

1 SOUTHCENTRAL FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE  
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

3  
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5  
6 VOLUME II

7  
8 Tazlina, Alaska  
9 October 8, 2008  
10 8:30 o'clock a.m.

11  
12  
13 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

14  
15 Ralph Lohse, Chairman  
16 Doug Blossom  
17 Greg Encelewski  
18 Robert Henrichs  
19 Chuck Lamb  
20 James Showalter  
21 Gloria Stickwan  
22 Willard Stockwell  
23 Dean Wilson  
24  
25  
26 Regional Council Coordinator, Maureen Clark (Acting)

27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43 Recorded and transcribed by:

44  
45  
46 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC  
47 700 W. 2nd Avenue  
48 Anchorage, AK 99501  
49 907-243-0668  
50 jpk@gci.net/sahile@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

(Tazlina, Alaska - 10/8/2008)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'd like to call the fall meeting of the Southcentral Alaska Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Council back in session. Okay. Good to see smiling faces floating around the table, ready for a day's work. Let's go to FP09-09.

MS. CLARK: Mr. Chairman. I have one quick announcement. We have one Council member, Chuck Lamb, who is hoping for a ride back to Anchorage this evening. If there's anybody who is driving back tonight and can offer a ride back to Anchorage, see Chuck. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Evidently Chuck is confident we'll be done by this evening. We had a paper from Ricky Gease I was going to read into the record on the last one we just did. However, we all had a copy of it to read, so I didn't think it was necessary. It basically corresponded to the action that we just took. If any of the rest of you would care to read his letter, it's here.

With that, we go on to FP09-09, presented by Steve.

MR. FRIED: Good morning. For the record, my name is Steven Fried. I'm a fishery biologist for the Office of Subsistence Management in Anchorage. This morning I'd like to summarize the draft Staff analysis for regulatory proposal FP09-09 that was submitted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. You can find that on Page 101 of your Council books.

This proposal requests that Cook Inlet Area regulations be modified to better define when and where fish need to be marked and the information entered on permits, to clarify the lower boundary for the Kasilof River fishing area, and to align permit due dates so only one permit could be used for both salmon and resident species in each drainage, in both the Kenai drainage and the Kasilof drainage.

You'll find the existing Federal

1 regulations that are relevant to this proposal on Pages  
2 101 and 102 and the proposed changes to these  
3 regulations on Pages 102 and 103. There's also a map  
4 showing the extent of Federal public waters in the  
5 Kenai River drainage on Page 105 and for the Kasilof  
6 River drainage on Page 106.

7  
8           The customary and traditional use  
9 determinations for the area covered by this proposal  
10 are for the Kenai River drainage, residents of Cooper  
11 Landing and Hope have a positive customary and  
12 traditional use determination for all fish and  
13 residents of Ninilchik have a positive customary and  
14 traditional use determination for salmon. In the  
15 Kasilof River drainage, residents of Ninilchik have  
16 positive customary and traditional use determinations  
17 for all fish. For the remainder of Cook Inlet, all  
18 Federally-qualified rural residents of the Cook Inlet  
19 area have a positive customary and traditional use  
20 determination for fish other than salmon, trout, Dolly  
21 Varden, char, grayling and burbot.

22  
23           The Council and Board considered  
24 fishery proposals for Cook Inlet in both 2007 and 2008  
25 and adopted regulations that allow for the current  
26 existing fisheries.

27  
28           Both the salmon populations and the  
29 resident species populations for the most part in both  
30 drainages are healthy. Harvests have also been  
31 generally within sustainable limits. The proponent is  
32 not requesting changes to any harvest limit.

33  
34           If this proposal is adopted, it would  
35 clarify existing Federal subsistence regulations  
36 concerning when and where harvested fishes must be  
37 recorded and marked, it would better describe the lower  
38 boundary of the Kasilof River fishing area and it would  
39 require that a return date be printed on fishing  
40 permits and this would reduce the amount of paperwork  
41 for  
42 subsistence users and management agencies since only  
43 one permit would be needed for all the fisheries in  
44 each of the drainages. The proposal would not affect  
45 fish populations or other uses.

46  
47           The preliminary OSM recommendation is  
48 to support this proposal since it would clarify Federal  
49 subsistence harvest regulations, simplify permit  
50 requirement, improve clarity and cut down on paperwork.

1                               That's generally what I've got to say  
2 on this short summary and that concludes my  
3 presentation. I'd be happy to answer any questions the  
4 Council members might have about it.

5  
6                               CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Steve. I  
7 was just looking at these and, like you said, it  
8 doesn't change anything like bag limits or fishing time  
9 or anything. The changes are all in dark on Pages 102  
10 and 103. Summarizing, it basically just says the fish  
11 have to be marked before leaving the site. It didn't  
12 change the boundary when it added 2.8 miles below the  
13 Tustumena Lake boat ramp, did it?

14  
15                              MR. FRIED: That's correct. It didn't  
16 change the boundary, it just better defined it by  
17 putting a mileage there instead of just saying Silver  
18 Salmon Rapids since there's some confusion on where  
19 that is.

20  
21                              CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. And there  
22 currently is no due date on the permit. We just said  
23 at the end of the fishing season. This means that you  
24 would put a specific due date on both permits or you'd  
25 actually make one permit out of two permits and put a  
26 specific due date.

27  
28                              MR. FRIED: That's correct. And it  
29 wouldn't change the 72-hour reporting requirement for  
30 dipnetting, but by allowing them to do that you  
31 wouldn't have a separate permit for the dipnet fishery  
32 for salmon and a rod and reel fishery for salmon and it  
33 would just simplify things by just one permit.

34  
35                              CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any  
36 questions for Steve.

37  
38                              (No comments)

39  
40                              CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Steve.  
41 Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

42  
43                              MR. PAPPAS: George Pappas, Department  
44 of Fish and Game. Starting with Proposal FP09-09. If  
45 you turn to Page 111 of the RAC book, I'll do my best  
46 to explain the Department's recommended modifications  
47 to OSM language.

48  
49                              The Department supports clarification  
50 of Federal regulations and better defining the

1 permitting and harvest recording requirements and  
2 fishery area boundaries represented by this proposal.  
3 Department comments do not indicate the Department  
4 supports the content of the regulations as a whole.  
5 Even though we do not agree fully with the content of  
6 these regulations, we do fully support development of  
7 clear, concise language and recommend the following  
8 modifications.

9  
10                   The Department's regulatory experts  
11 have submitted the following modifications to OSM  
12 recommending language for further clarification. If  
13 you look on Page 111, we'll start off with the first  
14 recommendation. You'll see the original proposed  
15 language which is from OSM and right below that  
16 modified language by the State.

17  
18                   Number one. The following requested  
19 modification is intended to help ensure that fish  
20 harvests are properly allocated to a specific gear type  
21 and location of subsistence fishery. These changes are  
22 needed because different limitations and requirements  
23 apply to different gear types and areas. The  
24 modification qualifies language regarding the fishing  
25 site to avoid misleading fishers into incorrectly  
26 believing that all shorelines adjacent to claimed  
27 Federal public waters can be fished from under Federal  
28 regulations. For example, fishing from State and  
29 private shorelines located outside of the Kenai Refuge  
30 boundaries alongside the upper Kasilof River is subject  
31 to state regulation.

32  
33                   You see the underlined language under  
34 modified recommended language by the State. We added  
35 by species, harvest site, and harvest method (such as  
36 dipnet or rod and reel), or switching to a different  
37 method of harvest.

38  
39                   If you look at the Federal regulations,  
40 the subsistence regulations for the Kenai/Kasilof, I  
41 believe it's not quite a dozen, but there are nine or  
42 ten different fisheries for two rivers there. In the  
43 general regulations for ponds and lakes, what have you,  
44 it can get confusing about which fishery you're  
45 participating in. At the end of the year when folks  
46 turn their subsistence permits in, where did the fish  
47 come from, where did the effort go, what type of gear  
48 type is being use. Just for proper management of the  
49 fisheries, that level of detail should be included so  
50 maybe adjustments in the future to distribute the

1 effort to improve or restrict or liberalize the  
2 different fisheries could be possible. If you end up  
3 with a permit that says we caught 300 rainbows and  
4 1,000 sockeye, where did they come from, what type of  
5 gear was being used.

6  
7                   There is some confusion, such as the  
8 Moose Range Meadows dipnet and rod and reel fishery and  
9 also rod and reel fishery and resident species fishery  
10 all in the same place. The subsistence users are going  
11 to have a hard time keeping track of that. But if the  
12 permits are clear and folks write down where they  
13 fished, what gear type they fished, it would enable the  
14 in-season managers to do a better job of figuring out  
15 any modifications in the future instead of just having  
16 a total number of fish harvested from the system.

17  
18                   The second modification is on Page 112  
19 under modified recommended language by State.  
20 Regulations experts recommended putting in the words in  
21 the vicinity of Silver Salmon Rapids instead of at  
22 Silver Salmon Rapids for clarity. There could be legal  
23 ramifications we've seen in other fisheries in the  
24 state. Sometimes if you move a sign 100 feet one way  
25 or the other, it could cause some concerns for  
26 enforcement, some concerns for tributaries, what have  
27 seen. This seems from a legal standpoint just to  
28 clarify it's in the vicinity of Silver Salmon Rapids.  
29 Several folks here have probably been there. It's a  
30 pretty big area. Where the rapids begin, where the  
31 midpoint is. Instead of saying at, it's better to say  
32 in the vicinity of.

33  
34                   The third recommended modification is  
35 to ensure that the due date listed on the permit is for  
36 the same year of the fishing season, while retaining  
37 the administrative benefits of one permit. You'll see  
38 that at Page 113 at the top. Our regulatory specialist  
39 recommended to say that year instead of end of the  
40 fishing season. Now we know that some of the fishing  
41 seasons overlap the winter time, but just for some  
42 clarity the recommendation from the State is to add  
43 that year. If the fishery ends that year, say April  
44 15th, that would just be more concise language to add  
45 in the regulations.

46  
47                   That's all I have, Mr. Chair.

48  
49                   Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
50 Preliminary Comments to the Regional Advisory Council

1 FP09-09 Clarify Kenai Peninsula Fishery  
2 Regulations

3

4 Introduction:

5

6 Proposal FP09-09 would streamline the  
7 federal subsistence fishery permitting process, improve  
8 enforceability of permit reporting requirements, and  
9 further define fishery regulatory boundary limits of  
10 the fisheries. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
11 (Department) proposes modifications of the proposal to  
12 better achieve this intent without creating new  
13 unintended ambiguities and conflicts.

14

15 Impact on Subsistence Users:

16

17 Adoption of this proposal will not  
18 likely have any significant impacts on federal  
19 subsistence users. It simply provides for streamlined  
20 processes likely eliminating the need for separate  
21 seasonal permits, while also providing clarification of  
22 regulatory requirements that should aid enforcement and  
23 help prevent unnecessary enforcement actions. The  
24 intent of proposal FP09-09 is to increase permitting  
25 efficiency and clarify regulations. The proposed  
26 changes, if accompanied by the modifications suggested  
27 below to avoid unintended conflicts and ambiguities in  
28 the proposal, should make it easier for federal  
29 subsistence users to obtain necessary permits, better  
30 understand the federal regulations, and avoid violating  
31 the law or being charged with a violation.

32

33 In particular, the provisions making it  
34 clear that harvests must be recorded on site should  
35 help prevent federal subsistence users from being cited  
36 while in possession of unmarked and/or unrecorded fish  
37 in areas outside of claimed federal jurisdiction or  
38 away from the fishery. With slight modification, the  
39 proposed physical definition of the federal subsistence  
40 fishery on the Kasilof River is a clearer specification  
41 of that claimed boundary, which should help federal  
42 subsistence users identify the physical limits of the  
43 fishery and avoid citation for illegal fishing in  
44 waters closed to federal subsistence fishing.

45

46 Opportunity Provided by State:

47

48 Kenai and Kasilof Rivers are located in  
49 the Anchorage-Mat-Su-Kenai Non-subsistence area  
50 designation under state law. The State provides a

1 broad array of opportunities to participate in personal  
2 use, sport, and educational fisheries in these rivers  
3 and nearby areas to meet needs for personal and family  
4 consumption as well as cultural purposes.

5

6

Conservation Issues:

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

Jurisdiction Issues: The Department requests detailed land status maps that distinctly illustrate land ownership, easements, and exact boundaries within which it is claimed federal regulations would apply and justification for claiming those boundaries. Portions of both the upper and lower Kenai and Kasilof rivers are bordered by state or private lands including areas within federal claims of jurisdiction. While standing on state and private lands (including state-owned submerged lands), persons must comply with state law and cannot harvest under conflicting federal regulations. Fishers need to be provided copies of these detailed maps and advised that the State will enforce its regulations on fishers standing on nonfederal land.

Recommendation:

Support with modification as follows for specific portions of the proposal modifications submitted by the Office of Subsistence Management:

1. The following requested modification under .27(i)(10)(ii) Cook Inlet Area is intended to help ensure that fish harvests are properly allocated to a specific gear type and location of subsistence fishery. These changes are needed because different limitations and requirements apply to different gear types and areas. The modification qualifies language

1 regarding the fishing site to avoid  
2 misleading fishers into incorrectly  
3 believing that all shorelines adjacent  
4 to claimed federal public waters can be  
5 fished from under federal regulations.  
6 For example, fishing from state and  
7 private shorelines located outside of  
8 the Kenai refuge boundaries alongside  
9 the upper Kasilof River is subject to  
10 state regulation.

11  
12 Original proposed language:

13  
14 ^U\_\_.27(i)(10) Cook Inlet Area.

15  
16 (ii) You may take fish by gear listed  
17 in this part unless restricted in this  
18 section or under the terms of  
19 subsistence fishing permit (as may be  
20 modified by this section). For all fish  
21 that must be marked and recorded on a  
22 permit in this section, they must be  
23 marked and recorded prior to leaving  
24 the fishing site. The fishing site  
25 includes the particular Federal public  
26 waters and/or adjacent shoreline from  
27 which the fish were harvested.

28  
29 Modified recommended language by State:

30  
31 ^U\_\_.27(i)(10) Cook Inlet Area.

32  
33 (ii) You may take fish by gear listed  
34 in this part unless restricted in this  
35 section or under the terms of  
36 subsistence fishing permit (as may be  
37 modified by this section). For all fish  
38 that must be marked and recorded on a  
39 permit in this section, they must be  
40 marked and recorded by species, harvest  
41 site, and harvest method (such as  
42 dipnet or rod and reel ), prior to  
43 leaving the fishing site or switching  
44 to a different method of harvest. The  
45 fishing site includes the particular  
46 Federal public waters and/or adjacent  
47 shoreline where allowed from which the  
48 fish were harvested.

49  
50 The following modification is intended

1 to assist users in locating the regulatory marker  
2 located approximately 2.8 miles below the boat ramp.

3

4

Original proposed language:

5

6

^U\_\_\_\_.27(i)(10) Cook Inlet Area.

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

Modified recommended language by State:

^U\_\_\_\_.27(i)(10) Cook Inlet Area.

(iv)(A) Residents of Ninilchik may take sockeye, Chinook, coho, and pink salmon through a dip net and a rod and reel fishery on the upper mainstem of the Kasilof River from a Federal regulatory marker on the river below the outlet of Tustumena Lake downstream to a marker on the river approximately 2.8 miles below the Tustumena Lake boat ramp in

1 the vicinity of Silver Salmon Rapids  
2 (strikeout at Silver Salmon Rapids).  
3 Residents using rod and reel gear may  
4 fish with up to 2 baited single or  
5 treble hooks. Other species  
6 incidentally caught during the dip net  
7 and rod and reel fishery may be  
8 retained for subsistence uses,  
9 including up to 200 rainbow/steelhead  
10 trout taken through August 15. After  
11 200 rainbow/steelhead trout have been  
12 taken in this fishery or after August  
13 15, all rainbow/steelhead trout must be  
14 released unless otherwise provided for  
15 in this section. Before leaving the  
16 fishing site, all retained fish must be  
17 recorded on the permit and marked by  
18 removing the dorsal fin. Harvests must  
19 be reported within 72 hours to the  
20 Federal fisheries manager upon leaving  
21 the fishing location.

22  
23 2. The following modification is  
24 intended to ensure that the due date  
25 listed on the permit is for the same  
26 year as the fishing season, while  
27 retaining the administrative benefits  
28 of one permit.

29  
30 Original proposed language:

31  
32 ^U\_\_\_.27(i)(10) Cook Inlet Area.

33  
34 (E) For Federally managed waters of the  
35 Kenai River and its tributaries, in  
36 addition to the dip net and rod and  
37 reel fisheries on the Kenai and Russian  
38 rivers described under paragraph  
39 (i)(10)(iv)(D) of this section,  
40 residents of Hope, Cooper Landing, and  
41 Ninilchik may take sockeye, Chinook,  
42 coho, pink, and chum salmon through a  
43 separate rod and reel fishery in the  
44 Kenai River drainage. Before leaving  
45 the fishing site, all retained fish  
46 must be recorded on the permit and  
47 marked by removing the dorsal fin.  
48 Permits must be returned to the Federal  
49 fisheries manager by the due date  
50 listed on the permit(strikeout at the

1 end of the fishing season).  
2 Incidentally caught fish, other than  
3 salmon, are subject to regulations  
4 found in paragraphs (i)(10) (iv)(F) and  
5 (G) of this section. Seasons, areas  
6 (including seasonal riverbank  
7 closures), harvest and possession  
8 limits, and methods and means  
9 (including motor boat restrictions) for  
10 take are the same as for the taking of  
11 these salmon species under State of  
12 Alaska fishing regulations (5 AAC 56, 5  
13 AAC 57 and 5 AAC 77.54), except for the  
14 following bag and possession limits:

15  
16 Modified recommended language by State:

17  
18 ^U\_\_\_\_.27(i)(10) Cook Inlet Area.

19  
20 (E) For Federally managed waters of the  
21 Kenai River and its tributaries, in  
22 addition to the dip net and rod and  
23 reel fisheries on the Kenai and Russian  
24 rivers described under paragraph  
25 (i)(10)(iv)(D) of this section,  
26 residents of Hope, Cooper Landing, and  
27 Ninilchik may take sockeye, Chinook,  
28 coho, pink, and chum salmon through a  
29 separate rod and reel fishery in the  
30 Kenai River drainage. Before leaving  
31 the fishing site, all retained fish  
32 must be recorded on the permit and  
33 marked by removing the dorsal fin.  
34 Permits must be returned to the Federal  
35 fisheries manager that year by the due  
36 date listed on the permit (strikeout at  
37 the end of the fishing season).  
38 Incidentally caught fish, other than  
39 salmon, are subject to regulations  
40 found in paragraphs (i)(10) (iv)(F) and  
41 (G) of this section. Seasons, areas  
42 (including seasonal riverbank  
43 closures), harvest and possession  
44 limits, and methods and means  
45 (including motor boat restrictions) for  
46 take are the same as for the taking of  
47 these salmon species under State of  
48 Alaska fishing regulations (5 AAC 56, 5  
49 AAC 57 and 5 AAC 77.54), except for the  
50 following bag and possession limits:

1                   The Department support for  
2 clarification of federal regulations and better  
3 defining the permitting and harvest recording  
4 requirements and fishery area boundaries represented by  
5 this proposal and Departmental comments does not  
6 indicate Departmental support for the content of the  
7 regulations as a whole. The past and present record,  
8 including requests for reconsideration still pending,  
9 documents the State objection to and concerns with many  
10 of the regulations.

11  
12                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: George, let's take a  
13 look at that last one for a second. If you had a due  
14 date -- and I'm thinking trapping regulations. You  
15 know, your trapping license extends from one year to  
16 the next, just like the winter ice fishing one would  
17 do. If you put a due date on the permit, it normally  
18 has the day, the month and year that it's due. Where  
19 if you put in it has to be that year by the due date,  
20 then a license that is issued in 2008 would have to be  
21 returned in 2008 by the due date. If you just have on  
22 there by the due date listed on the permit, you could  
23 say this permit that's going for the winter fishery is  
24 due on the 3rd of March, 2009. I'm just grabbing  
25 numbers off the top of my head.

26  
27                   I really like your other changes, but I  
28 can't see where they would ever put a due date on a  
29 permit that wouldn't have a year date already listed in  
30 it. I could see where that could cause a problem, just  
31 like with the trapping license, with something that  
32 extends from one year to the next.

33  
34                   MR. PAPPAS: Mr. Chair. For  
35 clarification, say the due date is January 15. Well,  
36 the permit would be due at some point in time in 2009.  
37 If the due date was -- I don't think this would happen,  
38 but if the due date was December 20th, then by this  
39 regulation it would be due sometime during that year,  
40 through the next five days of the year. This is just  
41 some clarification that the legal department came up  
42 with. I understand what you're saying, but I don't  
43 believe the intent of this regulation is to have the  
44 permit turned in the same year as issued. It would be  
45 due at some point in the year that the due date -- the  
46 year of the due date that is listed on the permit. But  
47 you do have a very good point because the due date does  
48 include the year.

49  
50                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. And it's due at

1 that time. They can't be due during that year. It's  
2 due the 15th of March, 2009, period. But I do like  
3 your other clarifications. That one I think is  
4 extraneous right there. I can't imagine them putting a  
5 due date on that doesn't contain a day and a year or at  
6 least a month and a year.

7  
8 Any other questions for George. Do you  
9 see any problems if that was left out?

10  
11 MR. PAPPAS: Once again, this is just  
12 recommended clarification. I couldn't determine any  
13 challenges if it was left out. Yesterday, the request  
14 for the written language, if that was proposed, it's  
15 right here so there's no confusion.

16  
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions  
18 for George.

19  
20 (No comments)

21  
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, George.  
23 Are there any Federal, State or Tribal Agencies that  
24 wish to speak to this proposal.

25  
26 (No comments)

27  
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none. We go  
29 on to InterAgency Staff Committee comments.

30  
31 MR. BERG: Good morning, members of the  
32 Council. Mr. Chair. Jerry Berg with Fish and Wildlife  
33 Service. We had some discussions about some of the  
34 State's suggested modifications during our Staff  
35 Committee meeting. I just wanted to let the Council  
36 know the way we designed these permits for their first  
37 modifications, we do already include columns for people  
38 to record species, site of harvest, where they  
39 harvested, methods. So our permit provisions already  
40 allow us the authority to include that information on  
41 the permit without putting it in regulation. So we've  
42 included that information on the permit already.

43  
44 Now whether they need to record all  
45 that information before they switch to another method,  
46 we don't have that on the permit. I'm not sure what  
47 that would really serve. There's really only two gear  
48 types, dipnet and rod and reel. If you were to switch  
49 from one to the other and you're supposed to record  
50 what gear type you caught your fish with, you would

1 have to record how many fish you caught with one gear  
2 type versus the other. Trying to record that before  
3 you switch to the other gear type, I'm not sure how  
4 much that would add.

5  
6 As far as the next change suggested by  
7 the State to include the vicinity of Silver Salmon  
8 Rapids. My understanding is there was some confusion  
9 over -- there's a couple different maps available out  
10 there and one map showed Silver Salmon Rapids in one  
11 place and our map showed it in a different place, so  
12 there was some confusion and that's why we took it out  
13 of the regulation all together and just put a mile  
14 marker. We also have our markers on the river that  
15 tell people exactly where that boundary is. So we  
16 thought it was best to just leave Silver Salmon Rapids  
17 out of the regulation all together because there was  
18 some confusion over a couple of maps that exist that  
19 are out there. They're not out maps. They're some  
20 maps somebody else put together.

21  
22 Then regarding the permit, it would be  
23 beneficial to go to just one permit. Right now, the  
24 end of the salmon season -- well, the coho season is  
25 the end of October, I believe, or end of November now  
26 and so our permits are due by December 15th for salmon,  
27 but for resident species it goes to the end of the  
28 regulatory year, March 31st. If we were to combine  
29 them into one permit to make it easier for everybody,  
30 then we could just say by the end of whenever the due  
31 date is listed on the permit and combine them into one  
32 permit and then it would span two different years, but  
33 it would still be due by -- I think it's April 15th.  
34 So that was our rationale there.

35  
36 That's it. If you have any questions,  
37 I'll be happy to try to answer them. Thanks.

38  
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Jerry, I have one  
40 question because you did bring up something there. If  
41 you have one permit, would there be any benefit from a  
42 management standpoint to have your report in on salmon  
43 at the end of that year? Say if you take it to the end  
44 of the freshwater species, which is March 15th or  
45 something like that, you're not going to get your  
46 permit back in until like April 15th. By that time  
47 salmon season for the next year is almost started  
48 again. I don't know if that has any affect on  
49 management decisions. You'd still have the facts in  
50 front of you before the season started so that you'd

1 know what to look for, but you wouldn't have as much  
2 time to respond. Do you feel that that would be  
3 sufficient time for the managers to see if there was  
4 any problem areas or anything like that?

5  
6 MR. BERG: I think so because if you  
7 harvest fish under the household limits, you're  
8 required to report those fish within 72 hours. Most of  
9 the harvest is reported in-season, but if you double  
10 your bag limit with rod and reel, you do not have to  
11 report those in-season, although some people do. So  
12 there certainly are some fish that are harvested under  
13 the double bag limits that are not reported. We don't  
14 know those until the end of the season, but the  
15 majority of the harvest, the reports that Doug  
16 presented to you yesterday, a lot of that information  
17 was reported in-season. So we're getting a lot of that  
18 information already.

19  
20 If you backed up the date until April,  
21 would people forget about their salmon harvest? We may  
22 just decide to keep a salmon permit and a resident  
23 species permit. I don't really know at this point.  
24 But by just putting it on the due date listed, that  
25 gives us the flexibility to go either way. The thought  
26 behind it was we may want to go to a single permit  
27 eventually because there's been very little resident  
28 species harvest. So by just doing it all on one permit  
29 it would make it simpler. That was kind of the thought  
30 behind it.

31  
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, I know as a  
33 user, the less permits you have to keep track of and  
34 the less dates you have to keep track of when to send  
35 them in, the less times you're going to forget to send  
36 in your permit. So, from that standpoint, one is good.  
37 I was just wondering if there was any consideration  
38 given to salmon management by having permits com in  
39 that late, but if most of the data is coming in on 72-  
40 hour reporting, any major problems would be spotted in  
41 plenty of time to react for the next year or even for  
42 that year itself.

43  
44 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Ralph, can I make a  
45 comment.

46  
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Greg.

48  
49 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Jerry, I've just got a  
50 comment or question I guess it is. I understand trying

1 to clarify all this, but in clarifying it we maybe make  
2 it very complicated for the user. Like Ralph has  
3 stated, the less reports, the less encumbrance it is,  
4 the better off for the subsistence users. Very simple,  
5 very plain and as long as it follows the law. I mean I  
6 for one, even on a moose permit, I think I'll go on the  
7 late hunt, you know, I'll keep it a while and forget to  
8 turn it in. I mean the simpler we can make it, the  
9 easier.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bill.

12

13 MR. STOCKWELL: Thank you, Mr.  
14 Chairman. Listing the species harvest and all that in  
15 regulation, you said you already have that on the  
16 permit. Is there some reason it shouldn't be in  
17 regulation? You said it's not necessary. My question  
18 is why wouldn't we do what the State requested?

19

20 MR. BERG: Since we're already putting  
21 it on the permit, I guess it doesn't hurt to put it in  
22 regulation as well. It just makes more regulations  
23 that are out there. If for some reason we wanted to  
24 not collect that information sometime in the future,  
25 we'd have to go through another proposal cycle to  
26 address it at that point. I can't foresee that at this  
27 point, but by putting it in regulation then you just  
28 end up with more complicated regulations. We do have  
29 the authority to go either way as the current  
30 regulations are under the permit provisions.

31

32 MR. STOCKWELL: My comment would be  
33 that if it's in regulation, then people who are  
34 interested in applying for a permit would know what  
35 they would be applying for if it's in the regulation  
36 before they got their permit. If it's in regulation,  
37 then they can read the regulations the way it is. That  
38 information wouldn't necessarily be available to  
39 everybody. Thank you.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pete.

42

43 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair. Mr.  
44 Stockwell. I think it's important to understand a  
45 subsistence permitting process. One, you want to  
46 provide flexibility in season for the in-season manager  
47 to manage the fishery and make adjustments according to  
48 the type of fishery, et cetera. So we have to be  
49 cautious how much we put into regulation because then  
50 you get into the concern Mr. Berg laid out that if we

1 get too stringent in the regulation versus the  
2 flexibility in the permit, then before we can make any  
3 changes, i.e. in season, we have to come back to the  
4 regulatory process to make the change in the book.

5  
6 What appears on the permit, what's  
7 listed, in effect becomes a regulation. The person  
8 holding a permit has to follow that. Mr. Chair.

9  
10 MR. STOCKWELL: Thank you.

11  
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Pete. Any  
13 other questions for Jerry or Pete.

14  
15 (No comments)

16  
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Jerry.  
18 Fish and Game Advisory Committee comments. Mike, you  
19 got some.

20  
21 MR. CRAWFORD: Quick and easy. Mike  
22 Crawford, Kenai/Soldotna A.C. We were in support of  
23 this as long as we kept in mind let's keep the permits  
24 simple, make the regulations easy to understand so  
25 people aren't in violation because of misunderstanding.  
26 We're all for putting a sign and a mile marker at the  
27 Silver Salmon Rapids location and maybe that should be  
28 in some type of regulation. Let's put a sign and a  
29 distance from a set site so there's not  
30 misunderstandings. Well, I thought that was Silver  
31 Salmon Rapids or I thought this was Hong Kong Bend or I  
32 thought this was there. Just anything to make it where  
33 people don't violate rules due to not understanding the  
34 regulations or local names of places. Just make it  
35 easy. That was it.

36  
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Mike. I  
38 agree with you 100 percent on that. If somebody is  
39 violating, you want them to know that they're violating  
40 and they're doing it on purpose so you can give them a  
41 ticket. You don't want somebody to say I didn't know.

42  
43 MR. CRAWFORD: If you're doing  
44 everything you can to follow the rules, it should be  
45 easy.

46  
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Any questions  
48 for Mike.

49  
50 (No comments)

1                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Summary of  
2 written public comments. Do we have any?

3  
4                   MS. CLARK: Mr. Chairman. We have one  
5 from the Kenai River Sportsfishing Association. This  
6 proposal seeks to address ambiguity in the regulatory  
7 language regarding reporting requirements, clarify  
8 management area boundaries, and adjust the reporting  
9 dates.

10  
11                   Specifically the proposals state:

12  
13                   1. The reporting and recording  
14 requirements are worded in a way that makes it  
15 difficult for officers to enforce the regulations as  
16 currently written.

17  
18                   2. The lower boundary limit on the  
19 Kasilof River will not change but there has been  
20 confusion because of different maps available that show  
21 Silver Salmon Rapids at different locations.

22  
23                   3. The permit due dates need to be  
24 aligned so that only one permit is needed for salmon  
25 and one for resident species. The season ends dates are  
26 different for the dip net season versus the rod and  
27 reel fishing season which would require multiple  
28 permits for the same species caught with different gear  
29 types.

30  
31                   We believe these changes help clarify  
32 implementation of the existing fisheries and would  
33 adjust Federal regulations following Alaska Board of  
34 Fisheries actions. We view these changes as  
35 principally housekeeping and therefore recommend the  
36 Board pass them.

37  
38                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have any public  
39 testimony on this.

40  
41                   (No comments)

42  
43                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We don't. So at this  
44 point in time a motion from the Council to put this on  
45 the table so that we can discuss it is in order, FP09-  
46 09.

47  
48                   MR. ENCELEWSKI: Mr. Chairman. I move  
49 to put FP09-09 on the table.

50

1 MR. SHOWALTER: Second.  
2  
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and  
4 seconded to put FP09-09 on the table. Discussion,  
5 modification, amendments, justification, deliberation,  
6 whatever the Council wishes to do at this point in  
7 time. Mr. Henrichs.  
8  
9 MR. HENRICHS: You know, I'm just  
10 curious. I'm a commercial fisherman and when they  
11 announce openings they give you lat and long to mark  
12 the areas that are open. Let me tell you, if they  
13 catch you over the line there is no mercy. I wonder  
14 about if there is confusion about where certain areas  
15 are why they don't give lat and long there because  
16 everybody is running around with a GPS now.  
17  
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Not you, huh, Bill?  
19  
20 MR. STOCKWELL: Mr. Chairman. I do not  
21 have a GPS in my drift boat.  
22  
23 (Laughter)  
24  
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That is interesting.  
26 That would be a further clarification. I wouldn't  
27 expect them to -- if they have a sign on the bank --  
28 and by the way, Bill, I mean Mr. Henrichs, if Fish and  
29 Game has a sign and they have a lat/long, the sign  
30 takes precedent over lat/long because their signs don't  
31 always correspond with their lat/longs. Mr. Henrichs.  
32  
33 MR. HENRICHS: The only problem with  
34 that is I have seen these signs kind of move down the  
35 beach at times.  
36  
37 (Laughter)  
38  
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: James.  
40  
41 MR. SHOWALTER: Yes. I feel on this  
42 permitting system, the less permits the better and you  
43 don't have the confusion over it. I'm sure they read  
44 the permit when they're issued, so hopefully there is  
45 no misunderstanding on the due date.  
46  
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, James. Go  
48 ahead, Doug.  
49  
50 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chair. I'm going to

1 be in support of this as written by the Federal Staff.  
2 I see no problem. It's simple and the State  
3 modifications really don't make it any simpler.

4

5 MR. ENCELEWSKI: I agree.

6

7 MR. WILSON: Question.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been  
10 called. FP09-09 as written on Page 102 and 103, as  
11 modified by the OSM Staff. Is that what everybody is  
12 looking at.

13

14 (Council nods affirmatively)

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All in favor signify  
17 by saying aye.

18

19 IN UNISON: Aye.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by  
22 saying nay.

23

24 (No opposing votes)

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. With  
27 that, we go on to the next one, FP09-10 submitted by  
28 Fish and Wildlife Service. Steve.

29

30 MR. FRIED: Yes, I'm back again. For  
31 the record, I'm Steven Fried. I work as a fishery  
32 biologist in the Office of Subsistence Management and  
33 I'll summarize the draft Staff analysis for regulatory  
34 proposal FP09-10 that was submitted by the U.S. Fish  
35 and Wildlife Service and can be found on Page 116 of  
36 your Council books.

37

38 The proposal requests that Cook Inlet  
39 area regulations be modified so that they are aligned  
40 with changes made to State regulations by the Alaska  
41 Board of Fisheries in February 2008  
42 concerning the slot size limit for early-run Chinook  
43 salmon in the Kenai River and daily harvest and  
44 possession limits for lake trout in Hidden Lake.

45

46 You'll find the existing Federal  
47 regulations relevant to the proposal on Page 116 of  
48 your Council books, the proposed changes to these  
49 regulations on Pages 116 and 117 and existing State  
50 regulation on Page 117. There's also a map on Page 118

1 that shows the extent of Federal public waters in the  
2 Kenai River drainage.

3  
4 I'll just remind you that customary and  
5 traditional use determinations for the Kenai River  
6 drainage have been made for residents of Cooper Landing  
7 and Hope for all fish and for residents of Ninilchik  
8 for salmon only.

9  
10 First, for the early run chinook salmon  
11 the slot size regulation was placed into effect to try  
12 to reverse a declining trend in abundance in older,  
13 larger, early run chinook salmon. These would be  
14 primarily age 7, fish that spent five years in the  
15 ocean, two years in fresh water. Both State and  
16 Federal regulations now specify a slot size to protect  
17 this age class. The slot size limit regulation was  
18 first adopted by the State in 2003 and it only allowed  
19 retention of early-run chinook salmon less than 44  
20 inches or greater than 55 inches in length. The slot  
21 size limit was in place until July 1 downstream of the  
22 Soldotna Bridge and until July 15th upstream of the  
23 bridge.

24  
25 The State's 2003 slot limit regulation  
26 was initially incorporated into Federal subsistence  
27 regulations by reference and then it was specifically  
28 included in Federal regulations in 2007. As I  
29 mentioned before, in 2008 the Alaska Board of Fisheries  
30 changed the slot limit to allow retention of early-run  
31 chinook salmon less than 46 inches or greater than 55  
32 inches. So that lower limit was changed by two inches.  
33 The proposal before you would align the Federal slot  
34 limit with the new State slot limit.

35  
36 Also in 2008 Alaska Board of Fisheries  
37 adopted a regulations allowing sport angler the  
38 opportunity to increase their harvest of small male  
39 early-run chinook salmon, often called jacks. In this  
40 State regulation, harvested chinook salmon less than 20  
41 inches long are no longer counted as part of an  
42 individual chinook salmon annual harvest limit and the  
43 proposal before you would not incorporate this change  
44 into Federal subsistence regulations, but chinook  
45 salmon less than 28 inches long are rarely caught by  
46 fishermen.

47  
48 The escapements of early run chinook  
49 salmon during '96 to 2007 have been within or above the  
50 optimal escapement goal range of 5,300 to 9,000 Chinook

1 salmon and you can take a look at Table 1 on Page 122  
2 to see this information. A sustainable harvest level  
3 for the early run is about 8,000 chinook salmon and the  
4 sport fishery does not always harvest the entire  
5 surplus that's available.

6  
7 Federally-qualified subsistence fishers  
8 did not report any harvest of chinook salmon from the  
9 Kenai River drainage during 2007 or 2008 either, but  
10 you do have the information in front of you in case I'm  
11 in error on that one. I think there were two caught in  
12 the Kasilof.

13  
14 Moving on to lake trout. Lake trout  
15 are a long-lived, slow growing and have a well-  
16 documented of over exploitation. It should probably be  
17 harvested at an exploitation rate of no greater than  
18 about 10 percent. The State bag limit for lake trout  
19 in the Kenai River drainage was 10 through 1996. It  
20 was reduced to two of any size in Hidden Lake and two  
21 over 20 inches in the remainder of the drainage in 1997  
22 due to signs the population was being over-exploited.

23  
24 For Hidden Lake, the estimated  
25 sustainable yield potential is probably about 400 lake  
26 trout per year and this suggests the population was  
27 heavily over-exploited in past years and probably  
28 hasn't recovered yet. You could take a look at Figure  
29 1 on Page 123 which shows the sport fishing effort and  
30 harvest for Hidden Lake lake trout during 1977 to 2006  
31 and Table 3 shows harvest throughout the Kenai River  
32 drainage for the same years.

33  
34 Federally-qualified subsistence fishers  
35 did not report any harvest of lake trout from the Kenai  
36 River drainage during 2007 and I don't think there's  
37 been a report of any harvest in 2008 up to this point  
38 in time.

39  
40 If adopted, the proposal would be  
41 consistent with recently adopted State regulatory  
42 changes for early-run chinook salmon that seek to  
43 conserve the seven-year-olds and it would allow  
44 Federally-qualified subsistence users to harvest a  
45 slightly larger early-run chinook salmon within the  
46 lower range of the slot limit.

47  
48 The proposal would also be consistent  
49 with recently adopted State regulatory changes for lake  
50 trout in Hidden Lake that reduced harvest limits to

1 help rebuild the lake trout population, but it would  
2 still allow Federally-qualified subsistence fishers the  
3 opportunity to harvest twice as many as sport anglers  
4 are allowed.

5  
6 The preliminary OSM recommendation is  
7 to support this proposal for the following reasons.  
8 The proposed changes would maintain the intent of  
9 current Federal regulations when the Board adopted them  
10 in May 2007. It would realign early-run  
11 chinook salmon slot size limits with recently adopted  
12 changes to State regulations, and this would allow as I  
13 mentioned before Federally-qualified subsistence  
14 fishers the opportunity to harvest slightly larger  
15 chinook salmon within the lower range of the slot  
16 limit.

17  
18 The proposed changes would set daily  
19 harvest limits for lake trout in Hidden Lake at a level  
20 twice that now allowed for sport anglers, which would  
21 maintain that same ratio. And the proposed changes  
22 should provide for sustainable fisheries by  
23 conserving age-7, early-run chinook salmon in the Kenai  
24 River, a major component of a run that is being  
25 rebuilt. It would also reduce exploitation on the lake  
26 trout population in Hidden Lake, a population that has  
27 been over-exploited and has probably not yet recovered.

28  
29  
30 Mr. Chair, that concludes my  
31 presentation. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

32  
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Doug.

34  
35 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chair. Mr. Fried.  
36 Way back in the start you talked about the State  
37 changed the jack salmon size. Why didn't we do it with  
38 the Federal subsistence?

39  
40 MR. FRIED: Oh, you mean the changes  
41 that were made in 2008 by the Board?

42  
43 MR. BLOSSOM: Yes.

44  
45 MR. FRIED: I think it was an attempt  
46 to keep the regulation simple. Nobody thought there  
47 was going to be very many fish of that size class being  
48 caught. To date, there haven't been any chinook  
49 harvested in the Kenai River by Federal subsistence  
50 fishermen for the most part.

1 MR. BLOSSOM: I guess just for  
2 simplicity we should just mirror the State's size and  
3 go along with that. I don't see what that would hurt.  
4 It would be a plus, not a minus.

5  
6 MR. FRIED: That's certainly under your  
7 purview and the Board's purview. We had some  
8 discussions about that and this is what we came up  
9 with.

10  
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Steve. If  
12 I read this right, for simplification, basically this  
13 increases the opportunity for chinook and decreases the  
14 opportunity for lake trout.

15  
16 MR. FRIED: That would be correct.

17  
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's kind of  
19 interesting to me though that -- I'm trying to see the  
20 logical justification behind -- if you're trying to  
21 preserve seven year old fish and the idea is to try to  
22 increase that component, why would you add the  
23 opportunity to take more of them? I mean I'm trying to  
24 figure out what the State's logic was to go from 44  
25 inches to 46, which increases the exploitation of the  
26 very fish they're trying to preserve. Not that I'm  
27 against it. I'm just trying to see the logic behind  
28 it. If this proposal as written increases the  
29 opportunity for subsistence users to take -- I mean by  
30 being able to go from 44 to 46 inches, that's possibly  
31 one less fish you have to throw back, so that increases  
32 the opportunity on chinook and decreases the  
33 opportunity on lake trout, neither of which seem to  
34 being used much at this point in time.

35  
36 MR. FRIED: I'm sure the State might  
37 have a better answer. I'm assuming that they've based  
38 that on some analysis of size at age composition. It's  
39 just two inches, but I'm assuming that was based on  
40 some data they had.

41  
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Or the complaints of  
43 too many people that had to throw back 45 inches.

44  
45 (Laughter)

46  
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Thank you. Any  
48 other questions for Steve.

49  
50 (No comments)

1                           CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Alaska  
2 Department of Fish and Game.

3  
4                           MR. PAPPAS: Mr. Chair. George Pappas,  
5 Department of Fish and Game. I'll do my best not to  
6 get too complicated with the king slot limits and what  
7 have you. It's a very complicated issue. A lot of  
8 effort went into it, so I'll do my best to keep it  
9 simple.

10  
11                           Department comments begin in Page 128.  
12 The Department supports the intent of the proposed  
13 modification of the early-run Kenai River Chinook  
14 salmon slot limit in the federal subsistence rod and  
15 reel fishery. Conversely, the Department does not  
16 support maintenance of the liberal Federal subsistence  
17 fishery early-run chinook salmon daily/annual harvest  
18 limit of two fish per person. The Department strongly  
19 requests the Regional Advisory Council and Board to  
20 consider taking a  
21 conservative approach that mirrors the Alaska Board of  
22 Fisheries by adopting the one fish daily harvest limit.

23  
24  
25                           According to the OSM analysis, no  
26 chinook salmon have been harvested to date in the Kenai  
27 River drainage by Federal subsistence users, therefore  
28 such a change should have little or no effect on  
29 Federally-qualified subsistence users if a more  
30 conservative bag limit was adopted.

31  
32                           Before moving on to the next issue,  
33 slot limit wise, yes, it was liberalized on the lower  
34 end. The analysis showed a small percentage of age  
35 seven ocean fish would be exposed to harvest, but  
36 conversely on the tributaries where the early run fish  
37 go to in the Kenai, the tributary sanctuary is where  
38 they mill were closed for the year. So there was  
39 liberalization on one end, but a restriction on the  
40 other end to potentially get larger fish into the river  
41 system.

42  
43                           The 28-inch rule, they're not all  
44 jacks, so it could be two ocean fish. There's  
45 liberalization of early run to allow the harvest of a  
46 28-inch fish and it wouldn't go on your tag or apply  
47 toward your annual limit, but you'd have to put your  
48 rod up for the day. So it was a way of targeting some  
49 of the smaller fish that people were tossing back,  
50 allowing folks to throw a little bit of meat on the

1 grill at night, but you'd be done fishing for the day.  
2 It's a tough call. If you're out fishing for an eight-  
3 hour day and you catch a fish 20 minutes in and 95  
4 percent of the people were tossing those small fish  
5 back. Well, if you catch a small one, go home, eat it  
6 and come back the next day, that will increase some  
7 exploitation on part of the run that folks weren't  
8 really retaining.

9

10 Moving on to the next issue. Because  
11 of over-exploitation concerns, the Alaska Board of  
12 Fisheries recently reduced the State bag limit for lake  
13 trout in Hidden Lake from two fish of any size to one  
14 fish of any size. The  
15 Department recommends that the Federal Board adopt a  
16 corresponding reduction to two lake trout harvest  
17 limit. In addition, the Department recommends placing  
18 a maximum size restriction of 20-inch length for one of  
19 the two lake trout for conservation purposes. A lot of  
20 folks have realized that lake trout in Hidden Lake are  
21 becoming smaller and I'm not sure if effort has been  
22 the same or increasing, but I think the harvest has  
23 been reducing.

24

25 MR. PAWLUK: Effort has been  
26 decreasing.

27

28 MR. PAPPAS: The Department is very  
29 concerned that without good stock assessment  
30 information and reporting excessive harvest may not be  
31 detected in time. Everybody knows lake trout are  
32 long-lived, slow-growing and it takes many, many years  
33 to rebuild populations.

34

35 The Department agrees with the OSM  
36 analysis to reduce the harvest limit overall, but the  
37 Department definitely recommends to have maybe a size  
38 limit on the second fish if folks are interested in  
39 harvesting two fish.

40

41 So, in review, the Department supports  
42 the slot limit liberalization of early-run chinook  
43 salmon fishery, but requests a modification from two  
44 fish to one fish per day and also supports the  
45 restriction of the harvest limits in Hidden Lake down  
46 to two fish daily, but requests only one of them be --  
47 the second fish be under 20 inch in length.

48

49 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

50

1 Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
2 Preliminary Comments to the Regional Advisory Council  
3  
4 FP09-10 Modify Kenai River Chinook and  
5 Hidden Lake Lake Trout Harvest Limits  
6

7 Introduction:  
8

9 Proposal FP09-10 is intended to reflect  
10 and correspond to the Alaska Board of Fisheries  
11 regulatory changes made in February 2008. It proposes  
12 the following specific changes:  
13

14 1. Reduce the slot limit for Kenai  
15 River early-run Chinook salmon from  
16 44 -55 in length to 46 -55 in length.  
17 This will allow retention of any fish  
18 that are less than 46 in length or  
19 greater than 55 in length, thus  
20 increasing opportunity of retaining  
21 Chinook salmon.  
22

23 2. Reduce the federal subsistence  
24 daily bag and possession limit for  
25 Hidden Lake lake trout from 4 fish per  
26 day of any size down to two fish per  
27 day of any size. (Note: The new State  
28 limit is one fish per day, which is  
29 half the proposed federal limit).  
30

31 Impact on Subsistence Users:  
32

33 The Kenai River slot limit reduction  
34 will provide additional opportunity to harvest early-  
35 run Chinook salmon. Decreasing the Hidden Lake lake  
36 trout daily harvest limit from four fish per day to two  
37 fish per day will reduce the amount of fish a federal  
38 subsistence user can harvest on a daily basis.  
39

40 Opportunity Provided by State:  
41

42 The Kenai and Kasilof Rivers are  
43 located in the Anchorage-Mat-Su-Kenai Non-subsistence  
44 area designation under state law. The State provides a  
45 broad array of personal use, sport, and educational  
46 fisheries in these areas to meet needs for personal and  
47 family consumption as well as cultural purposes.  
48 Adequate opportunities for harvest of lake trout and  
49 Arctic char/Dolly Varden presently occur under State  
50 sport fishing regulations.

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

Conservation Issues:

1. The early-run Kenai River Chinook salmon stock is currently considered healthy and is managed for sustainability through a myriad of conservative regulations developed by the State over decades of managing the stock. The extensive list of restrictions placed upon the sport fishery is credited for the current sustainable stock level. The sport fishery is presently managed by using a combination of: (1) a slot limit that prohibits harvest of early-run Chinook salmon between 46 inches and 55 inches in length to protect seven-year-old spawners and help preserve genetic characteristics and diversity of the Kenai River Chinook salmon stocks and (2) a daily bag limit of one such fish, and a two-fish annual limit (excluding fish less than 28 inches in length before June 30). The Alaska Department of Fish and Game (Department) supports the federal staff recommendation to mirror the Alaska Board of Fisheries February 2008 decision to reduce the early-run Kenai River Chinook salmon slot limit from 44 -55 to 46 -55 in length. The Alaska Board of Fisheries reviewed all available data and the Department analysis of this issue and determined slightly liberalizing the sport fishery by adjusting the slot limit was appropriate. This slight liberalization of the fishery is in response to providing opportunity to harvest available fish which have been determined to be in surplus of established escapement goals.

Although the Department supports the intent of the proposed modification of the early-run Kenai River Chinook salmon slot limit in the federal subsistence rod and reel fishery, the Department does not support maintenance of the liberal federal subsistence fishery early-run Chinook salmon daily/annual harvest limit of two fish per person, which will be easier to achieve with the reduced slot

1 limit and which could create conservation concerns if  
2 widely utilized. The Department strongly requests the  
3 Federal Subsistence Board (Federal Board) to consider  
4 all the information previously submitted to the Federal  
5 Board and take a conservative approach that mirrors the  
6 Alaska Board of Fisheries by adopting the one fish  
7 daily harvest limit. This action would be consistent  
8 with the proponent s stated intent to adopt changes  
9 corresponding to those in the State regulation.

10

11 2. Because of over-exploitation  
12 concerns, the Alaska Board of Fisheries  
13 recently reduced the State bag limit  
14 for lake trout in Hidden Lake to one  
15 (from two) fish of any size. The  
16 Department recommends that the Federal  
17 Board adopt a corresponding reduction  
18 to two (from four) lake trout as the  
19 harvest limit and place a maximum size  
20 restriction of 20 in length for one of  
21 the two lake trout. Little is known  
22 about lake trout population sizes and  
23 appropriate harvest levels in Hidden  
24 Lake. The Department is very concerned  
25 that, without good stock assessment  
26 information and reporting, excessive  
27 harvest may not be detected in time.  
28 Lake trout, which are known to be a  
29 long-lived, slow-growing species  
30 susceptible to over-exploitation,  
31 require many years to rebuild  
32 populations after depletion, if they  
33 are able to do so at all.

34

35 Jurisdiction Issues:

36

37 The Department requests detailed land  
38 status maps that distinctly illustrate land ownership,  
39 easements, and exact boundaries within which it is  
40 claimed federal regulations would apply and  
41 justification for claiming those boundaries. Portions  
42 of both the upper and lower Kenai and Kasilof rivers  
43 are bordered by state or private lands including areas  
44 where federal claims of jurisdiction exist. Fishers  
45 need to be provided copies of these detailed maps  
46 because the State will enforce its regulations on  
47 fishers standing on nonfederal land while fishing.

48

49 Recommendation:

50

1 Support with modification as set out  
2 above, consistent with the proponent s intent to  
3 complement the Alaska Board of Fisheries changes and  
4 with ANILCA s conservation purposes, as follows:

5  
6 1. Support the slot limit  
7 liberalization for Kenai early-run  
8 Chinook salmon but request modification  
9 of the daily harvest limits from two to  
10 one.

11  
12 2. Support reducing lake trout harvest  
13 limits in Hidden Lake from four to two  
14 fish daily and request modification to  
15 allow harvest of 2 lake trout per day  
16 of which only one can be over 20 in  
17 length.

18  
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, George.  
20 Any questions for George.

21  
22 MR. BLOSSOM: George, you have no  
23 problem going to the 28 inch from 20, do you?

24  
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It doesn't do us any  
26 good though.

27  
28 MR. BLOSSOM: Sure it does.

29  
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I don't think so.

31  
32 MR. BLOSSOM: Well, I don't know.

33  
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If I understand right,  
35 your 28-inch rule went into effect to liberalize the  
36 28-inch rule at the lower end but closed the upper end  
37 completely in the area that they mill so they can't  
38 take any fish, am I right?

39  
40 MR. PAWLUK: Jason Pawluk, Fish and  
41 Game. Mr. Chair. Two things happened at the 2008  
42 Board of Fish in relation to early-run king salmon,  
43 both of them liberalizations. The first one being at  
44 the lower end of the size of a king salmon. Prior to  
45 this year the jack rule was 20 inches or less, 10 per  
46 day, 10 in possession daily bag limit. The Board kept  
47 that regulation of less than 20 inches still in place.  
48 That is actually what's called the jack rule. That's  
49 what defines jacks primarily under 20 inches.

50

1                   The Board liberalized early-run king  
2 salmon from 20 to 28 inches. You're allowed to harvest  
3 one per day. If you harvest one, you must put your rod  
4 down; however, there is no annual limit on king salmon  
5 20 to 28 inches long. Whereas prior to that you would  
6 have to tag that fish and it would count to your two  
7 annual limit on the Kenai River. So that portion of  
8 the run was liberalized and then the Board also took up  
9 the slot limit and liberalized that from decreasing  
10 the slot limit from 44 to 55 inches to making it 46 to  
11 55 inches.

12  
13                   Based on our figures, why we did that  
14 or why it was done, that was the Board's decision, but  
15 the numbers that we had, those two inches -- the  
16 primary reason why we were okay with it was that you  
17 have different age classes of king salmon. I'm just  
18 going to say the five ocean component, that's why the  
19 slot is there, to protect that particular component.  
20 By raising it to 46 inches you still protect  
21 essentially 75 percent of five ocean kings; however,  
22 you liberalize close to 20 percent of the four ocean  
23 component, which is the primary component of the early-  
24 run king salmon return. That was kind of the thought  
25 pattern there.

26  
27                   You brought up earlier the protection  
28 of seven year old five ocean kings. Since 2005, when  
29 the slot was initiated, we never sealed five ocean king  
30 salmon or sampled one in the harvest that was under 44  
31 inches. So the slot had done a really good job of  
32 protecting five ocean kings, so the Department felt a  
33 little liberalization of two inches was okay and the  
34 Board passed it.

35  
36                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So the 28-inch  
37 limit didn't take away the below 20 inch. You're still  
38 allowed 10 fish a day below 20 inches.

39  
40                   MR. PAPPAS: Correct, Mr. Chair.

41  
42                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. I was under the  
43 impression what you did is liberalize it to 28 inches  
44 and you were down to one a day.

45  
46                   MR. PAPPAS: No.

47  
48                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You're right, Doug.

49  
50                   MR. BLOSSOM: So my question still is

1 you have no problem with us going to 28 inches also.

2

3 MR. PAPPAS: Biologically they're  
4 available. Some of the original discussion with OSM  
5 Staff was what is the subsistence priority, what has  
6 been provided. The second question is how confusing do  
7 you need this to be because the 28-inch rule goes  
8 through July 1st for the entire river, though the slot  
9 limit is through end of June below the bridge and  
10 through July 15 above the bridge and that's not  
11 biological, that's allocative. So it gets a little bit  
12 confusing on which fish can I keep on July 2 in Moose  
13 Range Meadows. Well, you can't keep a slot fish and  
14 you cannot keep a 28-inch fish -- well, you can but  
15 that will come on your tag, so that will be one towards  
16 your annual limit. There's some confusion related to  
17 the Kenai River, imagine that, about that issue and I  
18 believe that was part of the reason it didn't go too  
19 much further forward. In addition, there's not a whole  
20 bunch of fish between 20 and 28 inches in early run.  
21 Right now it's not being harvested, but would it  
22 provide two or three fish for the Federal subsistence  
23 program. There is some confusion of all that, so I'm  
24 not sure why it wasn't further pursued.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: George, I just have a  
27 question. It comes up all the time. You said the  
28 State would like to see the Feds go to one fish a day  
29 instead of two fish a day. Because nobody took any  
30 there would be no effect on subsistence users, but if  
31 nobody took any there would be no effect on the  
32 resource either. I think that's what we've always  
33 said. If it becomes a problem on the resource, let's  
34 react. But in the meantime we've been given the  
35 opportunity and we've had no effect on the resource.  
36 In order to have a subsistence priority or the fact  
37 that it's a double limit, if that double limit starts  
38 causing problems on the resource, then it's time to  
39 react, but at this point in time it has no effect on  
40 the user because nobody is using them, but it has no  
41 effect on the resource either. Actually, I don't see  
42 any justification to go to the same limit if it's not  
43 having any effect one or the other.

44

45 George.

46

47 MR. PAPPAS: Mr. Chair. Yes, that  
48 consistently comes up, the difference between how the  
49 State manages the fisheries of not running into a  
50 problem you have to fix, but being out ahead of it and

1 learning from the lessons from decades past. It's just  
2 a difference in management philosophies. I'd rather  
3 not react. I'd rather be proactive and be conservative  
4 up front.

5  
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think there's a  
7 difference in how fast you have to react when you have  
8 a limited number of users and you have an unlimited  
9 number of users. Basically the other fishery operates  
10 with an unlimited number of users, how many people can  
11 come and how many people can get out, where on a  
12 subsistence fishery you have a limited number of known  
13 users and you can see what percentage of them actually  
14 make use of it. I think there's a difference in how  
15 fast you can react in a case like that.  
16 Philosophically, I would have to stick with providing  
17 the subsistence user with more opportunity than  
18 somebody from Minnesota or Wyoming or Florida or  
19 something like that. Doug.

20  
21 MR. BLOSSOM: I want to go back to the  
22 28-inch one more time. That 28 inches for the whole  
23 river for the whole summer, right? I mean you go back  
24 to 20 inches after the 1st of July. That's what I want  
25 to get straight.

26  
27 MR. PAWLUK: The 20-inch rule is in  
28 effect during the whole king salmon season. That's the  
29 jack rule, the 10 per day, 10 in possession, under 20  
30 inches. The liberalization for king salmon between 20  
31 and 28 inches only takes place from January 1 through  
32 the end of June.

33  
34 MR. BLOSSOM: Okay.

35  
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So it really has no  
37 effect on the timing of the subsistence fishery.

38  
39 MR. PAWLUK: I'm not familiar with the  
40 timing on the Kenai River for the subsistence fishery.

41  
42 MR. PAPPAS: Mr. Chair. Yes, it would  
43 coincide with the early run Federal subsistence  
44 regulations. It would not coincide, I believe, with  
45 the late run dipnet/rod and reel/rod and reel fishery.

46  
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Personally I  
48 would like to thank Fish and Game or the Fish Board for  
49 seeing the necessity to start protecting our fish when  
50 they get closer to the spawning grounds and the milling

1 areas where they're much more accessible and much more  
2 easy to exploit than they are like down in the mainstem  
3 of the river.

4

5 MR. PAPPAS: Mr. Chair. I believe the  
6 proposal came from the public and the Department I'm  
7 not sure was in full support of it because we had a  
8 harvestable surplus. Not to get into regulatory  
9 history, but the regulations in place the Department  
10 felt were sufficient, but the Board of Fish went one  
11 step beyond and they make the regulations.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's why I wanted to  
14 thank the Board of Fish. I wasn't thanking the  
15 Department of Fish and Game.

16

17 (Laughter)

18

19 MR. PAPPAS: Point taken.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, George, for  
22 the explanation.

23

24 (Laughter)

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: With that, any more  
27 questions for George.

28

29 MR. PAPPAS: You're going to make me  
30 mention steelhead, aren't you.

31

32 (Laughter)

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Thank you,  
35 George. George, you said that was the word we weren't  
36 going to mention today, remember. Okay. Federal,  
37 Tribal and State Agency comments. Bill.

38

39 MR. STOCKWELL: I was just wondering if  
40 the Department has any information. There was two  
41 chinooks caught in the subsistence fishery. I was just  
42 wondering if he had any information what size those  
43 fish were.

44

45 MR. PALMER: Doug Palmer, Fish and  
46 Wildlife Service. No.

47

48 MR. STOCKWELL: Thank you very much.

49

50 MR. PALMER: They were in the Kasilof

1 River. We do know that. Dipnetted in the Kasilof  
2 River.

3

4 MR. STOCKWELL: So there's no chinook  
5 harvest in the Kenai River for subsistence.

6

7 MR. PALMER: None reported as of today.  
8 The reports aren't due until December 15th.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. InterAgency  
11 Staff Committee comments. Jerry.

12

13 MR. BERG: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Jerry  
14 Berg with Fish and Wildlife Service. When we were  
15 drafting this proposal, we did not include the 28-inch  
16 provision just because it seemed like it was going to  
17 make it very complicated because there is a season end  
18 date and there was going to be very few fish actually  
19 available up in Moose Range Meadows at that time, so we  
20 focused on just the 46 to 44 provision. So that's why  
21 we went that way and didn't deal with the 28-inch  
22 issue.

23

24 As far as the lake trout, we felt like  
25 it seemed to make sense. There are some conservation  
26 concerns there. The State suggested a change that only  
27 one fish over 20 inches be allowed. The State  
28 regulations allow you to go up there and catch one per  
29 day without any size limit and you could go up there  
30 for multiple days, so I don't really know what that  
31 would really -- I don't see the conservation concern  
32 there when we have no harvest reported under the  
33 subsistence fishery to date for those lake trout. So  
34 it just seems like reducing it down to two at this  
35 point is consistent with what the Council and the Board  
36 has passed to date. That's all I have, Mr. Chair.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any  
39 questions for Jerry.

40

41 (No comments)

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Jerry.  
44 Fish and Game Advisory Committee comments. Mike.

45

46 MR. CRAWFORD: We supported this. I  
47 don't know that we need to talk about it any more.  
48 Thank you. Pretty simple.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Mike.

1 Unless somebody has a question for you.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No. Okay. Summary of  
6 written public comments.

7

8 MS. CLARK: We have one written  
9 comment, Mr. Chair, from the Kenai River Sportfishing  
10 Association. The Alaska Board of Fisheries recently  
11 (February 2008) passed regulatory changes affecting the  
12 management of Chinook salmon and Lake Trout in upper  
13 Cook Inlet waters. This proposal would help  
14 bring into alignment the Federal and state regulations.  
15 Lake trout harvest limits are proposed to be reduced by  
16 this proposed action. This is necessary to address  
17 conservation concerns for this stock. It is our  
18 understanding that a study is being conducted by the  
19 Kenai Fish and Wildlife Field Office during the 2008  
20 field season, the results of which will be helpful in  
21 assessing the population status of lake trout in Hidden  
22 Lake. We support the changes to king salmon and lake  
23 trout regulations proposed.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Do we have  
26 any public testimony on this one.

27

28 (No comments)

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none. A  
31 motion to put FP09-10 on the table is in order by the  
32 Council.

33

34 MR. HENRICHS: I make the motion.

35

36 MR. BLOSSOM: Second

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and  
39 seconded to put FP09-10 on the table. Discussion,  
40 amendments, justification, anything. James.

41

42 MR. SHOWALTER: Yes. Myself, the way I  
43 see it, subsistence has priority over any and all  
44 fisheries in the system and there is good, healthy  
45 returns on the kings. So you're going out there  
46 subsistence fishing and you've got a size limit slot.  
47 For subsistence there never has been and I've got to go  
48 catch this size and this size only and for subsistence  
49 I don't think that's right unless you really point out  
50 to me otherwise because subsistence is a way of life.

1 For sportsman I could see it because such a volume of  
2 sportsmen are out there, but not subsistence.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, James.  
5 Anything from any of the Council. Doug.

6

7 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chair. I'm going to  
8 support the Federal proposed regulations as they are  
9 written. We get two more inches on the small size and  
10 I don't see any reason to change any of the other  
11 things different than what they've proposed.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Doug.  
14 Dean.

15

16 MR. WILSON: Mr. Chair. It sounds  
17 pretty straightforward to me as well. I'll come out in  
18 support of the proposal put forth by the U.S. Fish and  
19 Wildlife Service. It doesn't seem like there's any  
20 conservation issues in regards to the proposal. At  
21 least from the Federally-qualified users there is no  
22 take at this time. So if there is some conservation  
23 issues, I think they're going to have to go elsewhere  
24 to take care of it because the subsistence users aren't  
25 doing anything to impact it. So I'll come out in  
26 support of it.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any more discussion.

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 MR. BLOSSOM: Question.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been  
35 called on FP09-10 as written by the Fish and Wildlife  
36 Staff, OSM Staff. I think we can find that on Page 116  
37 and 117. All in favor signify by saying aye.

38

39 IN UNISON: Aye.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by  
42 saying nay.

43

44 (No opposing votes)

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. With  
47 that, we've taken care of our proposals that are before  
48 us for this session. We're going to stand down and  
49 take a break for 10 minutes, get yourself a fresh cup  
50 of coffee, and we're going on into reports and other

1 interesting pieces of information that we're going to  
2 accumulate.

3

4 (Off record)

5

6 (On record)

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We're calling  
9 our Southcentral Alaska Federal Subsistence Regional  
10 Advisory Council meeting back in session. We are now  
11 on our reports and we have the report from Bureau of  
12 Land Management to start off with. Is somebody here to  
13 present that report. Pete, is it just a written one in  
14 our book?

15

16 MR. PROBASCO: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. I  
17 just want to draw your attention to the draft plan as  
18 it pertains to the use of firewood and house logs.  
19 It's a draft for you to review and comment.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: On Page 131.

22

23 MR. PROBASCO: Correct. Thank you.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Okay. So  
26 at this point in time we're going to have Fisheries  
27 Resource Monitoring Program and it's been requested  
28 that since they're also dealing with game now that they  
29 present both of them at the same time. So I've taken  
30 the liberty to invite them to have both the game and  
31 fish sit down at the same time so we can accomplish it.

32

33 I'll ask Pete. Pete, is there a date  
34 that we need to make comments on the draft subsistence  
35 policy for the BLM?

36

37 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair. I do not  
38 know, but we can find out.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Gloria would  
41 like to know because it directly affects people up here  
42 in the Copper Basin. Okay. Fisheries Resource  
43 Monitoring Program. Turn to Page 134.

44

45 MR. FRIED: Good morning. I'm back.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You're a regular  
48 repeat customer.

49

50 MR. FRIED: I guess. For the record,

1 I'm Steven Fried. I work as a fishery biologist in OSM  
2 and sitting next to me is Helen Armstrong, who is an  
3 anthropologist with OSM and Steve Kessler is at the end  
4 with the U.S. Forest Service. What I'd like to speak  
5 to you first about is the Fisheries Resource Monitoring  
6 Program. As the Chair pointed out, there's some  
7 information that begins on Page 134 in your books.

8  
9 OSM coordinates Federal subsistence  
10 management in Alaska and has two major functions in  
11 managing subsistence fisheries. We address issues with  
12 Federal subsistence regulations and dual Federal/State  
13 management, including coordinating analysis of Federal  
14 regulatory proposals, reconsideration requests, special  
15 actions, providing comments as appropriate for State  
16 fishery regulatory proposals and that's basically what  
17 we were doing prior to this during this meeting.

18  
19 We also provide funds through a  
20 competitive process to conduct projects that provide  
21 information that's needed to manage Federal subsistence  
22 fisheries and also Federal wildlife management and to  
23 assist rural organizations to more fully participate in  
24 fisheries management. So we have the Fisheries  
25 Resource Monitoring Program, the Partners for Fisheries  
26 Monitoring Program and the Forest Service now has a  
27 program for wildlife management.

28  
29 The Fisheries Resource Monitoring  
30 Program funds projects that address two broad types of  
31 information needs. There are stock status and trends  
32 projects that provide information on fisheries  
33 resources and this includes estimating abundance, using  
34 weirs, towers, sonar, mark recapture methods. We look  
35 at the age, size and sex composition of fish  
36 populations, seasonal migration patterns using marking  
37 and telemetry, stock structure projects that use  
38 genetics and marking.

39  
40 We also do harvest monitoring of  
41 traditional ecological knowledge projects that provide  
42 information on both the fishery and the users. We  
43 might do permitting, community surveys, key respondent  
44 interviews, trying to estimate the numbers or the  
45 pounds of fish that are harvested.

46  
47 Today we'd like to focus on the 2010  
48 requests for proposals for the Fisheries Resource  
49 Monitoring Program. We will have that request out  
50 sometime in November, next month. As part of the

1 request we have a priority information needs document  
2 and this is the draft document that starts on Page 134.  
3 The final version of this document will be used to help  
4 focus the 2010 request on the highest priority  
5 information needs for each of regions in the state.  
6

7                   For Southcentral Alaska, you can find  
8 the priority needs on Page 138 of the book. These were  
9 developed with an existing strategic plan for Prince  
10 William Sound, Copper River and on the expert opinions  
11 of the Technical Review Committee, Federal and State  
12 managers, OSM Staff and by the end of this meeting the  
13 Council members here for not only Prince William Sound,  
14 Copper River, but also for Cook Inlet area.  
15

16                   I'd also like to bring to your  
17 attention the section on the Inter-regional information  
18 needs. That's on Page 139 of your Council books and  
19 you might wish to provide some comments on that also.  
20

21                   Please keep in mind that consideration  
22 will be given to all submitted proposals addressing  
23 subsistence fisheries on Federal public lands even  
24 though projects addressing the priority information  
25 needs will be given the highest consideration.  
26

27                   Something new also beginning in 2010,  
28 the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program will begin to  
29 specifically gather information that will hopefully  
30 allow managers to better cope with climate change  
31 effects. We're going to be asking all investigators to  
32 examine or discuss climate change effects as part of  
33 their projects. Investigators conducting long-term  
34 projects will be asked to participate in a standardized  
35 air and water temperature monitoring program. That  
36 provides them with calibrated temperature loggers and  
37 associated equipment and also analysis and reporting  
38 services, and also access to a temperature database.  
39

40                   Investigators will also be invited to  
41 submit proposals whose main focus is on climate change  
42 effects on subsistence resources and uses and how  
43 management practices can be better adapted to deal with  
44 these effects.  
45

46                   Before I move on and discuss the  
47 priority information needs for the Southcentral Region  
48 I'd like to first give any Council members the  
49 opportunity to ask questions they might have concerning  
50 the Monitoring Program.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.

2

3 MS. STICKWAN: Could you do a research  
4 on hatchery versus wild stock? Is that something you  
5 would consider?

6

7 MR. FRIED: We could do a project on  
8 effects of hatchery stock on subsistence fisheries. We  
9 wouldn't fund just an enhancement project that would  
10 pay for raising hatchery fish and things like that, but  
11 I think effects would be within the purview of the  
12 Monitoring Program. So, yes.

13

14 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair. Could I  
15 just add a little bit. Helen Armstrong. It would need  
16 to show some kind of link to subsistence uses in  
17 Federal waters, so there would have to be demonstrated  
18 link to that. It couldn't be in State waters.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But it could be users  
21 in Federal waters even if the hatcheries weren't in  
22 Federal waters. Steve.

23

24 MR. FRIED: Moving right along. If you  
25 look at Page 138, you can see the priority information  
26 needs for Southcentral Region and there are two.  
27 They're both for Copper River. The first is validity  
28 and reliability of Federal and State permit estimates  
29 of subsistence harvests from the Upper Copper River. Of  
30 particular interest is a one to two year pilot study  
31 that focuses on harvest reporting. So that's one  
32 priority information need that's been identified.

33

34 The second is to estimate total run  
35 abundance and obtain reliable estimates of spawning  
36 escapement for chinook  
37 salmon in the Copper River. I'm sure you're all aware  
38 of the studies that are going on with the fish wheels,  
39 mark recapture. They've been very successful in  
40 providing us with the first ever total estimates of  
41 chinook salmon escapements into this system. We  
42 consider this to be very important.

43

44 So I don't know if at this point the  
45 Council would like to discuss either of these  
46 information needs or if they have suggestions or  
47 modifications to add to the list, but we'd certainly  
48 like to hear from the members on this.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Have you received any

1 applications or proposals to address these? Have there  
2 been any individuals or groups interested in addressing  
3 the first one? Helen.

4

5 MR. FRIED: If I recall, I think last  
6 time we had a call we asked for this same one and I  
7 don't remember if we didn't get a proposal or the one  
8 we got didn't make it through to the end.

9

10 MS. STICKWAN: It didn't make it  
11 through.

12

13 MR. FRIED: Yeah.

14

15 MS. STICKWAN: I don't remember what  
16 year, but it's been a few years. We tried to put one  
17 in and it didn't go through. It was by Copper River.

18

19 MR. FRIED: But it's still an important  
20 one I think people would agree we need to do.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, it's probably a  
23 fairly high priority one. So the same people who put  
24 it in before can submit another proposal this time,  
25 can't they?

26

27 MR. FRIED: That's correct.

28

29 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: And if they'd like  
30 to work with people in our office to see if there's  
31 something they need to do to change it or address  
32 something differently, they are certainly welcome to do  
33 that.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I was just thinking  
36 that since this was a priority issue it would almost  
37 behoove the Resource Monitoring Program to contact the  
38 individuals who've had that type of proposal in the  
39 past and let them know it's open for resubmission and  
40 give them suggestions on what they could do to meet the  
41 needs that have been recognized. Gloria.

42

43 MS. STICKWAN: So you can help us write  
44 the plan? I guess I'm asking for technical assistance  
45 if you'd be willing to do that or if the Native Village  
46 of Eyak biologist could do that.

47

48 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: We can provide  
49 assistance. Liz Williams is actually the person who  
50 works with this region and she would be the person to

1 talk to.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions  
4 for Steve or any other things you'd like Steve to go  
5 into. I think you've got a couple here that have been  
6 identified that are pretty good, but you are open to  
7 other proposals that deal with the same type of issue  
8 any place in Southcentral.

9

10 MR. FRIED: That's correct. Just  
11 because there's not an issue listed in this document  
12 doesn't mean it won't be considered.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: These are higher  
15 priority.

16

17 MR. FRIED: These would just be the  
18 highest priority ones. So given that they were written  
19 correctly, scientifically sound, they had good  
20 partnerships and things like that, they would be on top  
21 of the list. Every year probably 20 percent of the  
22 things that we fund are projects that weren't on the  
23 priority information needs.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, should we go on.

26

27

28 MR. FRIED: The last thing is on Page  
29 139, the Inter-regional information needs. The Inter-  
30 regional category is for projects that include two or  
31 more regions. Like I mentioned earlier, all  
32 investigators submitting proposals for a region are  
33 going to be asked to consider examining climate change  
34 effects. We're also interested in projects  
35 specifically focused on understanding management  
36 implications of climate change and we put that  
37 information need here and it would focus on this and it  
38 would look for projects that would document effects of  
39 climate change on subsistence resources and uses, and  
40 determine how subsistence fishery management can be  
41 better adapted to deal with these effects.

42

43 That really concludes what I had to say  
44 and if you have any questions I'd be happy to answer.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So you'll be asking  
47 all participants to do some minimal record keeping on  
48 climate change, but would it be worthwhile or make the  
49 project have a better priority and more viable if they  
50 included as part of their program something that would

1 directly affect this along with the issue they were  
2 addressing? In other words, do some thinking ahead of  
3 time to include some part of how they were going to be  
4 addressing this section along with what they're really  
5 doing.

6

7 MR. FRIED: Yeah, I suppose there would  
8 be some benefit to that. We've said this before is  
9 that especially the stock status and information  
10 projects and some of the harvest monitoring, they're  
11 long-term databases and that's just the kind of  
12 information that's useful to take a look at these  
13 changes over time. In a way, this program has been  
14 addressing climate change, but now we're just asking  
15 people to maybe put a little more thought into it and  
16 maybe put in some explanation or a description of how  
17 they think climate change might be affecting what we're  
18 seeing in these long-term data series.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.

21

22 MS. STICKWAN: When is the deadline for  
23 this?

24

25 MR. FRIED: When is the request going  
26 out?

27

28 MS. STICKWAN: When is the deadline to  
29 apply for this?

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: To submit proposals.

32

33 MR. FRIED: The proposal request will  
34 probably go out sometime in the middle of next month,  
35 middle of November, and then usually we ask that they  
36 come back sometime in January so that we get back, I  
37 think, to the people sometime in February or something  
38 like that to let them know whether or not they were  
39 successful and whether it was advanced and the people  
40 that had their proposal advance would then have to  
41 develop an investigation plan, which would be a lot  
42 longer and that would then go through a review process  
43 with the TRC, the Councils and finally to the Board for  
44 final funding decision.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Any other  
47 questions.

48

49 (No comments)

50

1                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So they basically have  
2 until January to submit a proposal and they can flesh  
3 it out a little bit more later.

4  
5                   MR. FRIED: Right. And it goes out in  
6 several forms and on our web site. We actually  
7 developed over the years a list of past investigators  
8 and organizations that have submitted proposals and  
9 they'll get something in the mail or an email. So  
10 hopefully we can reach all the people interested in  
11 this.

12  
13                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Good. Okay.

14  
15                   MR. KESSLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
16 Council. Steve Kessler with the Forest Service. What  
17 I want to talk about today is the parallel program that  
18 the Forest Service has for wildlife. Each of you  
19 should have received a one-page handout that says  
20 Wildlife Resource Monitoring Program priority  
21 information needs. I'll put a few extras on the back  
22 table if anybody would like a copy.

23  
24                   This is exactly the same sheet that we  
25 handed out in the Southeast meeting a couple weeks ago.  
26 The Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program started in  
27 about the year 2000. The Forest Service, having seen  
28 the great results of that program, decided in 2005 with  
29 an increase in funding to the Forest Service from the  
30 Federal Subsistence Program to use those additional  
31 funds to develop a parallel program.

32  
33                   As we go into this new request for  
34 proposal process for fisheries, we decided we would do  
35 a parallel process for wildlife and then take a look at  
36 what projects come forward and spend at least the  
37 Forest Service portion of the dollars that go into  
38 monitoring for the highest priority, looking at both  
39 fish and wildlife.

40  
41                   You might recall a few years ago we  
42 also did a strategic planning process for wildlife to  
43 take a look at region wide what are the priorities for  
44 wildlife. We have since funded a number of different  
45 projects. I think four different projects. Again,  
46 this is not nearly the scale of what fisheries has  
47 been, much much smaller, but we've funded four  
48 projects, including one in Prince William Sound on uses  
49 and needs for bear and goats. I think the final  
50 results of that project was sent out sometime in the

1 last year to the Council

2

3

4 The Forest Service went through the  
5 strategic plan and also thought about are there other  
6 special needs that are needed as far as the next round  
7 for wildlife purposes. The priorities have to do with  
8 is there information we need for regulatory purposes.  
9 Is there information that you folks need, the Federal  
10 Subsistence Board need for the work that they do, and  
11 are there any conservation concerns that at this point  
12 are not being addressed, researched, that really are a  
13 big priority out there.

13

14

15 In this handout you can see those items  
16 that we did come up with. Yakutat mountain goats.  
17 There's been severe changes in those populations.  
18 Quite a downward trend, especially on the Nunatak  
19 Bench, which is to the north and east of Yakutat. So  
20 that was a priority item. That was in the strategic  
21 planning. That was the highest priority there.

21

22

23 And then Unit 7 moose is the second  
24 item shown here. There's now, where there wasn't  
25 before, a Federal subsistence harvest in Unit 7 on the  
26 east side of the Kenai Peninsula. As we were all going  
27 through the regulatory process, this was a request from  
28 Cooper Landing to start a Federal subsistence harvest  
29 there. We all realized we really don't know very much  
30 information. There's a whole bunch of information  
31 known on the west side of the Kenai Peninsula, but very  
32 little on the primarily Forest Service side, the east  
33 side of Unit 7.

33

34

35 So you can see that's one that directly  
36 affects this Council in terms of population status and  
37 trend, determine habitat use and quality and  
38 subsistence uses and needs.

38

39

40 And then this third one was part of our  
41 requests for proposals three years ago, but we didn't  
42 receive any proposals on this and this has to do with  
43 methods for tracking bear parts and handicrafts. The  
44 Federal Subsistence Board and all the Councils have  
45 been dealing with this issue of handicrafts made out of  
46 bear parts for quite some time. This is actually a  
47 priority that came from our regional forester who  
48 controls the purse strings and he wants more  
49 information on tracking of bear parts made out of  
50 handicrafts.

50

1                   Now there's a separate process going on  
2 with that item and Fish and Game is helping coordinate  
3 that. This may actually move forward without being in  
4 our request for proposals. The end of the last  
5 paragraph says tracking bear parts as a current  
6 InterAgency effort may result in removal of that  
7 information need from here.

8  
9                   As far as Forest Service funds that are  
10 available, it used to be that we funded about \$2  
11 million worth of fisheries resource projects every  
12 year. When we got the boost for wildlife, it went up  
13 to about \$2.5 million and money has just been sort of  
14 on a downward trend here. It looks like we have about  
15 \$1.6 to 1.7 million for both programs at this point as  
16 we're going into the future. The same problem has been  
17 happening with the fisheries side, the statewide side.  
18 Money has been going down and down. We haven't been  
19 keeping up with inflation and other issues associated  
20 with Federal funding.

21  
22                   So there's less and less money and we  
23 need to make sure that we fund those things that are  
24 really important, really a priority. Now we're  
25 interested in any thoughts from the Council, especially  
26 Unit 7 moose. Would that be the highest priority on  
27 the National Forest only. For the National Forest only  
28 for this Council, is that something that you see or is  
29 there something else that's going on in the region on  
30 Chugach National Forest that you see as being a high-  
31 priority issue.

32  
33                   It's an opportunity to help us out. We  
34 will come out with a request for proposals. I don't  
35 know exactly if it's going to match the timeline of the  
36 fishery request for proposals. Hopefully it will be  
37 close enough so that when it comes later to picking  
38 which final projects are going to be funded you'll have  
39 the opportunity to comment and make recommendations to  
40 the Federal Subsistence Board.

41  
42                   Eventually when you are asked what are  
43 your priorities, do you think the Technical Review  
44 Committee, the TRC for fisheries came up with the right  
45 priorities or did you want to change something, we'll  
46 have the wildlife priorities at the same time.

47  
48                   So that's about all I have. If you  
49 have any comments on the wildlife side, I'd sure  
50 appreciate that.

1                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Steve, would you do me  
2 a favor to start off with and just pick one of those  
3 maps up there and show the rest of the Council what are  
4 the Forest Service lands in Southcentral.

5  
6                   MR. KESSLER: It's very clear here.  
7 It's the green right here.

8  
9                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

10  
11                  MR. KESSLER: For the National Forest  
12 Service.

13  
14                  CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So basically the  
15 western side of Prince William Sound, the islands in  
16 Prince William Sound, down to Cape Suckling. Whittier  
17 is where the slot comes through right there, so the  
18 land to the north there, that would be along Valdez  
19 Arm, Port Wells and that area up there. I was just  
20 trying to see how far into Southcentral the big green  
21 chunk went.

22  
23                  MR. KESSLER: It's mostly coastal, of  
24 course, and Unit 7 is pretty much all National Forest,  
25 a good chunk of the part that is available for  
26 subsistence and pretty much all of Unit 6 except for  
27 Unit 6A. So, yeah, it's coastal. There's an area down  
28 around Valdez and it's I think largely State.

29  
30                  CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So the farthest north  
31 piece right there, where does that extend up into?

32  
33                  MR. KESSLER: I think pretty much this  
34 is the crest of the Chugach Mountains. If you look  
35 here, Matanuska Glacier is north of the National  
36 Forest.

37  
38                  CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So basically all along  
39 the Glenn Highway is out of National Forest.

40  
41                  MR. KESSLER: That's correct. So what  
42 we address typically with this Council on the National  
43 Forest are some goats down in this area of Prince  
44 William Sound, moose and fish. The Kenai River is, of  
45 course, part of Unit 7 here also, so moose, bear and  
46 fish.

47  
48                  CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Would you like at this  
49 time any suggestions for some priorities in that area?  
50

1 MR. KESSLER: If you have any  
2 suggestions for this area that you consider to be a  
3 high priority for monitoring/research, that's what I'm  
4 asking for. So right now Unit 7 moose is something  
5 that you and the Federal Subsistence Board have just  
6 recently been dealing with. It was recognized that  
7 we're dealing with not very much information,  
8 especially surprising considering the number of people  
9 that use the Kenai Peninsula.

10  
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I know Bill is in this  
12 area, Mr. Henrichs is in this area, I'm in this area.  
13 A lot of people aren't. I can give you a couple ideas  
14 off the top of my head right now and then I'll let Bill  
15 and Mr. Henrichs.

16  
17 One has been the severe increase in  
18 black bear harvest in Prince William Sound that we've  
19 had in recent history. The other is the drastic  
20 increase in brown bears on Hawkins and Hinchinbrook  
21 Islands where a lot of the subsistence deer hunting for  
22 Cordova is done. We've been having lots of brown bear  
23 incidents out there. I don't think there's any  
24 recognition into how much the population of brown bears  
25 has grown on those two islands. We used to consider  
26 Hawkins Island brown bear free, didn't we, Mr.  
27 Henrichs?

28  
29 MR. HENRICHS: (Nods affirmatively)

30  
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now we've had quite a  
32 few defense of life and property incidents on Hawkins  
33 Island and those are directly affecting the subsistence  
34 users.

35  
36 Those would be two I can think of,  
37 increase in black bear harvest and increase in brown  
38 bear population.

39  
40 MR. KESSLER: I guess my question is  
41 then what sort of projects would you want formulated  
42 around those issues? For instance, for black bear, we  
43 did the black bear uses and needs project already that  
44 was geared towards subsistence users. Department of  
45 Fish and Game was the contractor on that. They  
46 actually added goats to that.

47  
48 We need to get a sense. What's the  
49 question?

50

1                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question in my  
2 mind would be population, status and trends, you know.  
3 Is our black bear population in the Sound holding up to  
4 the increased harvest  
5 and what is the population trend in brown bears. Do we  
6 need increased harvest opportunity in order for the  
7 subsistence users -- you can't say predator control.  
8 It's a bad word. But in order for subsistence users  
9 not to become the prey while they are pursuing their  
10 subsistence needs. I would say they were stock status  
11 and trends.

12  
13                   Bill, do you have a question for him.

14  
15                   MR. STOCKWELL: Yeah, I do. First, I  
16 think the Unit 7 moose thing is very important. If you  
17 remember when we took this up I was rather vocal that  
18 Unit 7 moose populations are not in good shape.  
19 Basically you're correct, we don't have any decent  
20 information on moose population in Unit 7.

21  
22                   One thing I think population status and  
23 trend is something we need and also habitat values.  
24 One of the things I've heard from biologists is that  
25 the moose habitat in Unit 7 is decreasing over time  
26 because the forest grows in. One thing I think you  
27 might want to add to that while they're investigating  
28 habitat they need to look at brown bear population in  
29 Unit 7 and Russian River and what that has to do with  
30 moose. There are some wolves in Unit 7, but I think we  
31 might be able to get more information on brown bears in  
32 Unit 7 at the same time as you're doing the moose thing  
33 as far as predation. Also black bear has some effect  
34 on predation of moose calves.

35  
36                   Subsistence use and needs is a brand  
37 new thing because this is the first season there's been  
38 a hunt, but we'll start gathering information on that  
39 and find out how the people in Cooper Landing use the  
40 hunt this year and where else it needs to be extended.

41  
42                   My personal feeling of the things you  
43 have listed, I think this should be our highest  
44 priority. That's my opinion. Of course, I live there.  
45 Thank you.

46  
47                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Henrichs.

48  
49                   MR. HENRICHS: You know, subsistence  
50 hunting, with the price of fuel skyrocketing, the

1 opportunity to get a moose is a huge thing for a  
2 family. In our area, it seems to be the brown bear  
3 kind of like the moose. We planted the moose and we  
4 don't really want to share them with brown bears.  
5 Recently a brown bear killed a cow and a calf and ate  
6 them and then killed the bull and buried it because he  
7 was full and the bull had a 65-inch rack on it.  
8 Fortunately there was some guides running around there  
9 and a guide had a customer coming in and he went out  
10 and got this brown bear. It was an 11-foot brown bear  
11 and estimated weight was 1,400 pounds. How would you  
12 like to find a 65-inch bull and think, hey, I wonder  
13 what happened here and then you've got a 1,400 pound  
14 bear in the bushes behind you. You might be a snack or  
15 something.

16  
17 But we don't really like to share them  
18 too much when you get something like that running  
19 around. We planted those moose for subsistence  
20 reasons, to put meat on the table. We're not trophy  
21 hunters. So I'd like to see something done there.

22  
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Steve.

24  
25 MR. KESSLER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
26 Mr. Henrichs, if you could help me formulate sort of  
27 what the question would be, that would be helpful.  
28 You'd like to have something done there as far as  
29 knowing the numbers of brown bear. We need to be very  
30 careful, of course, because we try to stay out of the  
31 predator control arena, discussions. Certainly there  
32 could be some sort of question formulated that would be  
33 helpful to the regulatory needs. Is there a specific  
34 question you would like asked or researched?

35  
36 MR. HENRICHS: Mr. Chairman.

37  
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Henrichs.

39  
40 MR. HENRICHS: Yeah, I'm not saying  
41 predator control. I just don't want to share them,  
42 period. A lot of people put a lot of time and effort  
43 in there. Maybe there's too many brown bear running  
44 around down there. Our Staff biologist Keith will be  
45 happy to help you on that.

46  
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Steve, what I can see,  
48 and that's kind of what I was getting at too, I know we  
49 don't have predator control, but if we don't have good  
50 stock status and trends, it's pretty hard to liberalize

1 -- you know, because we're dealing with a very  
2 political animal. One of the questions that always  
3 comes up when you want to liberalize a hunting season  
4 or give more opportunity is what is the stock status  
5 and what is the trend. One of the big arguments that's  
6 used against liberalizing some seasons by organizations  
7 who don't prefer to have them hunted is you don't know  
8 what the stock status is.

9  
10 That's basically what I was getting at  
11 and I think that's what Mr. Henrichs was getting at  
12 too. One of the thing we need to know, especially on  
13 things like the brown bear, is what is their stock  
14 status. Then we can say, okay, this justifies an  
15 increase in the hunting season or this justifies a  
16 decrease in the hunting season, but we can at least  
17 have a number to start with. It's what they're  
18 fighting with on the Kenai Peninsula. The more you  
19 know about the stock status, the easier it is. You can  
20 have anecdotal data all day. That doesn't fly in  
21 court. You need to know the stock status. You need to  
22 have some scientific stock status reports. That's what  
23 I was thinking of.

24  
25 Bill.  
26

27 MR. STOCKWELL: Just to back that up.  
28 As far as Unit 7 is concerned, some of the people said  
29 we didn't need a subsistence moose hunt, we needed a  
30 subsistence bear hunt to get rid of some of the bears.  
31 That was one reason I brought up the bear thing. We  
32 have lots of anecdotal information that there's bears  
33 all over the place, but we don't have any information  
34 on bears and what there really is. Thank you.

35  
36 MR. LAMB: Just a comment. I live in  
37 16B and that's an intense predator control area. If  
38 you think you're going to have a problem with bears on  
39 any ungulate population, I would say you should  
40 probably find out what you have for bears and do some  
41 studies on it before it gets to where it is in 16 and  
42 up around McGrath and stuff where there are no moose  
43 because of the predators.

44  
45 MR. KESSLER: Knowledge.

46  
47 MR. LAMB: Yeah.

48  
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Henrichs.

50

1 MR. HENRICHS: One thing we've done in  
2 our area is tribe work with the Forest Service and the  
3 Eyak Corporation and went after some USDA funding to  
4 create more areas with moose browse. We will probably  
5 do some more of that to help.....

6  
7 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Feed the bears.

8  
9 (Laughter)

10  
11 MR. HENRICHS: Yeah, right.

12  
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We do our part. Doug.

14  
15 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chair. I guess a  
16 suggestion to you in Unit 6, put in a proposal for C&T  
17 for brown bear.

18  
19 MR. HENRICHS: That's a thought.

20  
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's a good one,  
22 Doug. Any suggestions for Steve. Greg.

23  
24 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Through the Chair.  
25 Steve, I just have a question on stock status and  
26 trends. If brown bear or any predator or even your  
27 climate control and trends and all this stuff is  
28 affecting subsistence, it seems to me there would be a  
29 way to tie that to, you know, fund some studies to  
30 accurately figure out how many bear there are and what  
31 these trends are and how you're going to deal with it  
32 because you're adversely affecting the whole  
33 subsistence lifestyle and it's getting worse. I mean  
34 it's on the Kenai, the same thing as they have in Unit  
35 7.

36  
37 The other comment I had is I don't  
38 understand your funding stuff. If you have more higher  
39 priority projects identified, is there ways to get more  
40 Federal money for programs?

41  
42 MR. KESSLER: Mr. Chairman. Mr.  
43 Encelewski. As far as the funding goes, the Forest  
44 Service funding is a congressional line item. It's  
45 right in the appropriations bill. You can see what it  
46 is. It changes pretty much every year.

47  
48 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Uh-huh.

49  
50 MR. KESSLER: It's gone up and gone

1 down.

2

3

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Uh-huh.

4

5

MR. KESSLER: We don't know actually  
6 what it's going to be next year. We're on a continuing  
7 resolution right now for the first six months of fiscal  
8 year 2009, which started October 1st. That should give  
9 us the same amount of money that we had last year minus  
10 inflation and all of that.

11

12

I'm not sure that you were made aware  
13 of the president's budget for fiscal year 2009 that  
14 we're in right now. In the president's budget for  
15 fiscal year 2009 actually all of the funding was  
16 removed for the Forest Service. That line item was  
17 proposed to go away. As part of that, the funds for  
18 subsistence and the Forest Service would come out of  
19 other line items that already go to the Forest Service.  
20 For instance, the Forest Service receives money for  
21 fish and wildlife management, for recreation, for all  
22 sorts of other things. The anticipation was that the  
23 money would come out of those lines instead of what  
24 really amounts to a special appropriation just for  
25 Federal Subsistence Program.

26

27

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Right.

28

29

MR. KESSLER: So all that's sort of in  
30 play right now, but given that we're on a continuing  
31 resolution, we have no idea what the new congress, the  
32 new president is going to do for the rest of fiscal  
33 year 2009, things are a little bit up in the air.  
34 We're assuming that we're going to just keep moving  
35 ahead until something happens that tips us off where we  
36 are right now.

37

38

You did mention climate change a little  
39 bit.

40

41

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Uh-huh.

42

43

MR. KESSLER: We're very aware of this  
44 fisheries resource project need that's Inter-regional;  
45 document effects of climate change on subsistence  
46 resources and uses, and determine how subsistence  
47 fishery management can be better adapted to deal with  
48 these effects. It seems like wildlife ought to be a  
49 part of that too.

50

1                   Again, I don't want to talk for Office  
2 of Subsistence Management, but their funds come in  
3 different ways and their funding is fisheries type  
4 dollars, so they can only do fisheries type things with  
5 a lot of the dollars that they have. I don't know if  
6 they have the ability in any sense to modify this and  
7 look at the entire picture of climate change on fish  
8 and wildlife. But that's something we thought might be  
9 of some benefit on the National Forest.

10

11                   Although, thinking about this a little  
12 bit more, probably the National Forest are a little  
13 less influenced by climate change than the rest of the  
14 state because the National Forest is still maritime and  
15 the effect of the ocean on sort of reducing these big  
16 changes in climate on the National Forest lands, we  
17 probably won't see as big of a change in some of the  
18 interior areas.

19

20                   MR. ENCELEWSKI: When they're three  
21 feet under water.

22

23                   MR. KESSLER: Well, when they're three  
24 feet under water, that is another story. Anyway, it  
25 does seem that the climate change is a factor for  
26 everything subsistence users do.

27

28                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's also a factor  
29 that you can factor in but you can't change. I can see  
30 where it doesn't have the same apparent immediate  
31 effect as whether you're going to have an increase in  
32 the hunting season next year or shortening of the  
33 hunting season next year.

34

35                   Steve, I sure thank you for that. I  
36 think we all missed the boat, you know, when Congress  
37 was considering that \$700 million bailout and bought,  
38 what was it, \$20 million worth of arrows for the Boy  
39 Scouts out of it, wooden arrows for the Boy Scouts. We  
40 should have had our hand in there too and decided we  
41 needed something for subsistence and doing a little bit  
42 of lobbying around that time. I mean \$20 million would  
43 go a long way toward our subsistence research projects,  
44 wouldn't it?

45

46                   MR. LAMB: I think Ted's been kind of  
47 busy lately.

48

49                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, he's been pretty  
50 busy. Okay. With that, Steve, I sure thank you for

1 bringing that. I hope we gave you some ideas and we'll  
2 do some thinking and we'll see if we can come up with  
3 any others.

4

5 MR. KESSLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
6 That really was very valuable. That was helpful, the  
7 ideas that came forward.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay, you guys are  
10 done. We'll go on to the next one, 2008 annual report  
11 topics. Are there things we want to put into our  
12 annual report.

13

14 Thank you, Dean. Dean had to be  
15 excused at this time. His wife is leaving to go to  
16 work and he has a little child to take care of.

17

18 Any suggestions for our annual report.  
19 It's been kind of a quiet year. Maureen.

20

21 MS. CLARK: I'm looking at Pete coming  
22 up.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I know we should have  
25 been thinking about this, Pete, but off the top of my  
26 head I haven't got anything really -- I think things  
27 are a lot smoother than they have been.

28

29 MR. PROBASCO: A lot of times the  
30 Councils use the annual replies to report on issues of  
31 concern. It doesn't preclude you to address issues  
32 that you felt we have dealt with successfully or happy  
33 with how things worked out. I'm thinking the long  
34 process that went through in developing the Kenai  
35 Peninsula subsistence fishery. The input from the  
36 Council as well as the public on how that has unfolded.  
37 You do have recommendations from Ninilchik Tribal  
38 Council that deal with fishwheels. Refuges are working  
39 with them on that. It has been -- I don't want to say  
40 a quiet year, but it has been much easier than some of  
41 the past years.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Question. Do we have  
44 to have an annual report?

45

46 MR. PROBASCO: No, you do not.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We're not required to  
49 have an annual report.

50

1 MR. PROBASCO: Just encouraged.  
2  
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Just encouraged to.  
4 They won't fire us if we don't have one.  
5  
6 MR. PROBASCO: No. You're here for  
7 life, Ralph.  
8  
9 (Laughter)  
10  
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Don't say that. Mr.  
12 Henrichs.  
13  
14 MR. HENRICHS: If people are worried  
15 about funding and stuff, it might be a good idea to put  
16 an annual report out though.  
17  
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, I think one  
19 thing we can do is we can say we've been encouraged  
20 with the progress we've made in -- actually, I think  
21 back to when we first started subsistence on the Kenai  
22 and basically almost had to have armed guards standing  
23 at the door so that we could -- to the point that all  
24 that happens is they don't deliver the Clarion to  
25 Cooper Landing.  
26  
27 I think we have made a lot of progress  
28 on the Kenai, both in education and understanding. The  
29 word I'm trying to come up with is in recognition that  
30 subsistence is not only viable but is mandated and can  
31 be accommodated without total disruption of everybody  
32 else that lives there, to the point that it's almost --  
33 I don't know if I can use the word accepted, but there  
34 is definitely more acceptance than there was when we  
35 first started. And I think we have made some progress  
36 in that area.  
37  
38 Greg, you're down there. Do you think  
39 we've made progress to speak of in there?  
40  
41 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, Mr. Chair. I  
42 think we've made great progress. Made great leaps and  
43 bounds. There's always going to be challenges. The  
44 armed guards and the threats and everything else has  
45 definitely diminished and the terrorism.  
46  
47 Yeah, I agree. I think there are a  
48 couple items. There is the area of concern with the  
49 fishwheels for us in the Kasilof, you know, some of the  
50 challenges of the permits and stuff, but we are

1 actively working on it, and the funding is certainly a  
2 concern. But, yeah, I think we've done good and we can  
3 state that.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.

6

7 MS. STICKWAN: I think we should put in  
8 our report to go on record, like Bob was saying, our  
9 subsistence harvest will probably go down because of  
10 the cost of fuel to go out and hunt and fish. Our  
11 harvest levels will go down because it costs a lot of  
12 money for gas here and just to buy things to go out  
13 hunting. It's very expensive.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And along with that  
16 then, we need to look at how we can accommodate  
17 subsistence needs as close to home as possible.

18

19 MR. ENCELEWSKI: That's a good point.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So that should be  
22 something that we should be looking at in the future,  
23 is how we can accommodate as many subsistence needs as  
24 close to the home communities as we can do, even if it  
25 means increasing them at the expense of not having them  
26 farther away. So that's a need. Need to maximize  
27 close proximity subsistence resources and that would go  
28 along with what he was talking about, the fact that the  
29 moose are right there and close and handy. It behooves  
30 us to harvest as many bears as we can without  
31 destroying the population, but at the same time  
32 maximize the moose harvest.

33

34 So we'll hit that one and the progress  
35 on the Kenai and the challenges to go. Doug.

36

37 MR. BLOSSOM: Yeah, Mr. Chair. Along  
38 with that one, pat ourself on the back a little. We  
39 were able to get through the major subsistence parts on  
40 wildlife and fish and showed the Federal Board we could  
41 do without a special committee. You know, they tried  
42 the special committee and it didn't work. We handled  
43 it, we solved it and it looks like it's quieted down.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So the success of the  
46 RAC as opposed to special committee. Anything else.  
47 Bill.

48

49 MR. STOCKWELL: I agree, put the thing  
50 in on the Kenai that it's been a success. Good idea.

1 I think we just got talking about wildlife studies and  
2 so on and they did mention that there was funding  
3 issues, so I'd like to see us put in that we definitely  
4 support wildlife issues for the area and we would  
5 support increased funding for them however it can be  
6 managed through joint process, whatever. Thank you.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So we support funding  
9 or increased funding for both wildlife and fish as they  
10 affect subsistence needs.

11

12 MR. STOCKWELL: Correct.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: With the wildlife  
15 being a new component.

16

17 MR. STOCKWELL: Right.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Wildlife is a new and  
20 recognizable component. Gloria.

21

22 MS. STICKWAN: I was just thinking  
23 about that C&T policies we submitted in the past. One  
24 of the recommendations for the Board was once you put  
25 in a C&T determination, anyone that challenges that has  
26 to bring substantial new evidence to challenge that  
27 decision. I would like to see the Federal Board  
28 implement that before they close the C&T. It was a  
29 policy that was submitted, so I don't know. I guess I  
30 would like to see that as part of that.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

33

34 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair, if I may.  
35 Ms. Stickwan. I think you're talking about two issues.  
36 One is the policy itself and the status of that policy.  
37 Then you're speaking to what may be contained in that  
38 policy as far as a request for reconsideration of a  
39 decision the Board has made. Both of those are fair  
40 game if you will within a policy. I gave you the best  
41 guess I had right now where we are with the C&T policy.  
42 I'll know a lot more after November 3rd. But I think  
43 as far as the context of what you would like to see  
44 within a C&T policy you could report that on your  
45 annual report as well.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: How does this sound,  
48 Gloria. Support the idea that in order to challenge or  
49 reverse a current C&T, substantial new evidence must be  
50 brought forward. Does that sound like what you were

1 trying to say?

2

3 MS. STICKWAN: Yes.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You feel that should  
6 be part of the C&T policy.

7

8 MS. STICKWAN: Yes.

9

10 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair. If you look  
11 at last year's response, you also had an issue on the  
12 C&T policy and Mr. Mike Fleagle, the Chair, said your  
13 comments will be taken into account when the draft  
14 Customary and Traditional Use Policy is revisited in  
15 the future. Of course, that's prior to the Chistochina  
16 case. So your comments have been addressed and the  
17 commitment has been made by the Board Chair that  
18 they'll be incorporated, but if you want to re-  
19 emphasize that, please do.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'm not sure we had  
22 that comment in there, Pete. I'd have to go back and  
23 look. But I think that's important enough that we  
24 could reiterate it. It's not going to hurt to put it in  
25 this annual report too.

26

27 MR. PROBASCO: Here's your actual  
28 question if I may read it. The Council recommends that  
29 the Federal Board amend the C&T policy under the  
30 guiding consideration section to include language which  
31 states -- and I think this is where Ms. Stickwan is  
32 coming from -- after the Board has made a positive C&T  
33 determination for a community or an area, there will be  
34 a strong presumption that the determination is valid  
35 and that the Board will only consider a proposal to  
36 modify or rescind a C&T's termination if the proponent  
37 has demonstrated substantial new information supporting  
38 the proponent's claim.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Pete.  
41 That's exactly what we were saying. Do you think it's  
42 worthwhile including that or since we've already got it  
43 in that one it's probably not necessary?

44

45 MR. PROBASCO: It never hurts to  
46 remind. You could actually refer to our last year's  
47 annual report and reference it for '08.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you muchly on  
50 that. I didn't remember that's the way we worded it.

1 MR. PROBASCO: Well written.  
2  
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other things that  
4 anybody would like to include in the annual report. I  
5 think we should also include a little bit that I think  
6 this expanded RAC has worked out pretty good too.  
7  
8 (No comments)  
9  
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Hearing  
11 nothing, we'll go on to the next item on our agenda.  
12 Thank you, Pete, for your help.  
13  
14 MR. PROBASCO: You bet.  
15  
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We have Agency  
17 organization reports now. Bureau of Land Management,  
18 Anchorage or Glennallen. Is anybody here. I don't see  
19 anybody.  
20  
21 Office of Subsistence Management,  
22 status of the rural/non-rural RFR's. Do we have a  
23 report on that, Pete.  
24  
25 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair. There's a  
26 written report that gives you a status. These RFR's  
27 affect your area, Southcentral Council.  
28  
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You're on Page 140?  
30  
31 MR. PROBASCO: That's correct, 140. It  
32 gives you the current status. All RFR's submitted, the  
33 Board found that they did not meet the criteria and  
34 were not forwarded for further consideration. So that  
35 slate of RFR's for '07, one through six have been  
36 completed.  
37  
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Thank you. Now  
39 we'll go to Tribal and Non-governmental Organizations.  
40 The Native Village of Eyak I think has a report for us.  
41  
42 MR. van den BROEK: Mr. Lohse. Keith  
43 van den Broek, Native Village of Eyak. I'll be very  
44 brief. I apologize, I don't have any numbers to  
45 present yet. As usual, the fall meeting of the RAC is  
46 too early for us.  
47  
48 We successfully ran the sockeye and  
49 chinook mark recapture studies again, in addition to  
50 the sockeye radiotelemetry study, which was funded

1 through the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund this  
2 year. The sockeye/chinook mark recaptures were funded  
3 through the FRMP again.

4  
5 We operated at Baird Canyon three  
6 fishwheels from May 7th through August 4th and at  
7 Canyon Creek two fishwheels from May 14th through  
8 August 19th. This year we were using some new PDA's  
9 for our data collection and these are a large part of  
10 our problem of why we haven't produced any data yet at  
11 this point. We're going to be able to produce some  
12 decent estimates, but because of some issues we had  
13 with software and programming and whatnot, we have a  
14 lot of kinks in the database that we're still working  
15 out. I've been working full time for the last several  
16 weeks on this. We're getting through it, but don't  
17 have enough yet that I can present any certain numbers  
18 at this stage.

19  
20 The new tags we produced last year are  
21 still working out great. Produced some very good  
22 results. I wanted to report briefly that in June we  
23 had several members of the Federal Subsistence Board  
24 and their support staff visit our Baird Camp. I think  
25 we had a total of 13 people. It was a logistically  
26 challenging but very successful trip. I think everyone  
27 enjoyed their time out there. The newsletter that was  
28 on the back table had an article on the last page if  
29 you guys want to read over that.

30  
31 August 15th we had intern day for the  
32 Fisheries Monitoring Program interns and we had a total  
33 of three interns for the summer and two of them were  
34 able to attend the intern day along with myself and  
35 presented on their time at the fish camps and I think  
36 they did an excellent job with that. It was a really  
37 good opportunity to meet with the other interns around  
38 the state and the Partners biologists from around the  
39 state and see what they've been up to and kind of  
40 collaborate and work towards a better intern program in  
41 the future.

42  
43 I wanted to follow on from Gloria's  
44 comments earlier. I am now funded through the Fish and  
45 Wildlife Program as a Partners biologist, so as part of  
46 that position I am available to offer technical  
47 assistance to other tribes in the region in preparing  
48 grant proposals, so I'm happy to meet with you later on  
49 that.

50

1                               That's all I have to report this time  
2 unless you have questions.

3

4                               CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Henrichs.

5

6                               MR. HENRICHS: Yeah, Keith. Didn't a  
7 lot of the people that work in those camps weren't  
8 really there for the money, they were there because it  
9 helped them with their education and their resumes?

10

11                              MR. van den BROEK: That's absolutely  
12 right. With some of the funding cutbacks we did have  
13 to cut our pay rates. Definitely a lot of the people  
14 working there were coming up from the Lower 48.  
15 They're college students or recently graduated students  
16 that are really interested in the work and getting that  
17 padding on their resume.

18

19                              CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So that helps cut the  
20 costs.

21

22                              MR. van den BROEK: It does help cut  
23 the costs. At the same time we'd like to be able to  
24 increase the cost to be able to get more local  
25 employees. I have a real hard time getting any locals  
26 to want to work because the money that's available  
27 through fishing or other employment is a lot better.

28

29                              CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any  
30 questions. Gloria.

31

32                              MS. STICKWAN: You're funded for one  
33 year or two years, your position.

34

35                              MR. van den BROEK: My position is  
36 funded for another three years, I think. The FRMP  
37 projects right now were funded for just one more year.  
38 So we'll be writing to the new RFP to hopefully  
39 continue the chinook mark recapture at a minimum for  
40 another three years.

41

42                              CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. I think  
43 that's one of the more successful projects that's been  
44 taking place all over the state. I sure hope you can  
45 get funding for another three years because I think  
46 it's a very important project.

47

48                              Mr. Henrichs.

49

50                              MR. HENRICHS: For a lot of people that

1 don't know the history of that project, at one point  
2 when we were really naive and believe EVOS was going to  
3 fund things, we worked with the Aquaculture Association  
4 and put a project in to do the work on the Copper  
5 River. We never received funding from EVOS. I kept  
6 sticking those in and changing the dates on them and  
7 when this other funding popped up because the State  
8 didn't address subsistence and it came through the  
9 Federal government, we got together with -- oh, what is  
10 Link's outfit?

11

12 MR. van den BROEK: LGL.

13

14 MR. HENRICHS: LGL. And put it in and  
15 got it funded. For other organizations looking to do  
16 things like this, you have to be persistent. A lot of  
17 time you'll stick in a funding request knowing that  
18 you'll never get it where you're sticking it in, but it  
19 gets exposure, so it will help you down the line.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any other  
22 questions.

23

24 (No comments)

25

26 MR. van den BROEK: Thank you.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you for the  
29 report. Okay. With that we go on to the U.S. Fish and  
30 Wildlife Service. Do we have any report.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: None. U.S. Forest  
35 Service. I saw you took off your mayor's hat.

36

37 MR. JOYCE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I  
38 did take it off and checked it at the door. My name  
39 for the record is Jim Joyce. I'm a subsistence  
40 biologist in Cordova. Steve Zemke, who is the  
41 subsistence coordinator for the Chugach Forest is not  
42 here, so I'm going to be delivering a report for him as  
43 well. I was under the assumption there was going to be  
44 copies of this available to you, but they're not here,  
45 so I will make copies for you at noon time.

46

47 In light of that, I'll just go ahead  
48 and read it at this time. A total of 33 Federal  
49 subsistence permits were issued for the Prince William  
50 Sound area of the Chugach National Forest. These were

1 fisheries permits. This represents a 32 percent  
2 decrease in the number of permits issues from 2006 to  
3 2007. So in 2007 we had a reduced number of people  
4 that actually applied for a permit. The number of  
5 salmon harvested was also reduced by about 58 percent  
6 from about 250 fish to 104 fish. Granted, these  
7 numbers are pretty small when you consider that a  
8 commercial fishery is in the 2 million. Generally  
9 speaking, the last few years has been over 1 million  
10 fish. One can only speculate for the reason for the  
11 decline in the permits and the harvest.

12  
13 The sockeye salmon return to the Copper  
14 River was large in 2007, but the sockeye stocks on the  
15 Copper River Delta were less abundant. It's possible  
16 the subsistence needs for Prince William Sound  
17 residents were met in the State marine subsistence  
18 fishery and fewer people needed the Federal subsistence  
19 permit. It's also possible that some of the Federal  
20 subsistence users decided not to harvest salmon in  
21 fresh water because of the low numbers of fish and the  
22 difficulty to harvest fish in the shallow, clear  
23 waters.

24  
25 I want to also make sure that everyone  
26 is aware these are just the Federal subsistence  
27 permits. These are not the marine waters, just fresh  
28 water. The State also issues subsistence permits in  
29 the area for marine subsistence fishery. And I don't  
30 have those numbers. Those are addressed by the State.

31  
32 In 2008, currently we have 46 permits  
33 that have been issued and that's similar to the initial  
34 years, the first couple years. We had between 48 and  
35 49, 47 permits, so we're right in there again this last  
36 year.

37  
38 I also have a graph that kind of  
39 indicates each year the number of permits being  
40 harvested. Again, you probably won't be able to see  
41 it, but these are the permits issues, salmon harvested  
42 and this is other species, very small. The bottom line  
43 is for the first couple years of the permits we're  
44 about the same number of permits, about the same number  
45 of fish harvested. We did have a drop last year, but  
46 we do have an increase this year.

47  
48 On the Kenai Peninsula, the report you  
49 had earlier, which is this green sheet, has more  
50 updated numbers than the report we had. Basically the

1 real thing to look at was the numbers of salmon  
2 harvested have greatly increased in the last year, in  
3 2008 over 2007. In fact, they more than doubled on the  
4 Kenai Peninsula area. That was with the dipnet harvest  
5 in particular.

6  
7 That was one of the questions that came  
8 up earlier during some of your discussions, what was  
9 the change. Again, these are numbers that are not  
10 complete yet. The 2008 permits are still coming in, so  
11 there is a considerably higher harvest in 2008 than  
12 2007. You just have a slight increase in the number of  
13 permits issued, but it was something where the actual  
14 users were starting to get the hang of it and starting  
15 to harvest more fish. That included mostly sockeye,  
16 the two chinook that you saw harvested out of the  
17 Kasilof and there were a few coho harvested as well.

18  
19 The other thing that was going on there  
20 were some moose permits issued in the Kenai area and I  
21 believe those numbers have gone from around 10 permits  
22 that have been issued. This was for the Cooper Landing  
23 subsistence moose season. That is something that's new  
24 and is being looked at. I don't have any reports on  
25 harvest on that yet.

26  
27 If anybody has any questions.

28  
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Any questions.  
30 Go ahead, Doug.

31  
32 MR. BLOSSOM: You're talking about  
33 moose harvest. Did you have a number on the 15C late  
34 hunt from last year?

35  
36 MR. JOYCE: 15C. I don't have those  
37 numbers. Maybe Jeff McBride if he's here. No. He  
38 might have them. Steve didn't give them to me, so I  
39 don't have them. Sorry.

40  
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bill.

42  
43 MR. STOCKWELL: For your information,  
44 Jeff told me there was one moose harvested in the early  
45 season in Unit 7 by somebody in Cooper Landing.

46  
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Thank you.  
48 Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

49  
50 MR. PAPPAS: Mr. Chair. George Pappas.

1 The area manager should be arriving fairly soon. I  
2 guess we're moving right along in the schedule. he did  
3 not have a prepared report, but he'll answer questions  
4 when he arrives. I believe he has an informational to  
5 supply.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We'll just  
8 postpone Alaska Department of Fish and Game until he  
9 arrives. Is he going to be here before lunch?

10

11 MR. PAPPAS: Yes, he should be here any  
12 minute.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. National Park  
15 Service. Wrangell/St. Elias.

16

17 MS. CELLARIUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
18 Council members. For the record, my name is Barbara  
19 Cellarius. I'm subsistence coordinator for  
20 Wrangell/St. Elias National Park and Preserve. We also  
21 have some other people en route, but I'm hoping by the  
22 time I've finished with a couple of things that I need  
23 to talk to you about that they'll be here.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: In other words, you're  
26 going to stall.

27

28 MS. CELLARIUS: Well, this is pretty  
29 important. Gloria knows at least one of these things.  
30 So they're on my list of things to do and hopefully our  
31 folks will be here by the time I'm done.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If they're not, we'll  
34 take a coffee break.

35

36 MS. CELLARIUS: That sounds good. So  
37 the first thing I want to talk to you about is actually  
38 both for Wrangell/St. Elias and for Denali National  
39 Park. My colleague, Amy Craver, was not able to be  
40 here today.

41

42 Under the provisions of ANILCA, the  
43 Southcentral RAC appoints one member to the  
44 Wrangell/St. Elias National Park Subsistence Resource  
45 Commission and one member to the Denali Park  
46 Subsistence Resource Commission. These commissions  
47 were established under ANILCA to advise National Parks  
48 within which subsistence was allowed. They also make  
49 recommendations to the Federal Subsistence Board on  
50 proposals concerning subsistence harvest of fish and

1 wildlife. SRC appointments are for three year terms.  
2 ANILCA is very specific about who is eligible for these  
3 appointment. The only people who are eligible for  
4 appointments you make are members of the Southcentral  
5 RAC or of the Fish and Game Advisory Committee in the  
6 area in both cases with the additional requirement that  
7 the individual engage in subsistence in the relevant  
8 national park.

9  
10 So I'm going to start with Denali. The  
11 Southcentral RAC appointment to the Denali SRC is  
12 currently vacant. There are no RAC members that we're  
13 aware of who meet these eligibility criteria I've  
14 described. There is, however, a member of the Cantwell  
15 AC who meets the eligibility criteria and is interested  
16 in the appointment. His name is Jeff Burney and he's  
17 from Cantwell and a carpenter by occupation and has  
18 experience as a subsistence hunter, trapper and  
19 fisherman in the region. He has lived in Cantwell  
20 since 1978. His residence is within the resident zone  
21 for Denali National Park and he has gotten Federal  
22 registration permits for Federal hunts that occur in  
23 Denali and he's currently a member of the Alaska  
24 Department of Fish and Game Denali Local Advisory  
25 Committee. That's the only candidate I have to present  
26 to you for that appointment, but would ask that you  
27 consider making an appointment for this position. It's  
28 currently vacant. We have to have a certain number of  
29 members present to have a quorum and having vacancies  
30 makes it harder for us to have a quorum. So I hope you  
31 consider appointment Jeff Burney since he's the only  
32 candidate we have unless there are others you're aware  
33 of.

34  
35 MR. LAMB: I used to live in Cantwell.  
36 I know Jeff. I think he'd do a good job on it.

37  
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I was going to ask if  
39 anybody knew Jeff or if he had a letter he submitted.  
40 Gloria.

41  
42 MS. STICKWAN: (Indiscernible) Strong  
43 was interested at one time.

44  
45 MS. CELLARIUS: This was the only name  
46 I got. I didn't talk to Amy directly about the  
47 candidates, but I know she's worked really hard to find  
48 someone who was eligible.

49  
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So the requirements

1 are fairly stringent. They have to either be on the AC  
2 or in the RAC.

3

4 MS. CELLARIUS: Yes.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Henrichs.

7

8 MR. HENRICHS: I'm just curious how  
9 many members are on this advisory deal, who are they  
10 and where do they come from?

11

12 MS. CELLARIUS: I'll do my best because  
13 I don't have a membership list for Denali. I can tell  
14 you there are nine members for each SRC. Three are  
15 appointed by the governor, three by the Secretary of  
16 Interior, and three by the relevant Regional Advisory  
17 Councils.

18

19 For Denali, there are four resident  
20 zone communities. If I remember correctly, they're  
21 Cantwell, Minchumina and I don't know if it's both  
22 Nicholai and Telida. I've got my reg book. I could  
23 actually go and find that out for you for sure.  
24 Cantwell is the only road accessible community. The  
25 other three are on the west side of the mountains.

26

27 Ray Collins is the chair of the Denali  
28 SRC. I believe Florence Collins, who is a long-time  
29 chair of the SRC is still a member. I'm afraid I  
30 didn't come prepared with a roster for Denali, but  
31 they're going to be from those four communities that  
32 have subsistence rights within the National Park. They  
33 currently have no one from Cantwell.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If you have one  
36 application that meets the qualifications and we have  
37 collaboration from one of the members that knows him  
38 and feels like he would be a good member, Denali is  
39 just right on the edge of our area. We only appoint  
40 one, is that right?

41

42 MS. CELLARIUS: That's my  
43 understanding. This happened at the last minute.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: A motion to accept  
46 this appointment would be in order.

47

48 MR. LAMB: I'll make a motion.

49

50 MR. BLOSSOM: Second.

1                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and  
2 seconded. Mr. Henrichs.

3  
4                   MR. HENRICHs: In the future, I'd like  
5 people to come to these meetings prepared to answer  
6 questions about these. I'd like to know who the  
7 governor appointed, who the Secretary of Interior  
8 appointed. It's hard to do our job if we don't have  
9 that information.

10  
11                   MS. CELLARIUS: Mr. Chair. If you'd  
12 like, if you wanted to postpone this until after lunch,  
13 I could get that information for you. I have that  
14 information for the Wrangell/St. Elias SRC. I was  
15 asked to make this presentation for Denali at the last  
16 minute and I really apologize I didn't bring that  
17 information for them.

18  
19                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That would be nice  
20 information to have. It wouldn't affect this  
21 appointment if you only have one qualified person to  
22 choose from. I understand this is not your area, that  
23 you're just standing in for somebody else, Barbara, so  
24 don't take it personally what Mr. Henrichs was saying,  
25 but it's information we would like to have.

26  
27                   Any comments.

28  
29                   (No comments)

30  
31                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question is in  
32 order then.

33  
34                   MR. LAMB: Question.

35  
36                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been  
37 called. All in favor signify by saying aye.

38  
39                   IN UNISON: Aye.

40  
41                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by  
42 saying nay.

43  
44                   MR. HENRICHs: Nay.

45  
46                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. Okay,  
47 Barbara, now you're giving us the one for Wrangell.

48  
49                   MS. CELLARIUS: Now I'm giving you the  
50 one for Wrangell/St. Elias National Park. Tina is

1 passing out our roster. It shows the appointments, who  
2 appointed them and I believe where they're from.

3  
4 The term of the current appointee to  
5 this position, Gloria Stickwan, expires in November of  
6 2008. Gloria meets all of the eligibility criteria for  
7 this position and she's also interested in  
8 reappointment. To the best of my knowledge, she's the  
9 only Southcentral RAC member who is interested. You  
10 already know Gloria. If you'd like me to summarize her  
11 qualifications, I can do that. If not, I'll just move  
12 on to a second candidate that I have in order to  
13 provide you with choices.

14  
15 I contacted the Copper Basin and the  
16 Tok Cut-off Nabesna Road AC's to see if any of their  
17 members would be interested in serving on the SRC. I  
18 came up with another candidate who would be qualified.  
19 Chuck McMann is a resident of Gakona. He is a long-  
20 time member of the Copper Basin AC for about 20 years  
21 and he is currently the vice-chair of the AC. He is  
22 extensively engaged in subsistence activities. He  
23 hunts, fishes, trapped in the past. He was born and  
24 raised in this area. His wife is a local teacher. His  
25 parents started Meyer's Roadhouse, so he lived there  
26 when he was a small child. He's a Bush pilot and does a  
27 lot of survey work for ADF&G. He has attended Board of  
28 Game meetings and has been on Board of Game  
29 subcommittees, so he's been involved in the regulatory  
30 process as related to Fish and Wildlife. He's also  
31 been a guide and commercial fished in the Naknek area.

32  
33 So that's a summary of Chuck's  
34 qualifications. Both of those individuals, Gloria and  
35 Chuck, would be qualified to serve on the SRC as an  
36 appointment by this RAC. I'm happy to answer any  
37 questions.

38  
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Barbara, I just have  
40 one question. Even the appointments by the Secretary  
41 of Interior have to meet the same requirements, don't  
42 they?

43  
44 MS. CELLARIUS: It's interesting when  
45 you read ANILCA because it's really specific about this  
46 particular appointment and it isn't about the other  
47 appointments. In general, the people who are appointed  
48 to those positions, it makes the most sense if they  
49 have a history of hunting or fishing in the park, but  
50 it's not as strict a requirement as the requirement for

1 the position that you make.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: For the RAC.

4

5 MS. CELLARIUS: Yes.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I notice they're all  
8 from resident zone communities, the people that are  
9 appointed.

10

11 MS. CELLARIUS: That's been the general  
12 practice. It makes the most sense in terms of being  
13 able to provide advice from local communities to park  
14 management about subsistence issues.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria, since you're  
17 here, I can ask you a direct question. Have you  
18 enjoyed your work on the SRC?

19

20 MS. STICKWAN: You want me to be  
21 honest?

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Have you enjoyed it  
24 enough that you'd like to do it again? I guess that's  
25 a better question.

26

27 MS. STICKWAN: Yeah. I think our SRC  
28 works pretty well together even though we're a diverse  
29 group.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug.

32

33 MR. BLOSSOM: I'd like to nominate  
34 Gloria Stickwan to be our representative on the board.

35

36 MR. HENRICHS: I'll second.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and  
39 seconded to nominate Gloria for our appointment on the  
40 Wrangell/St. Elias National Park SRC. Discussion or  
41 question.

42

43 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Question.

44

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

47

48 IN UNISON: Aye.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by

1 saying nay.

2

3 (No opposing votes)

4

5 MS. STICKWAN: I abstain.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. It's  
8 totally okay to vote for yourself.

9

10 MS. CELLARIUS: I have a couple other  
11 things to mention and then I have three other people  
12 from the Park Staff here who have reports to give as  
13 well. I just want to mention a couple things really  
14 quickly. One is that the National Park Service is  
15 embarking on the writing of an environmental assessment  
16 and this will evaluate alternatives for managing the  
17 collection and use of horns and antlers by NPS  
18 qualified local rural residents in Alaska National Park  
19 System units where subsistence is allowed. So  
20 currently it is not allowed for subsistence users who  
21 are out in the park and encounter horns or antlers that  
22 are lying on the ground to pick them up and take them  
23 home and use them for subsistence uses. We've had some  
24 interest in being able to do that, so we will be  
25 evaluating that. We're at the very beginning of this  
26 process. As we get down along the road and have things  
27 for the public to comment on, I will do my best to make  
28 sure Donald is kept informed so he can share that with  
29 the Council and Gloria, as a member of the SRC, will be  
30 able to share that as well.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

33

34 MS. CELLARIUS: The other environmental  
35 assessment we're embarking on is going to reevaluate  
36 our management of timber resources in light of some  
37 recent regulation changes. So we're going to be doing  
38 an EA looking at establishing a permitting system for  
39 subsistence firewood. We're going to be having a  
40 scoping meeting on this later this year and I will make  
41 sure Donald and Gloria get the information and this  
42 will be a very preliminary discussion and at the next  
43 meeting I should have more information for you.

44

45 That's what I have. We also have here  
46 Judy Patera, who is our new wildlife biologist. Molly  
47 McCormick, who is the fisheries biologist for the Park  
48 and Bruce Rogers who is going to be talking a little  
49 bit and giving you an update on the Nabesna Road ORV  
50 EIS. Unless there's any questions for me.

1                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Barbara.  
2     Whoever wants to be first can be first.

3  
4                   MS. PATERA: It's very nice to be here  
5     today. My name is Judy Patera and I'm replacing Mason  
6     Reed, the previous wildlife biologist. I've been here  
7     just a very short time. I started the end of June. I  
8     previously worked in Denali National Park. I came to  
9     Alaska in 1995 and started there. I worked there for  
10    three years and moved to Lake Clark National Park and  
11    Preserve and worked in the Lake Clark and Bristol Bay  
12    region for eight to nine years and then came here.

13  
14                   Since I've been here a short time, I  
15    went ahead and put a brief report together,  
16    highlighting some of the subsistence resource species  
17    that we've done surveys on. We continued our efforts  
18    to monitor both the Mentasta and Chisana Caribou Herds  
19    this year. For the Mentasta Herd we'll continue to  
20    deploy a minimum number of radio collars on cows and  
21    this enables us to be able to locate the animals when  
22    we are trying to count them.

23  
24                   I also wanted to say we have recently  
25    requested and received technical assistance from, for  
26    lack of a better term, the hierarchy in the NPS to take  
27    a look at our policies and be able to interpret them  
28    and explore management strategies for these herds.  
29    We'll be starting that up shortly and trying to take a  
30    little more in-depth look at how we can manage these  
31    herds a little better.

32  
33                   We did a post-calving survey for the  
34    Mentasta Caribou Herd this summer in late June. We  
35    counted a total of 195 animals and this is just a  
36    minimum estimate. We did not locate all of our radio-  
37    collared cows, so we know there are some animals we do  
38    miss. It looks like we had pretty similar results from  
39    the previous year as far as total number of animals  
40    located. The number of calves and bulls that we  
41    located were a little lower than the previous year.

42  
43                   I'm just going to skim over these  
44    results because I am fairly new here and haven't had a  
45    whole lot of time to look into the history on these  
46    herds and what's been done previously, so I hope that's  
47    okay with everybody.

48  
49                   We did do a fall composition count on  
50    the Mentasta Herd this year and we were able to comp

1 172 animals and the results are there in the second  
2 graph. It looks like the cow/calf and bull/cow ratios  
3 are a little lower than last year.

4  
5                   There is a composition count being  
6 conducted on the Chisana Caribou Herd this fall. It  
7 started last year and is flowing into this week. I  
8 don't have the results yet, but I will provide those  
9 next time if the opportunity presents itself.

10  
11                   We did a moose population survey  
12 November of 2007 and I put the results there. The  
13 figure on the facing page is basically the area we  
14 survey. We lay out this large grid system and then  
15 randomly select areas or boxes we want to survey. I  
16 didn't participate in this survey. It was before I was  
17 here, but I thought I'd present the results. The boxes  
18 that are in bold are the units that were surveyed.  
19 There's a population estimate that is produced for the  
20 whole area based on the number of animals that were  
21 counted.

22  
23                   I believe there were trend areas that  
24 were surveyed previously that correspond to the Upper  
25 Copper, Mt. Drum and the Crystalline Hills. For this  
26 report they did, using the data, looked at these  
27 separate individual areas. For purposes of actually  
28 comparing with previous years, which I don't have here,  
29 but I thought I'd throw these in because there's a  
30 little bit of a difference in the results between the  
31 three areas.

32  
33                   So it's really very brief, but I'm  
34 excited to be here. Actually, I should talk about sheep  
35 a little bit. We intended to do quite a few sheep  
36 surveys this summer, but the weather prevented a lot of  
37 the work being done, so I don't have any of those  
38 results. That's something that I'm hoping to take a  
39 more active role in the future, to monitor the sheep  
40 population closer. Our new I&M program I think is  
41 going to help us be able to accomplish that in the  
42 years to come.

43  
44                   So I'm very happy to be here and would  
45 love to talk to anybody who would like to give me a  
46 call and just talk about what's on their mind and get a  
47 lot of local knowledge. That would be very helpful.  
48 Thanks.

49  
50                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Questions. Doug.

1 MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chair. This moose  
2 survey, you did it three years ago. Is that up from  
3 three years ago or down?

4  
5 MS. PATERA: Actually this was done  
6 just in November of 2007. It's kind of a new method  
7 we're using. We're going to repeat this every three  
8 years. We're rotating with other parks in the area.  
9 Like Denali will do it one year, Yukon Charlie the  
10 next. So our funding is coming from sort of a  
11 different funding source. Our next survey will be in  
12 2010.

13  
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Like you say you  
15 didn't see all the animals, but that's the same thing  
16 that happened on these other years probably. Is the  
17 confidence level enough to say that basically -- I mean  
18 I look at these numbers and the Mentasta Herd has had  
19 such a decline, but these numbers are all so close  
20 right here for the last '05, '07 and '08 that if you're  
21 missing any animals at all, you'd almost have to say  
22 that it was fairly stable.

23  
24 MS. PATERA: Yeah, I would definitely  
25 agree with that. I should point out I think 2007 there  
26 was a little different method employed. I think the  
27 results are pretty comparable. What I neglected to say  
28 about this is that we're working on a very repeatable  
29 sampling protocol for the Mentasta Herd and it's been a  
30 little loony-goody the last couple of years, but we'll  
31 have a document in hand before the next census and  
32 we'll follow that to the letter. There will also be --  
33 like I said, these are minimum numbers, but we need to  
34 factor in the number of animals we don't see and that  
35 will figure into the population estimate. I think  
36 these numbers will be a little higher in the future  
37 based on that more statistically rigorous procedures  
38 that we'll be done.

39  
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But these are close  
41 enough that you feel confident enough looking at these  
42 that you would see no major trend. While these may not  
43 be exact numbers, would these numbers be close enough  
44 in confidence factor that you could say there is no  
45 major trend. We have a slight decline shown here, but  
46 if we only have a confidence factor of say 70 percent,  
47 you'd basically have to say that's a stable population.  
48 In comparison to what it was, it's a very low  
49 population.

50

1                   The same with the Chisana Herd. You'd  
2 have to say the numbers are in the same ballpark even  
3 for the Chisana Herd to the point where you'd think of  
4 the population -- even if these numbers were exact,  
5 you'd have to say that would be within normal  
6 fluctuation anyhow. So you'd have a stable population  
7 even if that population was a lot lower than what the  
8 population used to be. I don't mean stable, meaning  
9 this is where we want it to be, but I mean it's like  
10 the crash has slowed down or bottomed out.

11  
12                   MS. PATERA: Right. And I think that  
13 will give us a little time to decide where we might  
14 want to go from here in coming up with some alternative  
15 management strategies.

16  
17                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hard to have  
18 management strategies when you've got a population in  
19 an environment that you have no hunting on or anything  
20 like that and the only thing you can supposedly manage  
21 would be habitat and other predators and you can't do  
22 either one. So I don't know how you have a management  
23 strategy other than just monitor.

24  
25                   MS. PATERA: Yeah. I think there are  
26 things we can take a look at. Part of it depends on  
27 how the herd -- what legal status it might have. One  
28 option would be to designate it a threatened or  
29 endangered species and then I think you have a lot more  
30 options open to you. I'm not saying that's what we'll  
31 do, but that's kind of what I'm getting at.

32  
33                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Just looking at other  
34 options.

35  
36                   MS. PATERA: Right. I feel like we're  
37 taking a step. Hopefully it's in the right direction.

38  
39                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think Gloria had a  
40 question for you.

41  
42                   MS. STICKWAN: You said there was a  
43 different method employed in 2007.

44  
45                   MS. PATERA: Well, it was just  
46 basically -- the folks in the planes went directly to  
47 the radio-collared animals as they were looking for  
48 other animals and that's not really how we -- I think  
49 what the protocol that's going to come out is going to  
50 do and what we did this year is we just surveyed the

1 area and systematically looking for any animals we  
2 could see. When we saw a group, we would determine  
3 whether that group had a radio-collared animal in it  
4 and record that. At the end of the survey we'll know  
5 how many animals that were radio collared that we  
6 completely missed and then we can go back and find  
7 them.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'm happy to see the  
10 moose survey starting to take place there. It will be  
11 interesting to see what the trends are. Again, all  
12 those things are long-term. On the ground it sounds  
13 like moose population is up. I actually had a friend  
14 who had a legal moose walk right up to his window and  
15 he didn't take it.

16

17 MS. PATERA: After having been over in  
18 Bristol Bay area, these numbers are pretty impressive.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Any other  
21 questions.

22

23 (No comments)

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

26

27 MS. PATERA: Thank you.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Moldy. Now the bad  
30 news comes.

31

32 MS. McCORMICK: Not necessarily bad.  
33 Hello, my name is Moldy McCormick. I work as a  
34 fisheries biologist at Wrangell/St. Elias National  
35 Park. I'm happy to be here today. There are a couple  
36 handouts you should have. I'm just going to talk real  
37 briefly about the projects we have ongoing in the Park.

38

39

40 We have three projects that are funded  
41 by Fish and Wildlife Service; two weirs and then  
42 another project that we're in the middle of three  
43 years. The Tannate Creek Weir is a weir that the Park  
44 has been working on and managing since 1997 with a  
45 couple of gaps in between and there was also kind of a  
46 change in the way that we were counting fish. If you  
47 look on the third page of the report, the first two  
48 years have some pretty high numbers in them that aren't  
49 reflected in the last several years. I don't know for  
50 sure, but there was sort of an extrapolation process in

1 the early years. I don't know if that's why the  
2 numbers were higher in 1997 and 1998 than they have  
3 been in the more recent years.

4  
5 This weir is located in the northern  
6 part of the Park, two miles off the Nabesna Road, just  
7 downstream from Batzulnedas, which is Kate Johns' fish  
8 camp. This year it was installed on May t and was in  
9 operation until July 8th, when we had a flood and it  
10 was lost downstream. We tried several times to put it  
11 back in operation after that, but it was such a wet  
12 summer, the water was so high, it was never safe enough  
13 to put the weir back in. The data we have runs through  
14 July 8th. Up to that point there were 2,850 sockeye  
15 salmon and 137 chinook salmon that had migrated through  
16 the weir.

17  
18 It's impossible to say what the  
19 escapement would have been if we could have counted the  
20 whole summer, but we did have some otolith crews there  
21 in September and whether or not we counted them all it  
22 was definitely a below average year.

23  
24 There are a couple pictures of the weir  
25 as it should be working and the weir at flood stage and  
26 the weir missing.

27  
28 The chinook count this year at Tannate  
29 Creek was exponentially higher than it normally has  
30 been since we were running the weir. A possible  
31 explanation for this might be there was a curtailment  
32 of commercial fishing in the early spring.  
33 Traditionally, according to Kate John, and this is  
34 information I got from Bill Someone, who works in the  
35 Alaska Department of Fish and Game Subsistence  
36 Department, there really has not been a big run of  
37 chinook up this creek as long as she has been catching  
38 fish at Batzulnedas. I guess we don't know why there  
39 were so many. There were 137 that were caught up until  
40 July 8th. In previous years, the numbers we have  
41 counted were 16, so it was just a very large run that  
42 went up Tannate Creek Weir.

43  
44 This weir is operated by a crew of  
45 three local residents and a little bit of volunteer  
46 help from the Slang Ranger Station. For the second  
47 year we've had an underwater camera and there's a  
48 picture of the camera. So the weir is actually open 24  
49 hours a day and then the crew comes in each day, looks  
50 at the recording. This is actually a very different

1 method and it's worked really well for us.

2

3                   We have some great photos. I was  
4 trying to get a still photo to show you how easy it is  
5 to see what kind of fish and how many fish are coming  
6 by. We have a space of about 10 inches that the fish  
7 swim through. There's no way we're going to miss them  
8 as they go by.

9

10                   It looked like the first fish we saw  
11 through the weir was just a little bit earlier than  
12 normal. Then we also have a weir at the outlet creek  
13 to Long Lake and that is about Mile 45 on the McCarthy  
14 Road, which is kind of right in the center part of the  
15 Park and it's in the China River drainage. Originally  
16 this weir was operated by the Alaska Department of Fish  
17 and Game back in the mid 's, but around 1976 they  
18 weren't able to fund it any longer, so the local land  
19 owner, Cliff Collins, took over operation of this weir  
20 and he continued counting fish until 2003. He was 93  
21 in that year and he decided he didn't feel he could do  
22 this any longer, so he talked to the Park and we  
23 continued the data collection for him. Since then the  
24 Collins Family Foundation has provided some of the help  
25 that works at the weir and the Park usually provides  
26 one or two people to work on it every year.

27

28                   There's a picture of the weir. This is  
29 a real different weir setup than the Tannate Creek.  
30 The Tannate Creek Weir is what they call a floating  
31 weir. The water is too swift, too deep and too dynamic  
32 to actually have a picket weir, which is what you see  
33 in the picture of the Long Lake Weir. So the Tannate  
34 Creek Weir is a hinged weir and attached to the bottom  
35 of the substrate and then the weir hinges from that.

36

37                   The Long Lake Weir is in a very small  
38 creek and the picket weir works very nicely. It's a  
39 late sockeye run coming into Long Lake Creek, so we  
40 usually don't install the weir until sometime in mid  
41 July. This year it was July 19th and it will be  
42 removed on October 10th. We still have a crew up there  
43 counting fish and getting scale samples and doing a  
44 little bit of otolith collection. This year the first  
45 fish migrated through on August 6th, which is sort of  
46 an average date for the first fish seen through the  
47 weir. As of September 20th we counted 555 sockeye  
48 coming through the weir. I don't have any more recent  
49 information, but my guess is there's not a whole lot  
50 more than that. This is the lowest number of fish that

1 we've ever counted through the weir in the 35 years  
2 it's been in operation.

3

4                   Last night a local land owner and one  
5 of the Council members offered a possible explanation  
6 for why the numbers were so low this year because in  
7 years past it's varied from 4,500 to almost 50,000.  
8 The explanation was that apparently occasionally in the  
9 Alakana River, which the Long Lake Creek flows into,  
10 the gravel gets shifted around and fish passage into  
11 the creek sometimes get curtailed or reduced and  
12 possibly this is what happened this year to account for  
13 the low numbers.

14

15                   We also have started to do a little bit  
16 of statistical analysis on the long-term data we had  
17 and this is done in collaboration with the inventory  
18 and monitoring program and it looks like there might be  
19 a possible correlation between the big fluctuation we  
20 see in this system if you combine it with a couple  
21 different weather -- big climatic weather phenomena.  
22 This is real preliminary stuff we've been looking at  
23 and it will be interesting to see if we can take that  
24 any further to see if it explains the big fluctuation  
25 in numbers of fish that come into Long Lake.

26

27                   I also put in a graph of the number of  
28 fish that come up into the Copper River system every  
29 year. There is a sonar counter located at Miles Lake,  
30 which is just upstream from the Million Dollar Bridge  
31 in Cordova. Every year the ADF&G counts the number of  
32 fish that come up in the river system. This can kind  
33 of give you an idea how it has varied over the last 15,  
34 20 years, but there's been a good number of fish coming  
35 up the river.

36

37                   The next thing that I have is the  
38 subsistence fisheries permits that we issue at the  
39 Park. There are two different subdistricts that local,  
40 rural residents can fish in, the Glennallen and China  
41 subdistricts. I have some information about how many  
42 permits we issued in each subdistrict since 2001, which  
43 was the first year that the Federal government issued  
44 permits in this area. Our count is down just a bit  
45 this year. There were 271 Glennallen permits issued  
46 and 84 for China.

47

48                   The permits aren't due back in until  
49 October 31st, so I don't have any updated data for this  
50 year, but if you look at the supplemental charts I

1 have, this will kind of give you an idea what the  
2 harvest levels have been in this area since 2002.

3  
4                   There is a small fishery, the  
5 Batzulnedas fishery, which allows people from Mentasta  
6 area and Dot Lake area to fish just off the mouth of  
7 Tannate Creek, which is upstream from the end of the  
8 Glennallen fishery. There was one permit issued and  
9 there were no nets that we gave permits for use in the  
10 Batzulnedas fishery.

11  
12                   We operate the China subdistrict in  
13 conjunction with the personal use fishery in the China  
14 subdistrict that the State has, so we keep this  
15 particular fishery open usually in alignment with  
16 whatever ADF&G decides for the personal use fishery and  
17 this is based on the maximum harvest level. I don't  
18 know if Mark Summerville was here earlier talking about  
19 the State fishery or not, but it's a fairly complicated  
20 formula that they plug in. If he feels there are not  
21 enough fish coming through, then he closes it for a  
22 certain number of hours each week if he feels that's  
23 necessary.

24  
25                   Usually we follow the openings and  
26 closings that he does for the State personal use  
27 fishery and this year we did two special actions in  
28 order to align the subsistence fishery with the State  
29 fishery. There was a variation this year. The Copper  
30 River commercial fisheries were closed for more than 13  
31 consecutive days this summer and there is a State  
32 regulation that states when this happens in the  
33 commercial fishery, then the maximum harvest level in  
34 the personal use fishery is reduced to 50,000 instead  
35 of the 100,00 to 150,000 salmon that it normally is.  
36 So this led to a couple weeks of reduced harvest  
37 schedule for the personal use fishery and the National  
38 Parks felt this was an allocation issue and it wasn't a  
39 conservation issue, so we decided to keep the Federal  
40 subsistence fishery open during those two weeks.

41  
42                   The third project we were working on  
43 this year is a burbot abundance project in both Tannate  
44 and Copper Lake. This was the second year of a two-  
45 year project. This year we sampled burbot in Copper  
46 Lake twice, once in the spring and once in the fall.  
47 About 120, 130 traps were set along the shoreline. We  
48 can only set traps in areas that are less than about 50  
49 feet deep and this lake has a deep trench running in  
50 the middle of it, so we could only set traps along the

1 shoreline of the lake. Then we leave them in the water  
2 for about 48 hours, then they're pulled, fish are  
3 tagged and any fish over 12 inches are tagged, put back  
4 into the water again, then we repeat this process.

5  
6 We repeated this process again in the  
7 fall and there's not really any statistical analysis on  
8 this yet, but in the spring sampling we captured and  
9 tagged 127 burbot, in the fall 119. It does look like  
10 there may be approximately 1,200 fish in Copper Lake,  
11 but this is pretty preliminary.

12  
13 Last year we did the same thing in  
14 Tannate Lake and in the spring sampling 443 burbot were  
15 captured, the fall 248 burbot were captured and we  
16 figured about 2,600 fish over 450 millimeters are  
17 present in Tannate Lake, which is a fairly healthy  
18 population for a lake of this size. There's a picture  
19 of one of the burbot from Tannate Lake.

20  
21 In 2009, it looks like we're going to  
22 have at least three more projects. We'll continue the  
23 weirs in both Tannate Creek and Long Lake for one more  
24 year. We'll continue some burbot studies in Tannate  
25 and Copper Lake for one more year. If we can get some  
26 funding, we have a possible project looking at a  
27 kokanee population in Copper Lake.

28  
29 That's all I had.

30  
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Moldy. Can  
32 I ask you just one question.

33  
34 MS. McCORMICK: Sure.

35  
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I don't want to keep  
37 everybody any longer, it's time for lunch. Isn't Long  
38 Lake the longest continuous running.....

39  
40 MS. McCORMICK: Data set.

41  
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: .....data set that we  
43 have in the state?

44  
45 MS. McCORMICK: It's the longest in the  
46 Copper Basin. I'm not sure that it is in the state,  
47 but it's definitely the longest in the Copper Basin.

48  
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So the longer the data  
50 set you have, the more we can tie it to weather, El

1 Nino and things like that.  
2  
3 MS. McCORMICK: Exactly.  
4  
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.  
6  
7 MS. STICKWAN: You said that camera you  
8 have there is the best count you have, better than the  
9 weir, and it was run all summer?  
10  
11 MS. McCORMICK: Yes. We keep it open  
12 24 hours long so we can visually see on the video  
13 recording every fish that comes through. There's only  
14 a space that's maybe eight inch wide that the fish come  
15 through so they're not going to be piling up on top of  
16 each other. They're going to be fairly easy to count  
17 as they come by the camera. In previous years before  
18 we installed the camera we did a visual count at the  
19 weir. At night we had an overhead camera which did not  
20 show up the fish nearly as efficiently as we can now.  
21 I really think this is going to be beneficial as long  
22 as we can keep the weir from flooding.  
23  
24 MS. STICKWAN: So you have numbers for  
25 that camera?  
26  
27 MS. McCORMICK: Yeah, this year we  
28 counted 2,850 up until July 6th and then the weir went  
29 out.  
30  
31 MS. STICKWAN: I mean for the camera.  
32 You don't have numbers for the camera and the weir that  
33 are different?  
34  
35 MS. McCORMICK: No. This is all we're  
36 doing this year.  
37  
38 MS. STICKWAN: You don't understand  
39 what I'm saying.  
40  
41 MS. McCORMICK: I guess not. I'm  
42 sorry.  
43  
44 MS. STICKWAN: Do you have counts just  
45 for this camera and counts for the weir to  
46 differentiate between the two of them?  
47  
48 MS. McCORMICK: In past years when we  
49 had an overhead camera running all the time and we had  
50 two different crews that went out to the weir and had

1 it open 14 to 16 hours each day, so while people were  
2 at the weir they were visually counting as well as the  
3 overhead camera. So, yes, in previous years we do have  
4 two counts. The last two years we've only used the  
5 camera, so we'll just have a count off of the video  
6 recording.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Basically what you're  
9 doing is using the weir to contain the fish so they  
10 have to go right by the camera.

11

12 MS. McCORMICK: Exactly. We're  
13 funnelling them.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So the camera is only  
16 taking pictures through the hole in the weir.

17

18 MS. McCORMICK: Uh-huh.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bob.

21

22 MR. HENRICHS: Somebody with 50 years  
23 of experience on the Copper River Delta, this year the  
24 Copper River was low and when those fish went by they  
25 didn't have to fight that heavy current and a lot of  
26 them made it all the way up to Mentasta and good for  
27 them. You have to have a year like that once in a  
28 while.

29

30 Those fish down there around our tribe,  
31 this is known as the year with no summer. I got up in  
32 late June one day and it was 34 degrees and those fish  
33 would come in and the water was too cold and they'd  
34 make a pass and go out. When they did come in, they  
35 just shot straight on up. I believe something happened  
36 to some of those fish in the ocean and I see those  
37 draggers went way over their 80,000 king salmon cap and  
38 caught an extra 58,000 and they offered to pay the  
39 market price for them. Well, something is drastically  
40 wrong there. There's no accountability there. I  
41 believe it affected the Copper River kings, Kenai River  
42 and other ones. We need to get to the bottom of that.  
43 It's like they're operating in their own world and  
44 they're not connected with us.

45

46 MS. McCORMICK: So you're talking about  
47 the fisheries further out in the ocean.

48

49 MR. HENRICHS: Sure.

50

1                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, we're late for  
2 lunch. We have one more person from the National Park  
3 Service and I hate to ask you, can you come back after  
4 lunch.

5  
6                   MR. ROGERS: Sure. Ten minutes.

7  
8                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: How about the person  
9 from Fish and Game, has he made it here? He hasn't  
10 made it here. The BLM is here. Well, let's eat lunch  
11 and we'll have it after lunch. It's quarter after  
12 12:00. We'll recess until 1:30.

13  
14                   (Off record)

15  
16                   (On record)

17  
18                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We'll call this fall  
19 session of the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council  
20 back into session. Barbara, I think you had a little  
21 something you wanted to hand out.

22  
23                   MS. CELLARIUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
24 Barbara Cellarius with the Wrangell/St. Elias National  
25 Park. You should have in front of you Council members  
26 a list of the members of the Denali Subsistence  
27 Resource Commission. This is in response to Mr.  
28 Henrichs request for information. It lists the current  
29 members, their appointing source and the community in  
30 which they live. There is another member from  
31 Cantwell. My understanding is that Cantwell is also  
32 the only resident zone community that is within the  
33 Southcentral region so it makes sense that this RAC  
34 would appoint someone from Cantwell.

35  
36                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's about the only  
37 place we can appoint somebody from, isn't it?

38  
39                   MS. CELLARIUS: (Nods affirmatively)

40  
41                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Barbara.  
42 Back to our reports. National Park Service. Gloria  
43 isn't back yet. Maybe we better slow down. Well,  
44 let's go ahead.

45  
46                   MR. ROGERS: My name is Bruce Rogers  
47 and I work for Wrangell/St. Elias National Park and  
48 Preserve. By way of introduction, I've been here  
49 before, but it was with the Bureau of Land Management.  
50 I was working on the East Alaska Resource Management

1 Plan and briefed this group several times for that  
2 project. That project is done, so I moved on to bigger  
3 and better things.

4

5 I want to talk about this project that  
6 we're currently working on, which is the Nabesna Off-  
7 Road Vehicle Environmental Impact Statement. There  
8 were a few handouts that went out. One is the map of  
9 the project area that's located in the northern part of  
10 the Wrangell/St. Elias National Park and preserve, east  
11 of Slang. The EIS is about off-road vehicle use on  
12 nine trails that go up the Nabesna Road.

13

14 The project is a result of a lawsuit  
15 that was filed in 2006 against the National Park  
16 Service. The plaintiffs were a consortium of  
17 environmental groups and they basically challenged the  
18 Park's authority to issue permits for recreational off-  
19 road vehicle use. As a result, a settlement was  
20 reached in 2007. One of the conditions of the  
21 settlement was that the Park Service would do an  
22 environmental impact statement to look at the effects  
23 of permitting ORV use. We're scheduled to get the  
24 project done by December of 2010.

25

26 Basically what we've done on the  
27 project so far is we've gone through our public scoping  
28 period. Last spring we had five public meetings;  
29 Glennallen, Tok, Slang, Fairbanks and Anchorage. Had a  
30 pretty decent turnout for those meetings. We put out a  
31 couple newsletters and we've had a lot of contacts with  
32 stakeholders and different groups and agencies and  
33 gotten some good, constructive comments.

34

35 This summer we did a lot of field work  
36 trying to fill in some information gaps of the project.  
37 We completed some cultural resource surveys on the  
38 trail corridors and completed wetlands mapping for the  
39 trails. We had a cooperative agreement with ADF&G to  
40 look at where these trails cross streams and a look at  
41 the fish habitat and the effects on it.

42

43 We had trail counters out this year to  
44 try and quantify some of the use on the trails and we  
45 took a close look at feasibility for doing some re-  
46 routes. What we're doing now is putting together a set  
47 of draft alternatives that we're going to send out to  
48 the public for review and comment before we get into  
49 the draft environmental impact statement, so it's kind  
50 of an extended part of public scoping. I would expect

1 we'll have those available within about a month and  
2 those will go out to the public for comment.

3  
4 I expect we'll get more comments as a  
5 result of those than we did in public scoping because  
6 people are always interested in what you're going to do  
7 about something. Anyway, look for those.

8  
9 We'll probably have a 60-day timeline  
10 to get comments in on those, but if this Board wants to  
11 take a look at those prior to your March meeting and  
12 make comments we'll take those. You'll have  
13 opportunities to look at those.

14  
15 So that's where we are and I'd be glad  
16 to answer any questions.

17  
18 Well, let me say this. The focus of  
19 the lawsuit was recreational off-road vehicle use and  
20 that's also the focus of the environmental impact  
21 statement. We can't look at one without looking at the  
22 other because the trails are used by both Federally-  
23 qualified subsistence folks and recreational use.  
24 We're looking at six different management alternatives.

25  
26  
27 There's an alternative that would have  
28 a little bit of an impact on subsistence use, basically  
29 ask people to stay on trails once we put a lot of money  
30 into fixing trails. So that's part of the range of  
31 alternatives. That's what we're looking at folks to  
32 take a look at and get their input on, but really the  
33 focus is on recreational off-road vehicle use. With  
34 that, I'd open it up for questions.

35  
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: When you say  
37 recreational, you automatically mean non-resident, non-  
38 subsistence. That automatically makes it recreational,  
39 doesn't it?

40  
41 MR. ROGERS: Yeah, recreational is not  
42 a real good word to use for it because it includes  
43 sport hunting. People can go into the Park and sport  
44 hunt in the preserve, so that quote/unquote  
45 recreational component of use up there is driven  
46 probably 90 percent by sport hunting. Six of the nine  
47 trails go to the north of the Nabesna Road into the  
48 preserve and then the Boomerang Trail goes through the  
49 Park but goes to the preserve, so the recreational  
50 component is driven by sport hunting.

1                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, up in the Tangle  
2 Lakes area, I think the BLM, when they did their trail  
3 thing, weren't they able to make it so that the people  
4 had to stay on the -- I think the regulations are if  
5 you use those trails up there you have to stay on the  
6 trail.

7  
8                   MR. ROGERS: Yeah. They designated  
9 trails in Tangle Lakes Archeological District. For the  
10 last 15 years trails have been designated to protect  
11 the sites off the trails. So, yeah, they've tried to  
12 get folks to stay on the trails.

13  
14                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So if you did fix up  
15 the trails or did limit them, that would be one option  
16 that could be pursued that off-current-trail use of  
17 ORV's would illegal?

18  
19                   MR. ROGERS: There's an alternative  
20 that considers that in these range of six alternatives.  
21 I would also say in this draft packet that we're  
22 putting out we don't identify a preferred alternative.  
23 As I mentioned before, this really is an extension of  
24 public scoping, so we're looking at getting the most  
25 public input we can before we do that.

26  
27                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So at this point in  
28 time the six alternatives are not solid enough that you  
29 can bring them to our attention?

30  
31                   MR. ROGERS: No. I'm glad to talk  
32 about them in a general sense, kind of a general theme.  
33 Basically you're required to do a no action and that's  
34 conditions under the lawsuit settlement.

35  
36                   Under the settlement, three of those  
37 nine trails are closed to recreational off-road use.  
38 They're closed seasonally. So when the ground is not  
39 frozen, people can't use their off-road vehicles. So  
40 that's the no action alternative.

41  
42                   Then we have an alternative that opens  
43 them all up to recreational off-road vehicle use, then  
44 we have an alternative that closes them all to ORV use.

45  
46                   And then there's three more and as you  
47 go through the alternatives they kind of ramp up the  
48 level of investment in trail improvement to try and  
49 address the degrading conditions on the trails. We've  
50 got everything from looking at re-routes for some of

1 these areas like Tannate Trail that is just in a  
2 wetlands and it was never meant to be a summer trail.  
3 It evolved from a winter trail into kind of a  
4 summertime use, but it runs mostly through wetlands.  
5 So we're looking at re-route options for that as well  
6 as some of the others.

7

8                   Basically the theme of the three action  
9 alternatives is that it ramps up the level of  
10 investment as you go through them. In a real general  
11 sense, that's what we're looking at. We're really  
12 focusing on maintaining access and doing it through  
13 good trails management. At least three of the nine  
14 trails are in tough shape and they're not fun to be on  
15 and it's a struggle to get from Point A to B and you  
16 can't do it without tearing some stuff up. We're  
17 really focusing on what do we do to provide some access  
18 but make these better trails. That's the focus.

19

20                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug.

21

22                   MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chair. Just a  
23 comment. Down our way we use a Geo-Strut and that goes  
24 across some awful boggy stuff and makes a good trail  
25 and people like it.

26

27                   MR. ROGERS: Yeah. That's one of the  
28 options. One of the alternatives actually looks at  
29 hardening these trails in place where they are right  
30 now and in particular using those geo-synthetics, geo-  
31 block. It sure is do-able. It's very expensive. Like  
32 Tannate Trail is 17 miles. It's about \$100,000 per  
33 mile, so it's pretty expensive for a trail, but we're  
34 looking at those kind of options for trail hardening.

35

36                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Are they doing  
37 anything to rate the importance of the individual  
38 trails, importance to subsistence users, important to  
39 recreational users?

40

41                   MR. ROGERS: Well, that's one of the  
42 important things about quantifying the use out there  
43 and really getting a good sense of who is using what  
44 when. We have kind of a general idea now. Since the  
45 mid '80s we've been issuing permits for that  
46 recreational component, but permits for subsistence use  
47 is optional, so we don't have a real complete record of  
48 the subsistence off-road vehicle use for those trails  
49 and we're trying to get a better handle on that. So,  
50 yeah, that's part of the equation.

1                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I notice there's quite  
2 a difference in level of degradation on the different  
3 trails. Some of them look like they're not too damaged  
4 at all. Those must be ones that are on hard rock and  
5 hard ground.

6  
7                   MR. ROGERS: Yeah, there's a couple of  
8 them, Trail Creek and Lost Creek, in particular that,  
9 you know, they follow stream beds. They got a gravel  
10 substrate, it's very durable but others don't. And  
11 others, like I mentioned, started out as winter trails  
12 and I don't think were ever really intended for  
13 summertime use.....

14  
15                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Uh-huh.

16  
17                   MR. ROGERS: .....and just can't  
18 sustain it. They're mostly through wetlands.

19  
20                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But when you got a  
21 blue line and it's broken, it doesn't have any other  
22 colors inside of it, it's just a broken blue line, does  
23 that mean it's not continuously in good shape or is  
24 that just -- you know, like Caribou Creek Trail.

25  
26                   MR. ROGERS: I'm not sure.

27  
28                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Or maybe it's got  
29 different colors in there and I'm just too blind to see  
30 them, like that one right there.

31  
32                   MR. ROGERS; No, it does have different  
33 colors.

34  
35                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: In those breaks there  
36 are different colors?

37  
38                   MR. ROGERS: Yep.

39  
40                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So what you're  
41 looking at is good trail with short chunks of  
42 degraded trail in between and potholes.

43  
44                   MR. ROGERS: Yeah. Yep.

45  
46                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Well, Trail  
47 Creek and Lost Creek, Soda Creek and Caribou Creek and  
48 even Soslota look like they're all into sheep country  
49 pretty much.

50

1 MR. ROGERS: Yep, that's the real  
2 driver for those trails. They get up into the  
3 Mentastas fairly quick and you get a lot of sport  
4 hunters using them for dall sheep.

5  
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And what is the  
7 current status on dall sheep in that area, is it the  
8 same as, you know, in the western Wrangells there, dall  
9 sheep populations have pretty well crashed Crsylin  
10 Hills, stuff like that, are the dall sheep populations  
11 capable of taking the kind of pressure those trails put  
12 in?

13  
14 MR. ROGERS: Yeah, I talked to the  
15 biologist out at Tok, he said right now that's not a  
16 concern. He did have some concerns if we were to  
17 improve these trails he said it would bear watching as  
18 far as it would really increase the level of  
19 sporthunting. He said that it would need monitoring.

20  
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, I would think  
22 that that would be pretty - sheep don't seem to do very  
23 good where there's easy access. That's -- that's the  
24 flip side of the coin in trying to protect the  
25 environment by making the trail better, you also make  
26 the trail more accessible so you impact the game and  
27 fish resources that much more.

28  
29 MR. ROGERS: Yeah, it's a balance, for  
30 sure.

31  
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I hope that that's  
33 taken into consideration.

34  
35 MR. ROGERS: Yeah.

36  
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Because if people have  
38 to work harder to get in and there are still animals  
39 there that's better for subsistence than if they can  
40 get in easier and there's nothing there.

41  
42 Any questions from anybody else.

43  
44 (No comments)

45  
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

47  
48 MR. ROGERS: Yeah, thanks.

49  
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I don't envy your job.

1 MR. ROGERS: Another one.  
2  
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay, with that, did  
4 the Fish and Game man come.  
5  
6 (No comments)  
7  
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So we'll go to the  
9 BLM.  
10  
11 (Pause)  
12  
13 MR. CEBRIAN: Mr. Chair. My name is  
14 Merben Cebrian. I'm the new wildlife biologist for the  
15 BLM here in Glennallen. And what I have distributed  
16 out is a graph of the most current data I have for the  
17 moose and caribou subsistence hunt, the Federal  
18 subsistence hunt, the RN313, RN314, RC513, AND RC514.  
19  
20 As of yesterday 54 moose have been  
21 harvested in both the RN313 and RN314, and there's also  
22 a total of 219 caribou harvested in both the Federal  
23 subsistence hunts, RC513 and 514. When you break them  
24 down into sex classes we have 144 bulls taken in both  
25 the caribou hunts and 72 cows taken in both caribou  
26 hunts and three were unreported as to what sex they  
27 were.  
28  
29 Those are the latest figures we have  
30 for those two subsistence hunts.  
31  
32 Now, I did talk to the subsistence area  
33 biologist here, ADF&G, and as of yesterday they had 737  
34 bull caribou harvested in Tier II and 254 cows  
35 harvested in Tier II.  
36  
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What were the numbers  
38 again.  
39  
40 MR. CEBRIAN: The bulls were 737 and  
41 the cows were 254. So summing those up as of yesterday  
42 you'd have 881 bull caribou harvested and you'd have  
43 roughly 326 cow caribou harvested for both the Federal  
44 subsistence hunt and the Tier II hunts and the quota,  
45 the harvest quota for the Nelchina Herd has been  
46 roughly set at around 1,000 bulls and about 400 cows,  
47 so we're getting close.  
48  
49 That's all I have.  
50

1 Questions.  
2  
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Caribou season's  
4 currently closed but it opens again the 20th of  
5 October?  
6  
7 MR. CEBRIAN: Yes, sir, the 21st or.....  
8  
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The 20th, 21st, right  
10 in that neighborhood.  
11  
12 MR. CEBRIAN: Right. Right.  
13  
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And goes to March 31st  
15 unless closed by announcement.  
16  
17 MR. CEBRIAN: That's correct. And I'm  
18 waiting on the move of the local area biologist to see  
19 whether he will continue with the Tier II hunt or not.  
20  
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, does the Tier II  
22 hunt open then too or is the Tier II hunt continuously  
23 open?  
24  
25 MR. CEBRIAN: The Tier II hunt is  
26 closed right now.  
27  
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's closed just like  
29 the subsistence hunt is?  
30  
31 MR. CEBRIAN: Right.  
32  
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But it could also open  
34 October 21st.  
35  
36 MR. CEBRIAN: It could, depending on  
37 the decision of Bob Toby (ph).  
38  
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Any questions.  
40  
41 (No comments)  
42  
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: How is that for the  
44 moose take, is that about normal for the last couple  
45 years?  
46  
47 MR. CEBRIAN: I would think so. I  
48 would have to look back at the raw data but it looks to  
49 me like it's about average.  
50

1                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: About average.  
2  
3                   MR. CEBRIAN: Uh-huh.  
4  
5                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that RM314, that's  
6 that area down by Valdez, down towards Valdez or is  
7 that.....  
8  
9                   MR. CEBRIAN: No, that's up  
10 towards.....  
11  
12                  CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Paxson.  
13  
14                  MR. CEBRIAN: Right, farther north.  
15  
16                  CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So now the  
17 RM313 is.....  
18  
19                  MR. CEBRIAN: That's from here to  
20 Valdez.  
21  
22                  CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Here to Valdez.  
23  
24                  MR. CEBRIAN: Right.  
25  
26                  CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.  
27  
28                  MR. CEBRIAN: And the blue figures are  
29 the total number of Federal permits that we have  
30 issued. We're in the process of collating the number  
31 of hunters that have not returned their hunt reports.  
32 It's better for us to manage the herd if we get all the  
33 responses back.  
34  
35                  CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. It'd be  
36 interesting out of that 1,392 permits actually hunted.  
37  
38                  MR. CEBRIAN: Right, and we'll find  
39 out.  
40  
41                  CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Because it's a pretty  
42 low success ratio if they all hunted.  
43  
44                  MR. CEBRIAN: That's true.  
45  
46                  CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions by  
47 anybody.  
48  
49                  (No comments)  
50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

2

3 MR. CEBRIAN: Thank you.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay, I think I saw  
6 the Fish and Game come in, didn't I.

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I thought I did. Did  
11 he go back out.

12

13 (Laughter)

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, he didn't. Okay,  
16 I didn't see him come in. Okay, with that, unless we  
17 have somebody else out there who wishes to make a  
18 report -- BLM.

19

20 (Pause)

21

22 MR. SHARP: Mr. Chairman. Members of  
23 the RAC. My name is Dan Sharp with Bureau of Land  
24 Management. I'm the subsistence coordinator based out  
25 of Anchorage.

26

27 The reason I'm before you today is to  
28 present this draft timber policy that BLM is putting  
29 out for subsistence use of timber and other vegetative  
30 resources. I'm not looking for any action or anything  
31 from the RAC at this point. We're distributing this to  
32 a number of RACs soliciting comment. The impetus for  
33 this comes from the Western Interior RAC, Jack Reakoff  
34 asked in January for the agency's represented on the  
35 Federal Subsistence Board to basically elucidate their  
36 policy with respect to subsistence timber and this is  
37 what's in front of you then, BLM's draft policy that  
38 we'd like to put out.

39

40 I guess to be as succinct as policy,  
41 what the policy does is allow for non-commercial  
42 harvest of up to 15 cord per calendar year without  
43 written authorization in cases of down and dead timber.  
44 With respect to green logs and house logs and such  
45 there is a request to secure written authorization from  
46 the area office.

47

48 The timber cutting would be allowed on  
49 BLM lands where it is otherwise not restricted, such as  
50 Wild and Scenic River Corridors and such. And,

1 although written authorizations aren't the requirement  
2 for small amounts, it would be important that the use  
3 is documented for both subsistence users and for agency  
4 use, both for future land designation changes, that it  
5 would be beneficial to all concerned if, in fact, the  
6 use is documented.

7  
8                   The other vegetative resources that's  
9 referenced in the title, it's basically summarized on  
10 Page 3 of the policy under special forest products and  
11 in essence it says, don't require a letter of  
12 authorization or a permit for things like berry  
13 picking, birching, other type of uses of vegetative  
14 resources.

15  
16                   And I guess what we'd like to see come  
17 from members of the RAC and their constituents is to  
18 address whether this policy meets their needs and their  
19 requirements. There's -- I think the plan is to  
20 formalize this policy over the winter and I guess  
21 that's roughly the summary, I guess.

22  
23                   I'd be happy to answer any questions if  
24 folks had any.

25  
26                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I don't see anything  
27 in here that deals with timber under three inches in  
28 diameter, in other words diamond willow, trapping  
29 poles, stuff like that.

30  
31                   MR. SHARP: Different agencies have  
32 different specifications. I believe it's the Refuge,  
33 they reference size of timber and such. It's just not  
34 part of the BLM policy.

35  
36                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So where would  
37 something like diamond willow fit in here?

38  
39                   MR. SHARP: That would be with -- that  
40 would, I guess, if you're not burn it, it would be  
41 special forest products.

42  
43                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

44  
45                   MR. SHARP: And, again, a written  
46 authorization wouldn't be required.

47  
48                   CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I just caught  
49 something I didn't see before, I didn't see that,  
50 included but not limited to, so it would be in there.

1 It -- I was just thinking mushrooms, berries, flowers,  
2 bark, roots, and the smaller stuff isn't in there, but  
3 it says it's not limited to these, so it'd just be  
4 special forest products then, okay, because you can't  
5 measure it in terms of board feet.

6

7 MR. SHARP: Right.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

10

11 MR. SHARP: This is basically replacing  
12 a policy that has regulations that date back to the  
13 1870s, I believe, when they're talking 200 cords of  
14 timber for feeding stern wheelers going up the Yukon,  
15 it's trying to bring this into ANILCA terms.

16

17 MS. CLARK: Mr. Chairman.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

20

21 MS. CLARK: Mr. Chairman.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes.

24

25 MS. CLARK: We had a question earlier  
26 about the comment deadline for this.

27

28 MR. SHARP: There wasn't a formal  
29 deadline. I guess what I was planning on doing was  
30 writing to RAC Chairs and see if they had gotten any  
31 feedback. It's sort of a policy in play right now,  
32 depending on the level of feedback that we receive.  
33 But we'll try to incorporate comments and such, I just  
34 don't have a good feel for how long or what sort of  
35 level of response we're going to get.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And this is being sent  
38 to like all of the Native associations and tribes and  
39 stuff like that in the area, too, isn't it?

40

41 MR. SHARP: I've hit the RACs. I just  
42 dropped off some yesterday in Dillingham at BBNA, and  
43 I'm trying to give this as broad a distribution as  
44 possible.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

47

48 MS. STICKWAN: I got a question.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

1 MS. STICKWAN: I don't see anything in  
2 here about policies for dry wood, it seems like it's  
3 harder and harder to get wood, dry wood I mean, you  
4 know, from this area, is there any way that, you know,  
5 the only way I know is to burn it and kind of just  
6 leave it, you know, and not let it burn entirely but  
7 you know what I'm saying?  
8

9 MR. SHARP: I'm not real clear on what  
10 you're asking, I guess.  
11

12 MS. STICKWAN: There's nothing in here  
13 -- it's just harder to get dry wood around here.  
14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Standing dead fire  
16 kill.  
17

18 MR. SHARP: Standing dead fire wood.  
19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Standing dead fire  
21 killed wood.  
22

23 MR. SHARP: Sure. Oh. Oh. I -- I  
24 would consider it as part of the basic timber policy.  
25 I don't think they distinguish between the -- the only  
26 caveat they have in there is live timber for house logs  
27 and such is where they're seeking authorization. And  
28 then in a lot of areas, this policy doesn't serve folks  
29 too well because BLM land in a number of areas is less  
30 accessible than Native lands or other areas where fire  
31 wood is available.  
32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think what Gloria  
34 was asking is the fact that it's -- because of the fire  
35 suppression policy and stuff like that that we've had,  
36 there's not as much -- there's not as much standing,  
37 either beetle killed or fire killed wood anymore on BLM  
38 land, it's harder to find that wood, which is much  
39 better to burn than it is than -- so if you can't --  
40 you can't cut green stuff and let it stand then  
41 basically a lot of your standing dead stuff is punky.  
42

43 MR. SHARP: Uh-huh.  
44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And not really good  
46 fire wood.  
47

48 MR. SHARP: Understand.  
49

50 MS. STICKWAN: It's not part of the

1 policy.

2

3 REPORTER: Gloria.

4

5 MS. STICKWAN: That's not part of the  
6 policy in here.

7

8 MR. SHARP: No, it isn't.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The policy says you  
11 can take it if you can find it but it's not the -- the  
12 BLM's policy isn't to make it.

13

14 MR. SHARP: Correct.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Well, hopefully  
17 with all the people in the area that you've sent this  
18 out to you'll get some feedback on it. I don't know  
19 how much feedback the Council will give you but I'm  
20 glad you brought it to our attention. For most of us  
21 on -- for most of the people on this Council, BLM land  
22 hasn't got much of an impact as far as things like  
23 firewood and stuff like that. I was thinking for myself  
24 probably -- probably Dean and Gloria and a little bit  
25 myself are about the only ones that have access to BLM  
26 land and then it's not close enough for firewood, it  
27 would be mostly for hunting, you know.

28

29 MR. SHARP: Sure. There may be those  
30 Native allotments that, you know, there may be some  
31 available house logs or something, just -- it's hard to  
32 get a good feel for who might be able to take advantage  
33 of the policy.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. I hope that  
36 some of your Native organizations in the area will give  
37 you some feedback on this too. Thank you for the  
38 presentation. And how is this -- I was just wondering  
39 how close are all the different Federal agencies, maybe  
40 the Forest Service could answer me that, how close are  
41 you all in basically using the same requirements or  
42 does each agency have its own set?

43

44 MR. SHARP: Mr. Chairman. Each agency  
45 has their own set of regulations. I've got a summary  
46 sheet, they all have a little bit different language,  
47 most of the other agencies -- I believe all the other  
48 agencies require a permit in hand for harvesting  
49 timber. And if I -- I've only got one copy but I'd be  
50 happy to share it with you.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Any other  
2 questions.  
3  
4 MS. STICKWAN: I have a question.  
5  
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.  
7  
8 MS. STICKWAN: You don't have a  
9 restriction on how to cut firewood, on the equipment  
10 you use, do you, BLM?  
11  
12 MR. SHARP: There's no restrictions  
13 other than, if, in fact, you're going in there with a  
14 loader or so and may cause more damage in sensitive  
15 areas and such. I suspect that there might be some  
16 permit stipulations and I don't believe -- I think most  
17 of this is the expectation that folks are going to go  
18 in there with a chain saw and truck or an ATV or a  
19 snowmachine in the wintertime, I don't anticipate that  
20 this policy is designed to address, you know, heavy  
21 equipment, logging.  
22  
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Not for 15 cords.  
24  
25 MR. SHARP: Not for 15 cords.  
26  
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No. Thank you.  
28  
29 MR. SHARP: Thank you.  
30  
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have any other  
32 reports that we missed.  
33  
34 (No comments)  
35  
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none, we'll go  
37 on to our other business.  
38  
39 Council, A, does anybody have any  
40 topics that they'd like us to bring up at the January  
41 200 -- topics they'd like me to take on the 2009  
42 meeting of the Board -- to the Board, any topics you'd  
43 like.  
44  
45 Mr. Henrichs.  
46  
47 MR. HENRICHS: You might talk a little  
48 bit about the king salmon bycatch by those draggers  
49 because they affect everybody up the river. And those  
50 CDQ groups in the Bering Sea have bought into the

1 dragging operations out there so all the villages  
2 within 50 miles of the coast benefit from that but the  
3 ones that are further on out, they sure ain't  
4 benefiting from it and we really need to ask what's  
5 going on there and ask for scale samples and find out  
6 where all those king salmon are coming from, there and  
7 both in Kodiak.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Salmon bycatch  
10 trawlers on the Chain and Kodiak. I'm not sure how  
11 much the Federal Subsistence Board can actually affect  
12 that but I can put that on the table as a subsistence  
13 concern by up stream users. Something to that effect.  
14 I see Pete's coming here so he's probably going to tell  
15 me that I can't even mention it.

16

17 (Laughter)

18

19 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair. Actually  
20 some of your other Councils dealing with Bering Sea  
21 have made this an issue and we actually took Council  
22 representation to the summer North Pacific Management  
23 Council meeting in Kodiak to testify on their concerns  
24 for chinook harvest in the Bering Sea. I believe Mr.  
25 Henrichs is talking about the bycatch in the Gulf of  
26 Alaska, and that would be, I guess, a start for us to  
27 start doing some information gathering and take it from  
28 there.

29

30 Mr. Chair.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Scale samples and DNA.

33

34 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair. If this is  
35 going to be an issue that you're going to bring before  
36 the Council [sic], that's sort of a head's up for me  
37 and Staff to maybe start a request for the Council to  
38 see what we do know as least as far as number of  
39 bycatch in the Gulf, if that's something the Council  
40 would like us to start looking into.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I would put that  
43 request in personally and if I'm even going to mention  
44 it to the Board, any information that you could have  
45 for me before the Board meeting I'd appreciate it,  
46 Pete.

47

48 MR. PROBASCO: Well, we could get that,  
49 Mr. Chair, from your Council, we would start with a  
50 letter drafted from OSM to the North Pacific Fishery --

1 starting to look at - sort of like we did with the  
2 Bering Sea and, of course, that's had its own momentum  
3 and we can start getting that information.

4  
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Can I get together  
6 with you on that or do we have to do -- do we have to  
7 have an action item as a Council.

8  
9 MR. PROBASCO: I don't think you need a  
10 motion, I just think if you could get agreement that  
11 you would like OSM to start collecting some of these  
12 figures that Mr. Henrichs is looking into would be  
13 sufficient.

14  
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I have any  
16 disagreement to that.

17  
18 (No disagreements)

19  
20 MR. BLOSSOM: Well, the Bering Sea's  
21 involved though, too, not just the Gulf.

22  
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. But they're  
24 already looking into the Bering Sea, we're interested  
25 in them looking into the Gulf because that affects us  
26 locally.

27  
28 MR. BLOSSOM: So does the Bering Sea.

29  
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, I know it does.  
31 Mr. Henrichs.

32  
33 MR. HENRICHS: Yeah, that's exactly  
34 what I was saying, too, that Bering Sea drag fleet may  
35 not just catch salmon headed up the Yukon Kuskokwim,  
36 they could be catching salmon headed up the Copper and,  
37 you know, we won't know until we get scale samples.

38  
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, I think there  
40 starting to get a DNA and a scale sample thing going on  
41 the Bering fleet, aren't they right now.

42  
43 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair. The work  
44 that looks promising and they have some preliminary  
45 work is genetic work.....

46  
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, the DNA work.

48  
49 MR. PROBASCO: .....dealing with  
50 chinook and scale pattern analysis has a lot of

1 inherent problems in trying to separate stocks. So  
2 right now the genetic work is looking much more  
3 promising.

4  
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Well, they're  
6 getting much better at quicker at DNA analysis all of  
7 the time to where it's not going to be that long and  
8 they're going to be able to do it pretty fast.

9  
10 Okay, well, I think you could say that  
11 the Council would appreciate information on that. And  
12 from your standpoint, is it even something, you know,  
13 this is topics to take before the Board, would this  
14 even be a topic that I would -- would it be an  
15 appropriate place for me to mention it then?

16  
17 MR. PROBASCO: I think, Mr. Chair, that  
18 would be an appropriate place and you may want to --  
19 thinking back just a little while ago, a couple hours  
20 ago, you might want to add that to your annual report.

21  
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. If that's an  
23 agreement with the rest of the Council, we'll do that,  
24 we'll add that to our annual report.

25  
26 (Council nods affirmatively)

27  
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Pete.  
29 Okay, does anybody else have any other topics that  
30 they'd like for me to bring before the Board that we  
31 haven't put in our annual report or something special.

32  
33 (No comments)

34  
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No. Then with that,  
36 let's go on to deciding our future meeting places. We  
37 need a winter 2009 meeting, that would be what I would  
38 consider the spring meeting and time and location for  
39 the fall meeting.

40  
41 MS. STICKWAN: I have a question.

42  
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.

44  
45 MS. STICKWAN: I guess this has already  
46 decided that it would be March 3rd through 5th.

47  
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, I thought we  
49 did.

50

1 MS. STICKWAN: I was just wondering if  
2 we could change that because that's when the Board of  
3 Game meeting's going to be.  
4  
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.  
6  
7 MS. STICKWAN: And we have some  
8 important topics there for our region that we wanted to  
9 -- we'd like to be at the Board of Game meeting.  
10  
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay, then we would  
12 have to check with Donald to see what's available, what  
13 our conflict would be with other -- have you got the  
14 spring group right there?  
15  
16 MS. CLARK: That's -- that's -- it's on  
17 the other side of the paper.  
18  
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, my fault, I'm  
20 sorry, I didn't turn it over. Okay. So we have  
21 Southcentral when, March 3rd, 4th and 5th. The only  
22 other one there is Northwest Alaska at Kotzebue on  
23 March 5th, that's not what Donald's at right now, is  
24 it?  
25  
26 MS. CLARK: Unh-unh.  
27  
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Uh?  
29  
30 MS. CLARK: No, Mr. Chairman, he's at  
31 Bristol Bay. That's the only one you want to avoid.  
32  
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's the only other  
34 one we have to worry about?  
35  
36 MS. CLARK: Yes.  
37  
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So that means  
39 that we could move that -- when did you say that the  
40 Board meeting is?  
41  
42 MS. STICKWAN: March 29th through March  
43 -- I mean.....  
44  
45 REPORTER: Gloria.  
46  
47 MS. STICKWAN: I mean February 28.....  
48  
49 REPORTER: Gloria.  
50

1 MS. STICKWAN: It's February 28th  
2 through March 9th.  
3  
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Through March 9th,  
5 okay. So we don't want to have the Staff all too many  
6 things to go to so would we like to have our meeting  
7 right after the Board meeting if that would be good  
8 with the rest of the Council we could do the 10th, 11th  
9 and 12th instead of the 3rd, 4th and 5th, if that's  
10 acceptable to the rest of the Council. Does anybody  
11 have a conflict with that?  
12  
13 MR. ENCELEWSKI: That's my birthday  
14 Ralph.  
15  
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Uh.  
17  
18 MR. ENCELEWSKI: That's my birthday  
19 man.  
20  
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Wouldn't you like to  
22 be here for your birthday, we'll sing you happy  
23 birthday and probably even get a cake.  
24  
25 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, that'll work.  
26  
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We'll tell Staff. If  
28 that's okay then we would like to move it to the 10th,  
29 11th and 12th, and that way anybody that wants to can  
30 attend the Alaska Department of Fish and -- the Board  
31 meeting because I was planning on going to some of that  
32 myself. I think it's in Cordova, isn't it?  
33  
34 MS. STICKWAN: What's that?  
35  
36 MR. HENRICHS: No, no, that's the  
37 fisheries meeting.  
38  
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's the fishery  
40 meeting, this is the game meeting.  
41  
42 MR. HENRICHS: Yeah.  
43  
44 MS. STICKWAN: Yeah.  
45  
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay, you're right.  
47 Okay, 10th 11th and 12th if that's okay, let's move  
48 ours Southcentral 10th, 11th and 12th. Now, let's take  
49 a look at the fall. We had a suggestion from one of  
50 our Council members for a fall meeting, if we could

1 find places to stay there, Bill, would you like to  
2 speak to the fall meeting.

3

4 MR. STOCKWELL: Yeah, we've got a real  
5 nice meeting facility in Cooper Landing and it's kind  
6 of handy to some of us that live on the Kenai. So the  
7 biggest problem would be is finding places to stay and  
8 I think if we started working on it now there's not --  
9 the Princess Lodge is closed, so we'd probably have to  
10 stay in more than one place and I'm not too sure how  
11 many rooms we'd need but we have a nice meeting  
12 facility, it's about this size here to accommodate us.

13

14 So my recommendation would be late  
15 September, if people have extra time, it's pretty good  
16 fishing that time of year.

17

18 (Laughter)

19

20 MR. STOCKWELL: And if you want to take  
21 a little raft trip down the river, we could probably  
22 arrange some seeing what goes on in the -- what it  
23 looks like.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We've always been kind  
26 of leery to take September from this Council because a  
27 lot of the Council members are either moose hunting or  
28 caribou hunting.

29

30 MR. STOCKWELL: Well, early October.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Early October'd be  
33 okay?

34

35 MR. STOCKWELL: Sure. Southeast is in  
36 Yakutat so.....

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Southeast is in  
39 Yakutat, I don't think there's any conflict if we're at  
40 the same time as Southeast, or is there?

41

42 MS. CLARK: No, Mr. Chairman, there is  
43 not.

44

45 MR. KESSLER: Yes, there is.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, would Pete make  
48 it to both of them.

49

50 (Laughter)

1 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair. Probably the  
2 main concern as a Council is to try to avoid no more  
3 than two Council meetings a week. So like if you look  
4 at the last part of September, that first two days in  
5 October we already have two meetings scheduled that  
6 week and we get into problems with Staff and now  
7 Southeast is going to be problematic because Forest  
8 Service Staff has a large presence at the Southeast  
9 meeting as well as your Southcentral.

10  
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So would the 13th,  
12 14th and 15th be conflicting then, I mean that'd be the  
13 week after, would that cause any problems?

14  
15 MR. PROBASCO: Not at all.

16  
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What does that look  
18 like for the rest of the Council.

19  
20 MR. LAMB: It's probably questionable  
21 weather for me but I think it's still pretty good at  
22 that time of the year.

23  
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Can be and can not.

25  
26 MR. LAMB: If not I guess that's the  
27 way it is.

28  
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bill.

30  
31 MR. STOCKWELL: Lord knows the driving  
32 conditions can be kind of dicey going but.....

33  
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Let's  
35 tentatively put it down for Cooper Landing if they can  
36 find the facilities for the 13th, 14th and 15th, and if  
37 we don't find the facilities in Cooper Landing we can  
38 change this at our spring meeting.

39  
40 MR. ENCELEWSKI: There we go.

41  
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's a pretty place to  
43 be that time of the year.

44  
45 MR. STOCKWELL: Question, does anybody  
46 know approximately how many rooms are required for our  
47 meeting, Staff and so on.

48  
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pete.

50

1 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair. Mr.  
2 Stockwell. A lot depends upon the location and as far  
3 as your attendance. But when you look at a meeting,  
4 you focus on Council representation and having  
5 facilities for them, with a secondary concern for  
6 others. So to answer your question directly we could  
7 give you probably using the Glennallen meeting as an  
8 indicator we could count up how many rooms we used and  
9 get that to you.

10  
11 As everybody knows, scheduling meetings  
12 and finding meeting space, the further we're out in  
13 front of it, the better it is for us, so you may want  
14 to think of a second choice now versus the springtime  
15 if you so desire.

16  
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, my suggestion  
18 would be to just have Anchorage as a backup if we can't  
19 do it, if that's okay with everybody else.

20  
21 MR. HENRICHS: Yeah, well, a lot  
22 depends on what's on the agenda, too. I remember  
23 having a meeting in Anchor Point and that place was  
24 packed to the rafters and everybody there wanted to  
25 kill us.

26  
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, well, hopefully  
28 Anchor Point's not thinking of killing us anymore so I  
29 think we should -- like you said it depends on what's  
30 on the agenda, but I think we can probably chance the  
31 Kenai Peninsula without worrying about it anymore.

32  
33 MR. STOCKWELL: I don't think  
34 anybody'll have hangman noose's in the trees or  
35 anything like that.....

36  
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

38  
39 MR. STOCKWELL: .....so it should be  
40 fairly calm.

41  
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Well, let's try  
43 Cooper Landing. If we can't get it, if it's okay with  
44 everybody else, let's give Staff the option to use  
45 Anchorage as a secondary place because we can all make  
46 it there easier than we can make it anyplace else.

47  
48 (Council nods affirmatively)

49  
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's kind of centrally

1 located.

2

3 MR. PROBASCO: Thank you Mr. Chair

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pete -- oh, I thought  
6 you had something you wanted to tell me.

7

8 MR. PROBASCO: No, I said thank you.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So with that I  
11 think we've -- Mr. Henrichs.

12

13 MR. HENRICHS: Yeah, I'd like to thank  
14 Tazlina for allowing us to hold this meeting on their  
15 traditional homeland.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, that's a  
18 good idea. Anybody else on the Council got anything  
19 they wish to add before we do the next action item.

20

21 Gloria.

22

23 MS. STICKWAN: When you visit us you're  
24 supposed to bring us something.

25

26 (Laughter)

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With that a  
29 motion to adjourn's in order.

30

31 MR. HENRICHS: I'll make a motion to  
32 adjourn.

33

34 MR. LAMB: Second it.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and  
37 seconded to adjourn, the meeting is adjourned.

38

39 (Off record)

40

41 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

