanks.

21
22 MR. SHOWALTER: Okay.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.

25
26 MR. TAUBE: And Gloria could correct me
27 if I'm wrong, but the rationale why the locals do not
28 want this subsistence put on there is that they do not
29 feel that the use, the history of that history, is not
30 the same as the local users. And it's -- you know, it's
31 been very offensive to the local users to be classified
32 in the same grouping as the urban, Anchorage, Fairbanks
33 users.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The local Copper Basin
36 residents feel that they are doing subsistence, and when
37 people travel from the urban areas, it shouldn't be
38 classed as subsistence. So that's -- so if we -- if
39 we're going to support -- if we haven't got any more
40 discussion on -- Bob.

41
42 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, this is exactly my
43 point on the action we took regarding the Kenai
44 Peninsula. Exactly the same thing. Here, you know, on
45 one hand we're saying, gosh, oh, golly, we don't have a
46 lot of empirical evidence of prior use, but we have some
47 anecdotal. Now we're sitting around where we have a lot
48 of empirical evidence on prior use. It wasn't me. Of
49 historical use going back to the 40s of Fairbanks and
50 Anchorage folks using this fishery and we're going to

1 say, no, no, in this case it's not subsistence. I think
2 -- it strikes me as talking out of both sides of our
3 mouth. And that's why I'm going to vote against this.

4
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob, I'm going to speak
6 to that at this point in time. If we take a look at the
7 difference between Federal regulations and State
8 regulations, State regulations say all residents are
9 qualified for subsistence, just because they're residents
10 of the State of Alaska.

11
12 MR. CHURCHILL: Right.

13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And the Federal
15 regulations say rural Alaskans. And basically what's
16 happening is the rural Alaskans under Federal law think
17 that they should be classed more as subsistence than the
18 urban residents.

19
20 MR. CHURCHILL: I understand all those
21 arguments. I just don't agree with them.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, I didn't say that
24 you did. Anyhow, with that -- Gloria.

25
26 MS. STICKWAN: A study was done by Bill
27 Simeon that showed two different uses between personal
28 use and subsistence use. It showed actual differences,
29 that we had a longer use as subsistence users and their
30 knowledge was gained through friends and families, ours
31 is through generations of passed down. There's a big --
32 there is a difference between personal use and
33 subsistence use.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria, can I ask a
36 question? Are you going to make sure that that study is
37 presented at the Board of Fish?

38
39 MS. STICKWAN: Well, maybe you guys could
40 help and put that in the letter, too.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, we can't put it in
43 the letter, because none of us have seen it, but I think
44 that would -- it would behove -- if you know where that
45 study is, it would behove you to make sure that that
46 study's presented at the Board of Fish, either from Ahtna
47 or some other group.

48
49 MS. STICKWAN: I think it will be. It
50 should be.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom.
2
3 MR. TAUBE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. That
4 report is part of what Subsistence Division provided at
5 the last Board of Fish meeting, and they are -- my
6 understanding is that Jim Fowler, Bill Simeon will
7 present the same thing, and their feeling is that there
8 hasn't been any change since that 2003 report. The State
9 obviously -- we're neutral on these things. It's up to
10 the Board to decide based upon the eight criteria. But
11 that report should be presented.
12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So we have a
14 resolution on the table. any more discussion on the
15 resolution.
16
17 MR. CHURCHILL: Call the question.
18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question's been
20 called. All in favor signify by saying aye.
21
22 IN UNISON: Aye.
23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
25 saying nay.
26
27 MR. CHURCHILL: Nay.
28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries.
30
31 Okay. Now, nomination for Council
32 members is open. If you guys -- and this doesn't mean
33 that we have to do anything at this point. This is an
34 informational thing. If you -- people know somebody who
35 should be or who would like to be or who might possibly
36 be willing to accept the nomination to this Council --
37 how many seats have we got coming open, Donald.
38
39 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We have
40 -- currently we have four members that would be expiring
41 in 2006, and those include James Showalter, Ralph Lohse,
42 Tom Carpenter and Harley McMahan. And if each individual
43 would like to reapply, let me know, or you can take an
44 application. We have some on the table. Or you can have
45 an agency or an individual nominate someone that is
46 interested in serving on the Council. Mr. Chair. And we
47 have applications on the table for those people that are
48 interested, or they can take them back to their community
49 or do some recruiting and this is a big program from
50 subsistence users, and we have a lot of great talent here

1 on this table.

2

3

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

4

5

6

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So this is for -- this
is nominations for the seats that will expire in 2006?

7

8

9

MR. MIKE: That's correct, sir. And the
closing date is January 3rd, 2006.

10

11

12

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: January 1st?

13

14

MR. MIKE: January 3rd, 2006.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

31

32

33

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Okay. And
the Board meeting is January the?

34

35

36

37

38

39

MR. MIKE: I don't have my calendar. Do
you? It's January 10th, 11th and 12th in Anchorage.

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

Future meeting plans. Turn to your last
page. You see a Regional Advisory Council meeting
window.

MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Donald.

1 MR. MIKE: The calendar on your page on
2 Page 239, that's the wrong calendar. That was from last
3 year's calendar. But in your blue folder you have a pink
4 sheet, and that shows the correct dates for our meeting
5 window in March for Southcentral Region. And they
6 selected -- last fall they selected the meeting to be in
7 Anchorage March 14th, 15th, and 16th. And you just need
8 to -- the Council just needs to verify those dates and
9 then select a fall 2006 meeting location and date.

10

11 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Which one --
14 Donald, which ones did you say you were involved in that
15 we -- so we can't have it at? Which ones can we overlap
16 and which ones can't we? Can we overlap any of these?
17 Oh, you've got Southcentral. I'm sorry, I didn't see it.
18 Southcentral.....

19

20 MR. MIKE: Okay. So this is for
21 winter.....

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:March 14th, 15th
24 and 16th down here in Anchorage.

25

26 MR. MIKE: Right. Winter 2006 meeting
27 windows. March 14, 15, and 16th in Anchorage. And what
28 the Council needs to do now is select a fall meeting date
29 for 2006.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anybody have any
32 objections to those days?

33

34 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What was the fall
35 one?

36

37 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chairman.

38

39 MR. MIKE: The Council have to select a
40 fall meeting date. You have to look at the calendar.
41 The only region we cannot overlap is the Southeast
42 Region. And I don't know when they -- does anybody know?

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So would you like us to
45 set our fall one right now?

46

47 MR. MIKE: If it's the wishes of the
48 Council, Mr. Chair.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The fall one would be

1 the back side of the pink page. We haven't decided that
2 yet either. Tom, did you have some advice?

3
4 MR. BOYD: Yeah, we would like for you to
5 target a fall date. It doesn't have to necessarily be so
6 firm that you can't back out of it next time, but it --
7 the reason we ask you to look that far ahead is it gives
8 my office some planning to look forward to as well, and
9 as we, you know, set up meetings. We'd kind of like be
10 able to plan further ahead than just the next six months.

11
12 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Does anybody on the
15 Council have any particular wishes or anything that
16 doesn't work on this fall one right here? It looks to me
17 like we could have either the 2nd, 3rd, or 4th, or 16th,
18 17th, or 18th.

19
20 MR. CHURCHILL: How about the 25th? How
21 about the 25th, the week of the 25th.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Of September?

24
25 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, let's see. Will I
28 be off the Council by that time so I can go caribou
29 hunting?

30
31 (Laughter)

32
33 MR. CHURCHILL: I'm thinking earlier in
34 the month. Moose hunting myself, but

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Caribou -- that's the
37 week I go caribou hunting, but that's okay. If you want
38 it on that week, if the rest of the Council wants it on
39 that week, we can have it on that week, but.....

40
41 MR. CHURCHILL: Well, what about the
42 previous week?

43
44 MR. ENCELEWSKI: What about October?

45
46 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can we go to
47 October?

48
49 MR. ENCELEWSKI: October would be better.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's awful hard to have
2 meetings in September, because there's.....
3
4 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah.
5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:there's silver
7 fishing, moose hunting, there's caribou hunter, berry
8 picking.
9
10 MR. CHURCHILL: The first week in
11 October.
12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The first week in
14 October, is that agreeable with everybody? Greg.
15
16 MR. ENCELEWSKI: I work that week, I'm
17 off the second week, but I can make arrangements with
18 somebody.
19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You're off the second
21 week. Are you on the third week?
22
23 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yes, I am.
24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, boy. Well, the
26 second.....
27
28 MR. CHURCHILL: Well, Greg's saying he
29 could probably make arrangements for that first week, so
30 why don't we target that.
31
32 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, if need be, I'd
33 work it out.
34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Let's target the
36 first week in October at this point in time. We can get
37 all our animals butchered by that time.
38
39 MS. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair, I just wanted
40 to encourage the Council for the fall meeting to consider
41 it on the Kenai Peninsula, because we'll be addressing at
42 that point the rural issues. It will actually be after
43 we've done an analysis and making some recommendation for
44 those communities that might or might not still change
45 their rural status.
46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That sounds good. Have
48 you got any -- let's see, we've been at this end of the
49 Kenai quite a bit. How about Seward or Cooper landing or
50 some place like that. tom.

1 MR. BOYD: Mr. Chair, looking at the
2 communities that we've identified for further review, the
3 Seward -- the Moose Pass area is certainly on the list as
4 well as the Clam Gulch and the -- I guess that's it. And
5 the Homer area. So it's all the way around, but if you
6 pick sort of a central place, it might be good for
7 everyone. But that's again your discretion.
8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, we need some place
10 that has the facilities to stay and.....
11
12 MR. CHURCHILL: Seward or Homer. We're
13 -- I don't have a problem with Homer that time of year.
14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I don't have a problem
16 with either one of them, so.....
17
18 MR. CHURCHILL: Do we want to shoot for
19 Homer?
20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, is that good for
22 everybody else?
23
24 MR. ENCELEWSKI: It's 10 miles closer for
25 me. It's good for me.
26
27 (Laughter)
28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, let's shoot for
30 Homer, and if we can't get Homer, let's shoot for Seward.
31 How does that sound. I don't know if there would be
32 facilities in Cooper Landing. Would there be?
33
34 MR. CHURCHILL: Well, the Princess ---
35 well, wait, that time of year, is the Princess -- it's
36 closed.
37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Well, let's shoot
39 for Homer, and if we can't find the facilities we need in
40 Homer, let's give Donald the okay to check Seward out. I
41 know with the Sealife Center and everything in Seward,
42 there ought to be facilities there.
43
44 James.
45
46 MR. SHOWALTER: Yes. Which date the
47 first week of October.
48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, I just took
50 for.....

1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 3rd, 4th and 5th.
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: 3rd, 4th and 5th.
4
5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Of October?
6
7 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah. We're good to go.
8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: 3rd, 4th and 5th. Okay.
10
11
12 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair.
13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Let's -- now, you
15 guys -- since you.....
16
17 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair.
18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes.
20
21 MR. MIKE: Sorry to disrupt your meeting
22 here, but the Southeast Regional Advisory Council is
23 meeting that week of October 2nd, and we share staff with
24 the Southeast Council. And I was just informed of their
25 meeting dates, so.....
26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So they've
28 already picked that week, Southeast.
29
30 MR. MIKE: Correct.
31
32 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How about the 10th
33 to the 12th of October?
34
35 MR. SHOWALTER: Sure, that's fine with
36 me.
37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Can we do the 10th
39 through the 12th?
40
41 MR. MIKE: We can do that, Mr. Chair.
42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We can do that. Okay.
44 We'll switch it to the 10th, 11th and 12th. That way you
45 don't have to change anything, Greg.
46
47 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah. If you could move
48 it one day, 11th, 12th and 13th would be the best.
49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If there's no problem

1 with that, that's acceptable to me. 11th, 12th and 13th.
2 Is there anybody else that has a problem with it?

3

4 MR. CHURCHILL: You might force me to
5 spend the weekend steelheading, but I'll suffer.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh.

8

9 (Laughter)

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You can't keep any, so
12 it's not subsistence. Okay.

13

14 MR. CHURCHILL: Statute of limitations
15 isn't even approaching that.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With that we have
18 picked a future time and location and a time and location
19 for the fall meeting. So our spring meeting is in
20 Anchorage, 14th, 15th, and 16th.

21

22 Okay. At this point in time, I am going
23 to read a letter into the minutes, and this was a request
24 by Bruce Cain, Native Village of Eyak. It's in response
25 to our action on Proposal 19.

26

27 It has come to my attention that the
28 Southcentral Subsistence Regional Advisory Council passed
29 FP06-19 at its Kenai meeting yesterday against Staff
30 recommendations. I strongly recommend that you bring
31 this action up for reconsideration and vote against it.

32

33 Our Staff was present at the meeting, but
34 not able to testify due to the rapid manner in which this
35 proposal was brought up for consideration and the short
36 deliberations. This is out of the ordinary for the
37 practice of the Council which normally allows plenty of
38 time for comment from the public and takes considerable
39 time in its deliberations.

40

41 I request that you have Donald Mike read
42 this into the record of the meeting, and, if you choose,
43 bring up this proposal for reconsideration using this
44 additional information.

45

46 This proposal requests that seasons,
47 harvest limits and possession limits for cutthroat trout,
48 rainbow trout, lake trout, Dolly Varden, whitefish and
49 grayling be identical to the Alaska sport fishing
50 regulations for these species in the waters of Prince

1 William Sound, except for those waters of the Copper
2 River drainage upstream of Haley Creek.

3

4 The reason the Native Village of Eyak
5 opposes this proposal and requests that you bring it up
6 for reconsideration are as follows:

7

8 Alaska sport fishing regulations
9 do not provide a priority for the
10 subsistence users as required under
11 Federal law.

12

13 Some areas are only catch and
14 release in the sport fish regulations,
15 other areas have restrictive size and
16 different bag limits.

17

18 C. While the proposal does not
19 specifically restrict gear types and
20 methods and means, they in effect do
21 restrict gear types. How can you catch
22 only one trout in a gillnet under the
23 ice.

24

25 D. The needs of subsistence
26 users are different and often at odds
27 with the needs of sport users, and the
28 conflict and diminishment of subsistence
29 opportunity of such a regulation now and
30 over time to meet the needs of
31 subsistence users is painfully obvious.

32

33 E. One stated reason given by a
34 Council member was that the State sport
35 fishing bag limits were more liberal than
36 the subsistence bag limits. This is not
37 true, and even if it was, the way to
38 address it is to amend the subsistence
39 bag limits if there is a requested need.
40 Do not make a blanket change based on
41 sport fishing limits.

42

43 Regulation -- 2. The regulation
44 is unduly restrictive. No one has
45 brought up a conservation concern. There
46 is no need to blanket restrict the
47 subsistence fishery in this way.

48

49 3. If there is a conservation
50 concern, restriction should be placed on

1 sport and commercial fisheries before
2 subsistence fisheries. If there is a
3 need to expand opportunity, it should be
4 done in response to a specific need and
5 request.
6

7 4. There is no need to address
8 bag limits or seasons at this time. If
9 there was, it should be done in
10 restriction and conversion of the entire
11 subsistence regulations. this is
12 unwarranted, uncalled for, and
13 circumvents the advisory process and is
14 totally out of line.
15

16 5. The Staff recommendation was
17 to oppose this proposal.
18

19 A. The Staff recommendation is
20 well-founded and well-researched. We
21 feel the Council needs to go over these
22 recommendations and ask more questions of
23 staff to better understand why they made
24 this recommendation.
25

26 B. The Native Village of Eyak
27 agrees with the Staff recommendation to
28 opposed this proposal for the reasons
29 given in the Staff analysis, and urges
30 the Council to evaluate this further.
31

32 6. This proposal will
33 unnecessarily limit the Federal manager's
34 ability to make adjustments for a
35 response to local needs as they come up.
36 And
37

38 7. The Native Village of Eyak
39 Traditional Council strongly recommends
40 that you reconsider this proposal and
41 vote it down.
42

43 Sincerely yours, Robert J. Henrichs.
44

45 Okay. It's read into the minutes. Does
46 anybody wish to put this proposal up for reconsideration
47 at this time.
48

49 (No comments)
50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none, the issue
2 is closed for this meeting.

3
4 With that.....

5
6 MR. CHURCHILL: Mr. Chairman.

7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

9
10 MR. CHURCHILL: Two items for the
11 pleasure of the Council. One, I was asked this year to
12 sit in on a cooperators meeting on muskox on the Seward
13 Peninsula, not in my capacity with either the RAC or the
14 Anchorage AC. But it was a fascinating discussion. If
15 the Council is interested, I can provide them with a
16 summary, because it's an interesting situation of they're
17 looking to increase harvest in a thoughtful way that
18 won't result in overrunning the local folks hunt. But do
19 to the nature of muskox and how social an animal they
20 are, they're causing some problems. Yet the animals that
21 are causing the problems, are in fact not high priority
22 for the folks in the villages to hunt. But it was a
23 fascinating meeting, and an awful lot got done, and a lot
24 of good will passed between all the user groups.

25
26 I was kind of the lone, not from the
27 Seward Peninsula guy to be asked, but if it's the
28 pleasure of the Council, I can put a summary together,
29 because it provided some very interesting dynamics.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do you mean put a
32 summary together for right now or for.....

33
34 MR. CHURCHILL: No, no, just.....

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No. Put a summary.....

37
38 MR. CHURCHILL:put something
39 together that -- believe me, I'm not going to hold us any
40 longer. Trust me.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think that that would
43 be very -- personally, I don't care if anybody wants to
44 see it, I personally would be very interested.

45
46 MR. CHURCHILL: There may be some
47 excellent hunt opportunities. The one piece of it that I
48 found fascinating, there's nine permits I think on the
49 Seward Peninsula for muskoxen, and Clifford Wiawana (ph)
50 who is the guide on that area said that when he had --

1 all nine animals were taken. I believe there were seven,
2 100 percent of the meet was taken by the hunters, and in
3 the remaining cases, some meat was left merely as a gift
4 to the village. But they said it was primarily a meat
5 hunt even though it was a permit draw. They thought it
6 would be a trophy hunt, and Clifford was saying it was
7 just the opposite, it was primarily a meat hunt from his
8 perspective.

9
10 The other thing I'd like to offer is I've
11 been noticeably absent. As kind of a lead-in, I'm the
12 head of my family clan, and we've had a lot of things
13 going on that have required my attendance in the Lower 48
14 and travel, and I apologize for my lack of involvement,
15 and missing the last meeting. It was just -- there were
16 other priorities, not that this didn't have a high
17 priority to me, but I really had no choice but to do what
18 I chose to do, but I still felt badly about not being
19 able to participate.

20
21 So with that, I offer the Chair and the
22 rest of the members my apologies.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Bob. Anybody
25 else have anything they'd like to add or say.

26
27 (No comments)

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If not, a motion for
30 adjournment is in order.

31
32 MR. CHURCHILL: So moved.

33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Meeting adjourned.

35
36 (Off record)

37
38 (Meeting adjourned)

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 328 through 477 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 27th day of October 2005, beginning at the hour of 9:00 o'clock a.m. in Kenai, Alaska;

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

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

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 6th day of November 2005.

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