SOUTHCENTRAL FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE

REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

PUBLIC MEETING

VOLUME II

TELEPHONIC October 8, 2020 9:00 a.m.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Greg Encelewski, Chairman Aaron Bloomquist Ed Holsten Andrew McLaughlin Michael Opheim Diane Selanoff Gloria Stickwan John Whissel Dennis Zadra

Regional Council Coordinator, DeAnna Perry

Recorded and transcribed by:

Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2 Anchorage, AK 99501 907-243-0668/sahile@gci.net

```
Page 176
                      PROCEEDINGS
 1
 2
                     (Telephonic - 10/8/2020)
 3
 4
5
                     (On record)
 6
 7
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, folks,
     we're ready to go now. Good morning, we're going to
8
     move on and see if we can't get through this.
9
10
                     We ended up last night with the
11
     crossover closure with Eastern Interior and Hannah, I
12
    believe you're going to give that one so if you want to
13
     go ahead, we're ready to go.
14
15
16
                     MS. VORHEES:
                                   Thank you, Mr. Chair.
17
     Good morning.
                    This is Hannah Vorhees, I'm an
     anthropologist with the Office of Subsistence
18
19
     Management.
20
                     Before presenting Fisheries Closure 21-
21
22
     06, which begins on Page 191 of your book.....
23
                     MS. PERRY: I'm sorry, Hannah. Hannah.
24
25
26
                     MS. VORHEES: Yes.
27
28
                     MS. PERRY: I'm sorry to interrupt.
     Greg, I needed to wait until you called the meeting to
29
     order before I did a roll call of the Council, I still
30
     need to check Council members, if I could do that real
31
     quick.
32
33
34
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, I thought
     we had done that but I guess I was lost, but go ahead.
35
36
37
                     MS. PERRY: Okay, thank you.
38
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead.
39
40
                     MS. PERRY: No worries.
41
42
                     Ed Holsten.
43
44
                     MR. HOLSTEN: Yes, I'm here, good
45
46
     morning.
47
48
                     MS. PERRY: Alrighty, and Greg is on.
49
50
```

Page 177
1 Diane Selanoff.
MS. SELANOFF: I'm here, good morning. 4
5 MS. PERRY: Good morning. 6
7 Gloria Stickwan. 8
9 MS. STICKWAN: Here.
11 MS. PERRY: Thank you.
13 Dennis Zadra. 14
MR. ZADRA: I'm here.
17 MS. PERRY: Thanks.
19 Michael Opheim. 20
21 MR. OPHEIM: I'm here. 22
MS. PERRY: Thanks. 24
25 Andy McLaughlin. 26
27 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Here. 28
29 MS. PERRY: Thank you.
31 Aaron Bloomquist. 32
MR. BLOOMQUIST: Hello there.
34 35 MS. PERRY: Good morning.
36 37 John Whissel.
38 39 MR. WHISSEL: Present.
40 41 MS. PERRY: All right. Mr. Chair, you 42 have nine members present and you have a quorum.
43 44 Thank you.
45 46 Thank you for indulging that 47 interruption.
48 49 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Last interruption 50

you get for the day, thank you DeAnna. Okay, good, welcome. Everyone's here now Hannah, sorry about that but let's go ahead.

2.

MS. VORHEES: All right. So I'll be presenting Fisheries Closure Review 21-06 and the analysis begins on Page 191 of your book. Normally it would also be available on the Southcentral region -- on our Federal Subsistence Management Program website under Southcentral meeting materials but there's an issue with the website currently so please be patient if that's an issue.

All right, so before jumping into the analysis I wanted to go over the Federal closure review policy briefly.

 So if the Board deems it necessary to close Federal public lands or waters to subsistence users, all closures will be periodically reevaluated to determine whether the circumstances necessitating the original closure still exists. So when a closure is no longer needed, actions to remove it will be.....

(Teleconference interference - participants not muted)

MS. VORHEES:(indiscernible).

(Teleconference interference - participants not muted)

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$ PERRY: Can people please put themselves on mute.

MS. VORHEES: Previously closure reviews stops with the Council if the Council's recommendation was to maintain the closure. As of 2018, this recommendation has changed and -- I'm sorry, as of 2018 the Council's recommendations are forwarded to the Board even if their recommendation is to maintain the closure.

So please keep in mind as I give this presentation....

(Teleconference interference - participants not muted)

MS. VORHEES:that you can recommend that the Board maintain the closure, modify the closure or remove the closure.

Pat, I can hear you're coming through on the phone line if you can put your phone on mute.

Fisheries Closure Review 21-06 specific to the Toklat River in Denali National Park and Preserve is a crossover from Eastern Interior. Cantwell, located in the Southcentral region is a resident zone community for the area under consideration in Denali National Park, and that's why it's being brought before this Council.

Under Federal regulations, Toklat River is closed to subsistence fishing for all fish from August 15th through May 15th each year. This closure date's from 1992. The closure was brought over from State regulations and has not been reviewed or modified since.

The Toklat River (indiscernible) Denali National Park about 50 miles above its confluence with the Kantishna River. That portion of the river in the pre-ANILCA section of Denali National Park is strictly closed to all subsistence fishing. So the only portion of the river that's relevant when considering the data of this closure is that stretch within the new Park post-ANILCA section of the Park.

State sport and subsistence regulations have recently change to allow fishing for salmon and non-salmon fish on the Toklat year-round, except for about three miles of spawning area down stream of Federal public land. So this means that currently subsistence and sportfishing are allowed under State regulations but there is no Federal subsistence.

The Toklat River is one of the larger producers of fall chum salmon in the Tanana River drainage. Currently the Toklat River stocks are included as part of the Tanana River drainage estimates.

 In terms of communities affected. The four resident zone communities for Denali National Park are Nikolai, Telida, Lake Minchumina, and Cantwell. These communities tend to take non-salmon fish such as

grayling and trout locally and salmon, such as chinook and sockeye further away from their communities. It's worth noting that approximately 20 percent of Cantwell residents harvested fresh water fish within the boundaries of Denali National Park in the year 2000.

2.

Yukon River fall chum salmon have met the drainagewide escapement goal every year since it was developed in 2004. The Tanana River escapement goal has been met annually since 2001. In 2007 the Alaska Board of Fish determined that the Yukon River chum salmon no longer met the criteria for a yield concern, and in 2010 the biological escapement on the Toklat River was eliminated. Federal waters on the Toklat for up stream at the primary spawning aggregations but the majority of harvest of these stocks occurs down stream of Denali National Park boundary.

Considering all this the OSM recommendation is to eliminate the closure. Coupled with poor access and closure to all subsistence fishing in the pre-ANILCA portion of Denali National Park it's unlikely that Federal subsistence harvest within Federal public waters would have much effect on these stocks.

Thank you, and I'm available for

 questions.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Is there any questions on the presentation.

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$ SELANOFF: This is Diane Selanoff, I do have a question.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Diane.

MS. SELANOFF: Just out of curiosity, this was closed in 1992, how long after a closure normally do you have reviews? Is it like a year later or how often are they reviewed?

Thank you.

 MS. VORHEES: Yes, great question. So currently the policy is that -- or I believe 50 percent of closures are reviewed every cycle, so -- or every fish cycle, so all closures should be reviewed every

four years but that's been a recent policy change.
Going back further there's -- you know, some of these
closures on smaller systems that were carried over from
State regulations with the aim of just ensuring
continuity with -- in the Federal Subsistence
Management Program originally have not been reviewed in
a timely fashion and that's why the policy was changed
recently.

MS. SELANOFF: Okay. And currently you said that river is being -- the Toklat is being fished but not for Federal subsistence?

MS. VORHEES: That's correct. It's made a little bit complicated by the fact that I don't think the State has fully published the new regulations for subsistence but in 2019 Board of Fish did open Toklat to both subsistence and sportfishing, except for the small spawning area down stream of the Park.

MS. SELANOFF: Yes, and that's the review criteria, you said, prior to closure only Federal subsistence users had fished that minimally?

MS. VORHEES: Federal subsistence users could have been fishing under sport regulations or during seasonal openings under State subsistence regulations -- yeah, so this was a seasonal closure but I believe most of the harvest to date has been under sport regulations.

MS. SELANOFF: Okay. And then you said which four villages, I have Nikolai, Cantwell, and what were the other two villages that were affected by this closure?

MS. VORHEES: Yeah, Nikolai, Telida, Lake Minchumina and Cantwell. Those are the communities that are resident zone communities for Denali National Park.

MS. SELANOFF: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Alrighty, are there any other questions for the presentation.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hearing none,

consultation, is there tribes who would like to speak to this one.

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, this is Darrel Williams from Ninilchik.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Darrel.

MR. WILLIAMS: There's a couple things I'd like to speak to on this just because our experience with this process over the years. And it's not even really to do with opening or closing the fishery. I guess some of the things that concerns me with proposals that I see like this is when we see a mirroring of State regulations and Federal regulations. And this goes back to the idea of meaningful preference in subsistence, and that goes back to the 1996 precedence that was set about meaningful preference.

You know it's interesting that I see a lot of this and a lot of discussion that we're talking about, you know, about like State subsistence too. I know that we still have issues, you know, associated with the McDowell Decision when it talks about equal access clauses. I also agree with the opinion of Heather Kendall-Miller when we talk about public lands. Public lands are public lands. ANILCA did not define, well, public lands except for some or the other, or something else, we'll change it whenever that happens to be. That's not in there but it sure is -- it's always interesting to me when I see these inferences about how we're going to treat public lands differently in different areas. And I think that's one of the larger concerns associated with the subsistence process.

And I just wanted to share those points because I think that they're important. I certainly support opening subsistence for subsistence users. I think it's the subsistence priority, that should be there. It's kind of like with some of our issues that we had in our area, there are times when there is no subsistence regulation and the only ones who suffer from that are those small user groups who actually rely on those kind of things.

So I just wanted to share those thoughts. I think that they're important. I think that these are important concepts that seem to be getting

```
Page 183
     deluded over time. I know I've spent a lot of time on
     those particular issues myself and I know a lot of
 2.
     other people have too and there's -- you know there are
 3
 4
     those strong precedences that were determined by the
     Courts that I think need to be reflected and evaluated
 5
     in these analysis.
 6
 7
 8
                     Thank you.
 9
10
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: All right, thank
    you, Darrel. That was good comments, good info.
11
12
                     Anyone else on the tribal side.
13
14
15
                     (No comments)
16
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Anyone from any
17
     ANCSA Corporations want to address this closure.
18
19
20
                     (No comments)
21
22
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: How about
     agencies, Alaska Department of Fish and Game.
23
24
                     MR. BURCH: Hello, Mr. Chair. This is
25
26
     Mark Burch.
                  The Department of Fish and Game doesn't
     have any comment at this time.
27
28
                     Thank you.
29
30
31
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. Okay.
    How about the Federal agencies.
32
33
34
                     (No comments)
35
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hearing none.
36
37
     Okay, how about tribal.
38
39
                     (No comments)
40
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: All right.
41
     Advisory Group comments, other Regional Councils.
42
43
44
                     DeAnna.
45
                     MS. PERRY: No other Regional Councils
46
     commented on this closure.
47
48
49
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you.
                                                        Fish
50
```

```
Page 184
     and Game Advisory Committees, anyone.
 2
                     (No comments)
 3
 4
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Subsistence
 5
 6
     Resource Commission -- or Commissions.
 7
8
                     (No comments)
9
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: All right.
10
    you have a summary of written public comments.
11
12
                     MS. PERRY: We did not receive any
13
14
     public comments on this closure.
15
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Is there
16
17
     any public testimony that would like to testify on this
     closure.
18
19
                     (No comments)
20
21
22
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. It's up to
     the Regional Council's recommendation at this point so
23
     we could entertain a motion to adopt.
2.4
25
26
                     MR. WHISSEL:
                                  Mr. Chairman move to --
     this is John Whissel, move to adopt FCR21-06.
27
28
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, John.
29
     Is there a second to that.
30
31
                     MR. MCLAUGHLIN:
                                      Second.
                                               Andy, second.
32
33
34
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                           Thank you, Andy.
35
                     Okay, we're open for discussion.
36
37
     Council members you go right ahead if you have
     discussion on this matter.
38
39
40
                     MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chair, this is John
     Whissel. It seems to me like a pretty clear case of
41
     there being a resource here and our need to get around
42
     to the review process and get it opened back up for the
43
44
     people that need to use it.
45
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you
46
     for that comment. Anyone else got a comment on it.
47
48
                     MR. OPHEIM: This is Michael.
49
50
```

```
Page 185
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead,
     Michael.
 2
 3
 4
                     MR. OPHEIM: Yeah, I think it's time to
     lift this closure. It looks like it's had some
 5
     sustainable escapement for some time now and get that
 6
 7
     resource used by the people hopefully now.
 8
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, that sounds
9
10
     good. Anyone else got a comment.
11
                     MR. HOLSTEN: Yeah, this is Ed.
12
13
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Ed.
14
15
16
                     MR. HOLSTEN: Yeah, I think it's a good
17
     idea to rescind this closure, they've met their
     escapement goals. So that's all I've got to add.
18
19
20
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Ed.
     Anyone else want to speak to it.
21
22
                     MS. CRAVER:
                                  This is Amy Craver with
23
    Denali National Park and Preserve. And the Denali SRC
2.4
25
     was briefed on this proposal and did not have any
26
     comment.
27
28
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you,
     Amy. Okay, back to the Council, one last time, anyone
29
     else want to speak before we take a vote -- call the
30
     question and take a vote.
31
32
33
                     (No comments)
34
                     MR. WHISSEL: Call the question, Mr.
35
     Chair.
36
37
                     MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Call the question.
38
39
40
                     MR. WHISSEL: John Whissel.
41
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, question's
42
     been called. All in favor of rescinding aye.
43
44
                     IN UNISON: Aye.
45
46
47
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any opposed.
48
                     (No opposing votes)
49
50
```

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: DeAnna, that was unanimous, I don't think we need a roll call on that one.

4

Thank you.

5 6 7

8

9

10

1

2

At this time I'm going to go back and get to my duties. Every morning we open it up for public and tribal comments on non-agenda items. So if there's a non-agenda item that you want to talk to, I'm going to let you speak at this time.

11 12 13

(No comments)

14 15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

2425

26

27 28

29

30

31

32 33

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, well, hearing none, we're going to go ahead and move on. next one we have -- we have State Board of Fishery and Board of Game proposals, and as Council members you have the opportunity to bring any proposal before the Council and see if the Council wants to submit comments. I'm not sure if all of you have gotten through all of this, I know I haven't. But they're open, they're having meetings, the current comments due before the Board of Fish is November 25th, Board of Game January 8th. They are expecting maybe some extension on comments, the meeting's probably now April to May and they say they will know on the Board of Fish once they meet in October 15th and 16th. So those meetings are coming up, so if you guys have comments or if you want to write them up and bring them up at the end of the meeting we could think through that. But anyway I'm opening it at this time for a discussion, just briefly and we'll see where we want to go.

34 35 36

I know I need to dig into them myself but it's on the agenda for the opportunity.

41

42

43 44

45

46

47

48

49 50 MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chairman. This is John Whissel. I don't know the Board of Fish proposals that are duplicative with the proposals that we reviewed yesterday regarding limitations of Federal subsistence users on the Copper River, but those going back to FP21-11 to 21-14, all of those restrictions have proposals going before the Board of Fish and I feel like from our discussion, we felt like those restrictions were a good idea and should start at the State level and so I think it would be suitable for us to provide comments to the Board of Fish in support of

those proposals at the State level and after that consider implementing them if there's additional conservation needs at the Federal level.

2.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. That is good, so we could make that recommendation, John, and if you wanted to make a motion to make that recommendation I would accept that and get a second and then we would send a letter to them in support of those proposals, 11 through 14.

MR. BLOOMQUIST: Yeah, Mr. Chair, this is Aaron. I could probably -- I have those sitting in front of me, we just went through them in my Advisory Committee meeting last night if you want me to toss out the numbers I can.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, if you want

MR. WHISSEL: Aaron that would be

awesome.

do that.

to....

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:go ahead and

MR. WHISSEL: Yeah, I'm looking through my book trying to get them and I'm not going to get them in time so that would be great, I appreciate that.

MR. BLOOMQUIST: All right. Yeah, so what we'd be looking at is these are the upper Copper River personal use and subsistence proposals.

Proposal No. 6 is the daily harvest reporting proposal.

No. 7 -- it's not one we discussed but I actually think it's a really good alternative on this whole boat issue and may be the only one that has a -- looking at my crystal ball, maybe the only one that has a chance of actually getting passed at the Board of Fish and it's to prohibit guiding in subsistence fisheries. And actually I'd like to discuss that one a little bit with the Council here, separately here.

I'll just go through these.

No. 8 is similarly maybe could pass and

would help, it's no dipnetting within the 500 yards of the confluence of tributary mouths. So maybe those two let's take separately if we could.

2.

No. 9 is to eliminate dipnetting from boats in the Glennallen Subdistrict.

No. 10 is to eliminate dipnetting from boats in the upper Copper River Subdistrict.

No. 11 is a little bit more convoluted, we probably could skip that one because it's covered in the other two.

 $$\operatorname{No.}\ 14$$ and 15 are to prohibit gillnet mesh dipnets.

And is that, let me look.

And No. 16 is the sonar one, right.

Yep.

batch....

MR. WHISSEL: Okay, I'm going to do a

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

MR. WHISSEL: Sorry, go ahead.

 MR. BLOOMQUIST: No go ahead, you might have a way to go forward with this, I guess. There are a couple from -- that modify limits and that sort of stuff in the dipnet fishery too but I'm not sure if we want to dive into the weeds there.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: No, we don't want to dive into the weeds and we don't want to submit something that the Council all hasn't had a chance to vett and read and are comfortable with. But what I took, you gave me 6, 7, you kind of had a question on 8, 9, 10, 14 and 15 it seems like they're all things that we want them to pay attention to.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ BLOOMQUIST: And 16 as well, Mr. Chair, the prohibition of sonar.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: 16, okay. So if that's acceptable, let's do that and let's ask DeAnna to make sure she vetts these and checks them out and

make sure we're not sending a letter on something we're missing.

MR. WHISSEL: Should I read off a motion, I've scribbled something down here if that's helpful.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes, please.

MR. WHISSEL: Okay. DeAnna, are you

11 ready?

MS. PERRY: Yeah, I just have a concern that you're making a motion and the Council members haven't had a chance to look at these proposals. You know as you know when you send a comment to the Board you do each one separately and you have to provide a reason and, you know, there's more to it than just a letter so I'm unclear if the Council's just wanting me to write a letter to Board of Fish saying we support all these proposals or if we're sending individual comments and, again, it's to the Council's comfort level on if they've had an opportunity to look these over before they vote.

MR. WHISSEL: Understood. I'm going to make a motion to send a single letter in support of Board of Fish Proposals 6, which is timely harvest reporting; 9 prohibiting dipnetting from boats in Glennallen; 10 prohibiting dipnets from boats in the upper Copper; 14 and 15 prohibiting gillnet mesh; and 16 prohibiting sonar.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thanks, is there a second to John's motion.

MR. HOLSTEN: Yeah, this is Ed, I second.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Ed. Okay, that's pretty clear.

Any other discussion on it.

MR. HOLSTEN: Yeah, this is Aaron. I'm going to vote against the motion for reasons I stated yesterday, you know, making people take fish finders off of their boats and -- I actually support a few of these but I'm going to vote no overall.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I kind of got mixed emotion too, it's hard to support things when you don't have it all -- DeAnna's correct, we don't, you know, I think this needs to come back to us in some form. We're really not prepared for it. But, anyway, John, do you -- well, it's already moved and seconded so....

2.

MR. WHISSEL: We've moved on it -- Mr. Chair, I'd be happy to modify my motion to deal with these separately if that's what it -- seems like would be more practical. And I also think we could do this another time. I have reviewed the proposals so I'm comfortable voting on them right now. It sounds like maybe Aaron has -- but I certainly am happy to do this discussion later on after we've had an opportunity.

 MR. BLOOMQUIST: And they are virtually identical in meaning to what we went through yesterday. They're not like little twists and turns here or there, they're the same as the Federal proposals. But I would prefer to do them individually.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Well, we got a motion on the floor, an active motion, seconded, unless we want to withdraw that motion and start over, we'll go ahead and vote on that motion.

MR. WHISSEL: I would -- do you think we should withdraw and start over, as my second, I'd consider it.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, Ed, do you concur on that?

(No comments)

MR. WHISSEL: I think I heard Ed say yes so I'll withdraw the motion.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thanks, John. If you want to make individual ones and be clear because this could get real convoluted without us knowing for sure but I'll entertain it, go ahead and see if you could take a stab at it. I think there were some we weren't prepared to take action on it, myself but, okay.

 $\mbox{MR. WHISSEL:} \mbox{ Okay. We could put the}$

```
Page 191
     motion on and table also I suppose.
 2.
                     So my motion would be to support Board
 3
 4
     of Fish Proposal No. 6 for timely harvest reporting.
 5
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Is there a
 6
 7
     second to that motion.
8
                                      Second.
                     MR. BLOOMOUIST:
9
10
                     MR. HOLSTEN: Yeah, this is Ed.
11
12
                     MR. BLOOMQUIST: Aaron seconds.
13
14
15
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Aaron, okay.
                                                         Any
     discussion on that to support No. 6 State proposal.
16
17
                     MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chairman, this is
18
19
     John Whissel.
                    I think timely reporting is something
     that we need to implement across the system and across
20
     the state and this is the best first step that we can
21
22
     make.
23
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Good comment.
24
25
26
                     MR. WHISSEL: At the State level.
27
28
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any other
     comments on the motion.
29
30
                     MR. BLOOMQUIST: Yeah, this is Aaron.
31
     I have my same concerns as yesterday but I'll vote to
32
     approve this one. And it is the identical meaning to
33
     the proposal that we went through yesterday on the same
34
     subject. I can read it if people want to hear how it's
35
36
     worded but the meaning is, you know, report within
37
     three days and daily harvest recording.
38
39
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: And we passed
40
     that yesterday.
41
42
                     MR. BLOOMQUIST: Yes, sir.
43
44
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.
                                                  Any other
     comments on it.
45
46
47
                     MR. OPHEIM: Mr. Chair, this is
48
     Michael.
49
50
```

```
Page 192
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead,
     Michael.
 2
 3
 4
                     MR. OPHEIM: Yeah, I just don't feel
     comfortable voting on these without going through and
 5
     looking at them. I haven't had a chance. I was pretty
 6
 7
     busy trying to get through the other proposals, trying
     to get those read. I've not gotten a chance to look
 8
     through any of this Board of Fish, Board of Game stuff.
 9
10
     So I would be voting to oppose any of these proposals
     to write letters right now.
11
12
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
13
     Michael. I'm in the same position. So I think there's
14
     probably quite a few of us there. John, we've got a
15
     motion and seconded, I won't ask you again to withdraw
16
     but do you want to consider tabling this until the
17
     Council's had time to understand it all.
18
19
                     MR. WHISSEL: Yes, sir, let's table it.
20
21
22
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. You got to
     motion to table it or just withdraw it.
23
2.4
25
                     MR. BLOOMOUIST:
                                      Either way.
26
                     MR. WHISSEL: We can do it later in
27
28
     this meeting or until a different meeting or what are
     we looking at here?
29
30
31
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: It's definitely
     going to have to be a different meeting.
32
33
34
                     MR. WHISSEL: Which would likely.....
35
                     MS. STICKWAN: Mr. Chair.
36
37
                     MR. WHISSEL: .....come after the Board
38
     of Fish meets but they may end up giving us far more
39
40
     time than we ever thought.....
41
                     MS. STICKWAN: Mr. Chair.
42
43
44
                     MR. WHISSEL: ....so who knows.
45
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Exactly.
46
47
48
                     MS. STICKWAN: Mr. Chair, may I say
49
     something.
50
```

Page 193 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Who is this? 1 2 MS. STICKWAN: Gloria. 3 4 5 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Gloria. 6 7 MS. STICKWAN: I listened to the work session on the Board of Fish and they're going to meet 8 October 15th and determine when the Prince William 9 Sound, upper Copper River fisheries meeting will take 10 place and they said when at that meeting, it may be 11 anywhere from March to May so at our February meeting 12 we would have time to go through these. It sounds like 13 we will have time in February from what they said at 14 the work session, that they're not really sure about 15 16 that. 17 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I read the same 18 19 thing, Gloria, and I'm pretty confident of that. think that's really good information, I appreciate 20 that. 21 22 MR. WHISSEL: We would certainly be in 23 before the meeting but we would most likely miss the on 24 25 time public comment deadline in order to have our comments published with the meeting material, which is 26 27 okay. 28 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, it's okay, 29 we could read it into the record. 30 31 MR. WHISSEL: Yes. 32 33 34 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Just for parliamentary, I got a motion out there on six and it's 35 36 been seconded, you want to withdraw it and then table 37 this until we have a chance to review it for our next meeting. 38 39 40 MR. WHISSEL: Yes, Mr. Chair. I think we'll just -- if my second is in agreement we'll table 41 this and we'll take it up as an agenda item at our next 42 meeting. 43 44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: 45 Okay. 46 MR. BLOOMQUIST: I was the second, this 47 I guess I'll concur although I would rather 48 do it now since it was on our agenda but, yeah, I'm 49 50

okay I guess. 1 2 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, it was on 3 4 our agenda but we haven't had time to get at it, those things were sent out just the day before. We can't 5 operate that way. So a few days before is when I saw 6 7 them. But, anyway, thank you guys. You both withdrew so we'll drop that motion and table it until our next 8 meeting so we'll move forward on that. 9 10 Okay. DeAnna, do I need a motion to 11 table it, I mean do we need to actually take a motion? 12 13 MS. PERRY: Motion -- tabling a motion 14 and withdrawing a motion are two different things since 15 we are not.... 16 17 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yep, we withdrew 18 19 it so we don't have nothing. 20 MS. PERRY: Well, both the word table 21 22 and withdraw has been used so if we are tabling it -- I think it would be cleaner if we withdrew it if we are 23 not going to revisit it this meeting. We could always 2.4 25 bring it up at the next meeting. To table something gives the impression you're going to revisit it during 26 this meeting. 27 28 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: That's why I 29 30 asked, yeah..... 31 32 MR. WHISSEL: My intention was to 33 withdraw. 34 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:to table is 35 36 a specific date -- so there's no motion to table, it's been withdrawn so we'll just take it up at the next 37 meeting, it'll be an agenda item. 38 39 40 MS. PERRY: Okay. 41 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. 42 moving on here is Fisheries Resource Monitoring 43 44 Program, and Jared you're going to present that. 45 MR. STONE: Good morning, Mr. Chair, 46 that will be myself and my colleague Robbin LaVine, 47

anthropologist with OSM.

48

```
Page 195
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Robbin,
     okay you guys go right ahead.
 2
 3
 4
                     MS. LAVINE: Good morning, Mr. Chair,
     this is Robbin. And I'm going to let Jared take the
 5
     lead right now.
 6
 7
 8
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                           Okay.
                                                  Go ahead,
     Jared.
 9
10
                     MR. STONE: Alrighty, let me just pull
11
     up my document real quick, if you don't mind holding
12
     for a moment.
13
14
15
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: No problem.
16
17
                     (Pause)
18
19
                     MS. PERRY: Jared, would you like me to
     put on the screen, the suggested 2022 Southcentral FRMP
20
     Priority Information Needs are are you going to do that
21
     on your end, I don't mind I have it up if you want me
22
     to?
23
24
25
                     MR. STONE:
                                 That would be perfect,
26
     thank you.
27
28
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Still can't see
     the screen but that's okay.
29
30
31
                     (Pause)
32
33
                     MR. STONE: Okay. Hello, Mr. Chair.
     For the record my name is Jared Stone and I am a
34
     fisheries biologist with OSM. And like I said joining
35
36
     me today as well is Robbin LaVine, anthropologist with
37
     OSM.
38
39
                     Today I will be providing you with an
40
     update on the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program and
     support your Council in the development of priority
41
     information needs which is an action item.
42
43
44
                     We would like to first start you with
     an update of continuing projects that are currently
45
     funded in your region. The Southcentral FRMP region
46
     there are currently four continuing projects and as a
47
     reminder these are typically projects that are funded
48
     for four years in total.
49
```

The first is a 2018 project. That's the Gulkana River sockeye salmon harvest contribution.

There's another 2018 project, that's the estimating the in-river abundance of Copper River chinook salmon.

And then there are two projects that were funded in the last cycle in 2020 and that includes the Klutina River sonar pilot project and the abundance and run timing of salmon in Tanada Creek.

The Office of Subsistence Management will announce the 2022 notice of funding opportunity for the Monitoring Program later this fall or later. We will be seeking proposals for these projects that gather information to manage and conserve subsistence fishery resources in Federal public waters in Alaska. The monitoring program is also directed at supporting meaningful involvement in fisheries management by Alaska Native and rural organizations and promoting collaboration among Federal, State, Alaska Native and local organizations. The development of the PINS is an important process for the Council. These PINS will drive the remainder of the -- of this FRMP cycle, and when I say PINS and FRMP, I just want to remind folks that I've shortened priority information needs and we sometimes call the priority information needs PINS, and just so there's no confusion. And, again, FRMP is just short for Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program.

Currently this is a primary point where the Council can influence the direction of the Monitoring Program. Today's discussion regarding the priority information needs for the 2022 funding cycle, again, is an action item for the Councils as part of the FRMP process.

 Volunteers composed of members of this Council met once earlier last month to discuss fisheries information needs and issues for the region. The volunteers consisted of the Chair of Southcentral Council, Greg Encelewski, Gloria Stickwan and Southcentral Council member John Whissel. OSM Staff included anthropologist Robbin LaVine, myself and Council Coordinator DeAnna Perry. The Office of Subsistence Management was fortunate to participate in a nationwide U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service directorate fellowship program where our office hosts a student who

Page 197

has recently graduated and has shown interest in natural resource management. During this internship, Keith Ivy, who has also participated in the ANSEP Program and has lived in rural Alaska took on the challenge to perform a gap analysis of each region's research needs and summarized these needs into an organized document that we have supplied to the volunteers to help inform their discussions. document incorporated previous years information needs and an assessment of which projects have addressed these needs. It also included a table that summarized all of Southcentral's previously funded projects, annual report replies and an extensive review of Council transcripts. The final project of Keith's internship was a well crafted document for each region to help better inform Staff and Council member volunteers of potential discussion points regarding future fisheries information needs.

So at this first meeting, the volunteers examined Keith's gap analysis as well as the priority information needs from 2018 and 2020 cycles and then also addressed projects that had been fully funded by those priority information needs. Additionally, volunteers assessed the projects that were funded through the Monitoring Program from 2000 to present, and activities not eligible for funding through the Monitoring Program. From this they composed a list of potential fisheries information needs for your consideration today.

The draft list provided to you today is the result of the volunteers meeting earlier last month and at this point I would like to request that one of your Council volunteers brief you on the discussions that took place and Robbin and I are here to support and assist you as you finalize the 2022 priority information needs.

Thank you, Mr. Chair for your time, and I believe the suggested draft should be up on your screens on teams and from here we can work through these one by one if you'd like. Again, this is a list that was composed by the volunteers and we can change, modify, add, or remove any of the priority information needs that you see there on your screen.

MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair.

4 / 48

```
Page 198
                     MR. LAVINE: Mr. Chair, this is Robbin.
 1
 2
                     Hello, Mr. Chair, this.....
 3
 4
5
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Robbin.
 6
                     MS. LAVINE: .....is Robbin LaVine.
 7
     Thank you. We can do two things right now. We could
8
     -- one, we could have one of the volunteers that
9
     participated in our discussion do a bit of a briefing
10
     on what occurred, or if you'd like I can give you a
11
     brief walk-through of the documents you should have
12
     before you to support our discussion today.
13
14
15
                     How would you like to proceed?
16
17
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I think you could
     give us a brief walk-through first and then if someone
18
     wants to talk to it after that'd be fine, but you can
19
     go ahead. Just so you know, Robbin, some people -- I'm
20
     having trouble, I don't have my teams, I can't get
21
22
     connected for some reason, so some people don't have
     that so we'll have to follow over the Council booklet,
23
     from what we got.
24
25
26
                     MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair.
27
28
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes.
29
30
                     MS. PERRY: This is DeAnna.
31
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes.
32
33
                     MS. PERRY: Hi, Mr. Chair.
34
     particular document that Robbin is referring to is not
35
36
     in the meeting book and I know most folks aren't on
     teams to view it in real time so I wanted to remind the
37
     Council that these documents were sent to you by email
38
     on September 24th and hopefully that will help you
39
40
     locate them if you don't have those in front of you.
41
                     Thank you.
42
43
44
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: That was two
     weeks ago, you expect us to find them.
45
46
                     (Laughter)
47
48
                     MS. LAVINE: Mr. Chair, members of the
49
50
```

Council, as you all look for those documents I'm going to give you a brief description of what they should be.

2 3 4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

The documents that were sent out in email for your reference are the 2018 and 2020 priority information needs, so those were the PINS used by this Council in previous notice of funding opportunities and, additionally, there should be a document of suggested 2022 Southcentral FRMP priority information needs. These documents can also be found on our website. Now, I was aware this morning that our website -- I was having trouble accessing our website, let me look and see if I can access it now, it looks like it's up, so another place to locate these documents, are to go to regions, Southcentral Alaska and look in the meeting materials and you will find near the bottom of the page 2018 and 2020 priority information needs and draft of suggested 2022 priority information needs.

18 19 20

So either they're going to be in your email or you can pull them up from the website.

212223

If you need a moment, please let me know, otherwise I'll proceed.

24 25 26

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes, if you'll give us just a couple moments here I'm going to try and pull mine up here.

28 29 30

27

(Pause)

31 32 33

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: How about the rest of the Council members, are you able to find what you need there from the $24 \, \mathrm{th}$.

343536

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ WHISSEL: Mr. Chair. This is John Whissel, I'm all set.

37 38 39

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

40 41

MS. STICKWAN: Mr. Chair.

42 43

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Gloria.

44 45 46

47

48

MS. STICKWAN: I just want to say at our Wrangell-St. Elias SRC meeting we supported the PINS develop test and implement methodologies for monitoring escapement and/or mortality of sockeye salmon in the Copper River and/or its tributaries. And

the second was predation of salmon in the Copper River Delta (seals, bears, ells/lampreys). We supported those two PINS at the SRC.

3 4 5

1

2.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

6 7

MS. LAVINE: Does everybody have what they need, are we ready to go?

8 9 10

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I think we're ready Robbin. I got mine so you go ahead, I got it up on another screen, so thank you.

12 13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

11

MS. LAVINE: Okay. So aside from the 2018 and 2020 PINS and the suggested 2022 Southcentral FRMP PINS another document for reference can be found on Page 203 of your Council books. And this is all the Southcentral Alaska region projects funded -- actually there's a misprint there, as you'll see, but all of these are Southcentral Alaska region projects funded since 2000. So that you can get a peak at the kind of research that this program has funded.

222324

25

26

But I want to draw your attention back to the document that we'll be working on today and that's the suggested 2022 Southcentral FRMP priority information needs document.

27 28 29

30

31

32 33

34

35 36

37

38

39 40

41

42

43 44

45

46

47

48

You will notice that this document has, oh, one, two, three, four, five, six -- six bullet points. So this document has six bullet points and you're going to notice that this document has some regular text and some bold text as well as some underlined text. Anything in bold, aside from the heading, indicates new language or new issue suggested for this new year. Also notice that two of the bullets at the very end of this list are brand new this year. You'll also notice that there are some sub-bullets underneath the primary issues of priority information needs and those sub-bullets indicate -- and they provide information or possible new wording that the volunteers suggested were related to the main bullet, that they're nested under. You'll also notice that there are some projects listed under the second bullet. These indicate that these projects made efforts to address that priority information need in past cycles and so it's up to you to assess whether those projects fully address that priority information needs or whether you'd like to keep it through the next cycle.

And then one last thing I'd like to talk to you about before we get into greater discussion, you may want to consider fisheries management reports. I know you've heard some, there are more on the agenda, so you may want to listen to some of the fisheries managers and their reports to request input from those attending, any of our local experts to assist in identifying additional critical issues that this list may not capture.

And I also wanted to let you know that if you consider all the Staff here, everybody in attendance, we're here to support you in your discussion so please call out to anybody if you have questions or if you think you need help in finessing the wording and, again, we're here under these really unique and challenging circumstances and I would like to express my gratitude and request your patience as we struggle through this.

Thank you.

And I'm ready for your questions.

(Pause)

MS. LAVINE: And, Mr. Chair, if -- if you are waiting for people.....

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead.

MS. LAVINE: If -- if you would like -- if you don't have immediate questions, we can walk through each bullet point one by one and I'm happy to do that with you.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Before you do that I want to, you know, this is going to be very complicated to try and do this by phone and over the Council and everyone all different, you know, we're looking at things to create documents and draft stuff and come up with a conclusion so it might be helpful to walk through but I'm -- Gloria had a good point, she talked about how they've reviewed the PINS, and so I'm going to open it to the Council members and maybe you guys give me some guidance, how you want to approach this.

MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chair. This is John

Whissel.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead,

John.

MR. WHISSEL: I thought maybe just in terms of a discussion to go through the PINS, we could just go through what we have on this draft document and we could align the Council with thinking -- Gloria and I spent some time reviewing priorities in different areas and tried to be as inclusive as we could and we tried to give you a succinct and brief a document as we could to facilitate the on line discussion.

But basically if it's okay with you I can just sort of let you guys know what our process was a little bit.

 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead,

John.

MR. WHISSEL: Okay. So what we thought -- it started as an overall sort of theme, and Gloria feel free to defer with anything I say if -- if you had a different take on any of this.

So we sort of were trying to move priorities out to all species. I think we generally saw that coho are kind of under represented in everything we're doing and coho are taken for granted a lot of times and I think we sort of see them as the bail out if the fish runs don't come in, we'll grab some coho, but I think we need to -- and I think Gloria was there with me, I think we need to start doing the kinds of things for coho we're doing for other salmon runs because we don't want to wait until they're in decline before we start looking at them. We need to start developing a baseline.

So coho got some attention from us and we -- the first bullet point addressed coho on the Kenai Peninsula. Gloria and I didn't really feel like we had the expertise in the area to really integrate coho into the existing priorities there and we're hoping that some of you guys on the Kenai would be able to add some nuance to that discussion so we just tact it on to the end of the priorities for the Kasilof and the tributaries. But we put it on as a bullet point that's broader for the whole Kenai because we saw that

theme in some of the feedback regarding PINS.

tributaries for escapement and mortality.

The second, you see coho bolded in the 2022 but it's in the 2020 PINS for the Copper. What we want to do is think about Delta coho along with everything else. And so if you look at the bullet point below it it adds Copper River Delta and

We added a predation survey. That's been a high priority up and down the river because as the resources diminish we want to manage by stock and bring this higher resolution to management, I think starting to look at all the -- all the resource users including the natural ones and seals and the bears and the in-river predation are things we should start to estimate and include, you know, the possibility of monitoring predation in our management. Of course that would be in the future but we need to lay the groundwork for that.

We sort of added some detail to bringing reporting, you can see reporting as a priority in our deliberations, both regarding the Board of Fish and Federal subsistence and we have a PIN on there to research and study ways that we can efficiently and effectively bring our reporting from post-season to realtime.

 We added estimating out-migration of sockeye salmon on the Copper River. This was something that was done -- sockeye salmon smolt on the Copper River -- this is something that was done for king salmon when the king salmon were in decline, and I think our discussions today have -- certainly nobody's arguing that the sockeye are doing spectacularly well on the Copper and so it's a good idea, I think, to start bringing some of the studies of out-migration so we can look at ocean survival and the only way to look at ocean survival is to be able to enumerate the abundance of fish going out versus coming back.

Then we added a multi-region suggestion that is reflective of our discussion among the Council was to explore broader impacts of climate change on salmon and their habitat and especially looking at how climate change affects ocean acidification on the marine sea web (ph).

And that was it.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thanks John, that was good. I'm not sure you had a lot more than what I'm seeing and reading on my paper but that's good.

Okay, Council, it's up to us how we want to prioritize these needs, let's go ahead and I'll open it up to the rest of you to discuss how you want to go forward.

MS. LAVINE: Mr. Chair, this is Robbin

 LaVine.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Robbin.

MS. LAVINE: And this is something that Jared and I did for the Kodiak/Aleutians, which was, began discussion, began wording or finessing the wording and making some major decisions on this first draft and then Jared and I worked to ensure that we were incorporating and capturing your comments through lunch hour and then after and also after hearing more reports that may have bearing on your priority information needs and some of the issues, and the final draft was finalized and approved.

So that is one way that we could do it that might -- or we could address it, which is to break up this agenda item, begin now, then -- and then bring it back for discussion and finalization after a little bit of work. And then as yo u confirm whether your identification of the issues matches all the information provided by the various agencies and entities that are providing testimony and reports on the health of the fisheries in your region.

 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Robbin, I think you're getting us a little off course here because, you know, that's a work session to work all that stuff out and I know you've worked hard and you got a committees and you come up with this stuff, but I mean the Council's got a lot on their plate today and we don't have time to go and finesse your work and draft before lunch and after lunch. I just don't see it happening especially over the phone like this, we can't get together. But I'm up for, you know, taking the suggestions of the people on the committee like John,

Gloria and them that worked it and if these priorities align, that we can come to a census to support them as presented or go ahead and modify them now so we could move on.

2.

MS. STICKWAN: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead.

MS. STICKWAN: I think since we supported the in-season monitoring, we should just support the one that says in-season monitor harvesting -- and Copper River drainage. This shows support for the actions we took yesterday.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yep. Okay,

17 so....

MS. LAVINE: Mr. Chair and members of the Council. If you look on your document you'll see there are -- that the language that Gloria has suggested is a sub-bullet, so basically it's kind of getting as the same information as the bullet carried over, or the priority information need carried over from 2020 and so you might make a decision on which language you would like to go with for this bullet. Would you like to go with the original from 2020, the suggested language in bold, or would you like to incorporate the two and make them -- use language from both.

MR. WHISSEL: I think that the suggested language in bold more accurately reflects the type of shift we're hoping to achieve.

REPORTER: And who is this?

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: That's John.

MR. WHISSEL: Oh, sorry, this is John

Whissel.

REPORTER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: And, John, if I'm correct, your suggestion in bold, it starts out at the top, suggested 2020 Southcentral Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program priority information needs, you go to the first bold it's addressing coho on the Kenai;

```
Page 206
     the second bullet you've got develop test and implement
     methodologies for monitoring escapement....
 2
 3
 4
                     (Teleconference interference -
 5
     participants not muted - piercing feedback)
 6
 7
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: ....and/or
     sockeye salmon in the Copper River and its tributaries;
 8
     and predation of salmon in the Copper River/Delta
 9
10
    (seals, bears and eels/lamprey; and then you move down
     and you get down to about the fourth bullet and in bold
11
     you've got the in-season harvest monitoring/reporting
12
     of harvest of salmon in the Copper River, and then a
13
     couple more bullets below that; estimate of sockeye
14
     salmon smolt out-migration and ocean survival on the
15
     Copper River; then multi-regional suggestion; explore
16
17
     the impacts of climate change on salmon and the
     environmental while exploring the impacts of climate
18
     change and acidification on the overall food web
19
     effecting fisheries resources important for subsistence
20
     harvest.
21
22
                     (Teleconference interference -
23
     participants not muted - piercing feedback)
2.4
25
26
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Is that what
27
28
     we're supporting or is that what we're looking at?
29
                     MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chair, this is John
30
     Whissel. I understand Gloria was in support of.....
31
32
33
                     (Teleconference interference -
34
     participants not muted - piercing feedback)
35
36
                     MR. WHISSEL: ....continuing the PIN
37
     carrying over some 2020 and in terms of addressing
     Robbin's question about how to word that.....
38
39
40
                     REPORTER: Wait, wait, the recording
     cannot hear anything with that loud whistle and
41
     feedback.
42
43
44
                     MR. WHISSEL:
                                   Yeah, I got.....
45
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, we need --
46
     let's go ahead and take about a five minute break and
47
48
     get some noise settled down and I'm going to do
49
     some....
50
```

```
Page 207
                     (Teleconference interference -
     participants not muted - piercing feedback)
 2
 3
 4
                     MR. WHISSEL: Very good.
 5
 6
                     MS. PERRY: Just a reminder for folks
 7
     to hit star-6 when you're not speaking. And with the
     feedback issue, if everybody could just take a look
 8
     around and make sure that their audio equipment is not
9
     close to either computers or other audio equipment that
10
     might produce the feedback.
11
12
                     Thank you.
13
14
                     Nickella, are you able to isolate what
15
16
     line that's coming from?
17
                     REPORTER: Let me call the operator
18
19
     right now while we're going on break.
20
                     MS. PERRY: Thanks.
21
22
                     (Off record)
23
24
25
                     (On record)
26
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Council members
27
     we're going to get back on schedule, back on task.
28
     What I would suggest and make sure I got everything
29
     lined out right here -- I'm going to suggest to the
30
     Council to take the work that John and Gloria did, the
31
     suggested 2022 Southcentral FRMP priority information
32
33
     needs, it covers what Gloria had suggested, it covers
     what everyone has suggested and worked on, and if we're
34
     okay with that, that's -- accept it as written and move
35
36
          There might be a couple little clarification
37
     points but I would like to get it approved as presented
     and move forward.
38
39
                     MR. OPHEIM: Mr. Chair, this is
40
     Michael.
41
42
                     MR. STONE: Mr. Chair, this is Jared.
43
44
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead,
45
     Michael.
46
47
                     MR. OPHEIM: Yeah, I'm okay with that
48
     if John and Gloria are okay with that.
49
50
```

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you. I think they worked on it so I think they're fine with 2 it, I'm just saying that we have two people that 3 4 actually worked on this pretty hard and did a good job so I think we've all been involved in this and I just 5 know for a fact we're not going to sit on the phone, 6 7 moving through lunch and later and try and rewrite the document, that's just not going to happen, but we could 8 certainly modify it a little or add to it if we see 9 something of great importance. I'm not trying to stop 10 any of the process, but I think we got something we 11 could work with and we could pass it forward. 12 13 MS. STICKWAN: Mr. Chair. 14 15 MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chair. I wonder if 16 17 someone from the Kenai.... 18 19 MS. STICKWAN: Mr. Chair. 20 MR. WHISSEL:wouldn't want to 21 22 look at our little tag on of..... 23 MS. STICKWAN: Mr. Chair. 24 25 26 MR. WHISSEL:of coho there and add some meat to it. This is John Whissel. 27 28 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, John, I 29 looked at it and I think the tag on needs to stay there 30 and I think the coho on the Kenai do need to be looked 31 at, it's been brought up several times so I think that 32 33 tag on is fine. So that's someone on the Kenai. 34 MR. WHISSEL: Very good. 35 36 37 MS. STICKWAN: Mr. Chair, this is Gloria. 38 39

44

45

46

47

48

49 50 MS. STICKWAN: I was just thinking about what Robbin said and I think we need to implement a program and do an in-season -- I don't think we can do an in-season monitoring unless it's implemented. It has to be set up and I don't know how complicated that would be so I think that's what Robbin was trying to get at. But I just think the program needs to be set up but it -- it is one of our -- it is written the way

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Gloria.

we wrote it though. 2. CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: And, Gloria, if 3 I'm not missing anything, if that's an implement 4 question, real-time harvest data on the Copper, whoever 5 in-season, harvest monitoring, reporting harvest, so I 6 7 think that's in here. 8 MS. STICKWAN: Okay. Because Robbin 9 10 was saying do you want the dark bold or the top bullet. 11 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Forget the dark 12 bold, let's approve the whole page. 13 14 15 MS. STICKWAN: That's up to the 16 Council. 17 MS. LAVINE: Mr. Chair, this is Robbin. 18 19 20 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead, Robbin. 21 22 MS. LAVINE: I understand that we don't 23 have a lot of time. The draft that you see before you 2.4 25 was not intended to be approved in its current form, 26 it's a little rough. 27 28 The suggestions that I made were that after some discussion, Jared and I, alone, without you 29 all because you all need to focus on your business, but 30 Jared and I could make some final tweaks and present a 31 finished copy for you to approve potentially after 32 33 lunch. If you walk through each PIN very quickly and approve, Jared and I will clean it up and come up with 34 a final document that you can support on record. 35 36 37 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I'm going to go back to the Council. I don't know that we have time to 38 do that. But I don't see what's wrong with it the way 39 40 it is but anyway go ahead. Anyone else got any comments on this. 41 42 MR. ZADRA: Yeah, Mr. Chair, this is 43 44 Dennis. 45 46 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead, 47 Dennis. 48

49 50 MR. ZADRA: I would be fine with the

```
Page 210
     document as written. Yeah, it seems like we could get
     hung up on this for quite some time.
 2.
 3
 4
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Probably another
     day. Thank you, Dennis, good suggestion. Any other
 5
     Council members.
 6
 7
 8
                     MR. HOLSTEN: Yeah, Mr. Chair, this is
     Ed.
9
10
11
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes, Ed.
12
                     MR. HOLSTEN: Yeah, I'm in agreement
13
     the way it's written right now. Thank you.
14
15
16
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you.
17
     Anyone else got a comment on it.
18
19
                     MR. WHISSEL: This is John Whissel.
     certainly wasn't intended to be published as it is.
20
     Some of this stuff on here are just kind of notes like
21
22
     a PIN carried over from 2020 without funded projects, I
     mean those are sort of notes to guide Gloria and my
23
     discussion. I do think it could use a little bit of
2.4
25
     cleanup but I don't -- I mean I don't think we need to
     spend much time on it, I agree generally that we can, I
26
     think if we just took out the little notes that they're
27
28
     carryover PINS, you know, that's something I think we
     would want to look at but I think we should get some of
29
     that language out of here.
30
31
                     You know for the first PIN, if we get
32
33
     rid of important PIN carried over from 202 without
34
     funded projects.
35
                     For the second one, if we get rid of
36
     following projects fall under the PIN.
37
38
39
                     The third one, if we get rid of that
40
     same language, important PIN carried over.
41
                     The fourth one, if we get rid of that
42
43
     same language.
44
                     Then I think we're okay to look at it
45
46
     vote on it now.
47
48
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Well, you
     make a motion to get rid of those and be very specific,
49
```

```
Page 211
     succinct and as quick as possible, John, and we'll vote
     on it.
 2.
 3
 4
                     MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair. We probably
     don't need a motion since this is in the drafting
 5
     phase, but if Robbin and Jared want to make those
 6
 7
     changes in real-time and the Council could go ahead and
     vote on the final project.
 8
 9
10
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I can't see them
     on real-time, sorry, but whatever.
11
12
                     MR. STONE: Mr. Chair.
13
14
15
                     MR. WHISSEL: Oh, because you're not
     able to look at the teams meeting, is that.....
16
17
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: That's correct.
18
19
20
                     MR. WHISSEL:
                                   Okay.
21
22
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Some of us can't,
     and I've spent all morning but I don't got it, so,
23
24
     anyway.
25
26
                                   Okay, that makes more
                     MR. WHISSEL:
27
     sense, I....
28
                     MR. SARAFIN:
                                   Mr. Chair.
29
30
31
                     MR. WHISSEL: .....thought we were all
     looking at it now.
32
33
34
                     MR. SARAFIN: Mr. Chair, this is Dave
     Sarafin.
35
36
37
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead
38
     Dave.
39
40
                     MR. SARAFIN: Yeah, I could provide
     just some brief recap of two significant brainstorming
41
     events that happened in the Copper River Basin this
42
     year that was looking into, you know, information gaps
43
44
     and potential, you know, things that could be included
     in the PINS and some of them are represented in the
45
     draft, but if you would like some additional topics
46
     because these were pretty large gatherings with
47
48
     researchers, agency managers, multiple user groups from
     Cordova to Fairbanks and in the Copper Basin, with an
49
50
```

interest -- this would all relate to Copper River salmon so if you'd like any supplemental information I could try to be brief on that.

2.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Well, we don't want to expand this, we're not trying to, you know, we don't have time to expand it at all. You know we done a lot of work and got to where we are and I understand there's always ongoing things and new information but we need to move forward with this. So I'm going to ask the Council to make a motion to accept this with removal of the notes that John made, and John I'd like you to make that motion and maybe move forward so we could get moving on this and we could send it in, whether it needs to voted on or not at least they could start drafting it.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ WHISSEL: Roger. Okay, so working off of our draft document I move to accept all PINS with the following edits.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

MR. WHISSEL: And the first PIN, abundance run timing, spawning site fidelity, I suggest we delete the second bullet point that starts with important PIN carried over.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

MR. WHISSEL: On the second that starts with obtain reliable estimates of chinook, coho and sockeye salmon escapement in the Copper River, I propose that we delete the third and last bullet point on that PIN that says following projects fall under PIN with sub-bullet 20-501 et cetera.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

MR. WHISSEL: For the third PIN that begins develop, test and implement methodologies for monitoring salmon spawning escapement in the Copper River drainage, I suggest we delete the sub-bullet, important PIN carried over from 2020.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ WHISSEL: In the fourth bullet that begins implement the collection of real-time harvest

```
Page 213
     data, I suggest we delete the second and last sub-
     bullet that reads important PIN carried over from 2020
 2
     without funded projects.
 3
 4
5
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                           Okay.
 6
 7
                     MR. WHISSEL: And that is it. That is
     very good, I marked them all on mine and I hope
8
     everyone got that, do I have a second to that.
9
10
                     MS. SELANOFF: This is Diane Selanoff,
11
     I'll second.
12
13
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Diane.
14
     Is there any more discussion.
15
16
17
                     (No comments)
18
19
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: If none, if
     someone will call the question and we'll take a vote
20
     and we'll see if we can move it forward.
21
22
                     MS. SELANOFF: Call for the question,
23
     this is Diane.
2.4
25
26
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Question has been
     called for, all in favor of it as presented and
27
28
     seconded and modified, aye.
29
30
                     IN UNISON: Aye.
31
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Anyone opposed to
32
33
     that.
34
                     (No opposing votes)
35
36
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Robbin, does that
37
     meet enough to get started now.
38
39
40
                     MS. LAVINE: I believe so, Mr. Chair.
41
     Thank you.
42
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you.
43
44
                     MS. LAVINE: Mr. Chair, this is Robbin.
45
46
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Robbin.
47
48
                     MS. LAVINE: If I may be so bold,
49
50
```

really quick, on that list, the very first bullet, which is about on the Kenai Peninsula, abundance run timing, spawn site fidelity timing age, sex, length composition for chinook salmon that stage or spawn in waters of the Kasilof River and its tributaries, there is a sub-bullet address coho on the Kenai Peninsula. I believe we nested that there because we thought that PIN could basically have the same wording that instead of chinook salmon, replace chinook salmon with coho salmon, and that potentially that might be for both the Kasilof and the Kenai River watersheds.

2.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, whatever you got to do to express that, that's fine, we passed that and it's understandable. I agree with you that you know we've always wanted to look at the chinook salmon in the spawning waters in the Kasilof and hopefully in the Kenai too, but however you need to modify it and if we never get another shot at it we'll take a look at it later.

MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

 $\label{eq:CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. DeAnna, am I ready to move on now or did I miss something on that proposal?}$

MS. PERRY: I believe we're ready for C, Moose Pass nondeter -nonrural determination proposal.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, I just wanted to make sure I didn't get into too much trouble here.

Okay, we'll go ahead, and Robbin I think you're going to start us in on the Moose Pass, at least that's what I got on my agenda so if you want to go ahead and make your presentation that'd be great.

MS. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the Council. So once again this is Robbin LaVine and I will be presenting the analysis for nonrural determination proposal RP19-01. And for those of you listening on line you can find the analysis on our website again under the regions tab, Southcentral, meeting materials, the nonrural analysis is at the bottom of the list. You can also find a timeline for the 20/21 nonrural regulatory cycle on Page 205 of your

Council book just to show kind of where you are in this regulatory -- where we are in this regulatory cycle.

So hopefully you all have a digital or hardcopy of the analysis in front of you. I'm going to walk you through highlights of the analysis and as I do I'll draw your attention to portions of the text, the tables and figures and page numbers, so I ask you to bear with me, settle in, this is going to take a little time, and this is an action item.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

MS. LAVINE: Nonrural determination proposal RP19-01 was submitted by Jeffrey Bryden of Moose Pass and he asks the Federal Subsistence Board to consider Moose Pass as a rural community independent of the greater Seward area.

 The proponent states that Moose Pass is a distinct rural community with a unique culture and character but was previously aggregated with Seward and never considered on its own merits.

The proponent asserts that under the new Federal Subsistence Board's nonrural policy, Moose Pass will qualify as rural.

The proponent describes the area for consideration as extending from Mile 25 to Mile 37 of the Seward Highway. He explains that south of Mile 25 has a different postal code, a separate electrical service, and north of Mile 25 the proponent also asserts that no one lives north of Mile 37 until after the start of the Sterling Highway.

The proponent states that Moose Pass residents rely upon fishing and hunting and gather natural resources from the Forest Service lands that surrounds the area. These Federal lands limit population growth and has allowed the community to keep the rural feel and culture that drew him to the area in the first place.

The proponent argues that because Forest Service lands are opened to subsistence harvest activities, Moose Pass residents should be eligible to harvest local resources as Federal opportunities allow.

On Page 2 you can see Figure 1, that's a map of Federal lands in Unit 7.

 Starting on Page 3 you can read a detailed discussion of the rural/nonrural regulatory history and I'm not going to go into this too deeply but I do want to point out some highlights that got us to where we are right now.

The first one, the rural/nonrural determination process was established in 1990. included a process for aggregating communities that it determined were socially and economically integrated before assessing the community or area for nonrural characteristics -- or rural or nonrural characteristics and once aggregated, a community or area with a population size of up to 2,500 was considered rural and over 7,000 was considered nonrural. Those communities with populations in between were not presumed to be either, so it was those in between communities that were assessed for rural status under the old policy. The Board aggregated Moose Pass with Seward in 1990 and again during the decennial review in 2000, both times the Board determined that the Seward area had primarily nonrural characteristics and created a Seward nonrural area.

That map you can see on Page 4 of your analysis.

In October 2009 the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture initiated a Subsistence Program review which concluded, among other things, that the Board should initiate a review of the rural determination process with Regional Advisory Council input. The Board approved the new policy on nonrural determinations in January 2017. This new process enables the Board to be more flexible when making decisions and to take into account regional differences found throughout the state. The new process also allows for greater input from Councils, tribes, Alaska Native corporations and the public.

Now I'm going to take you to Page 7 and the heading nonrural decisionmaking. It's important to note that the new nonrural policy does not provide explicit criteria or a checklist for determining whether a community is rural or nonrural. The text from Page 7 was taken directly from the policy and it

shows bold and underlined wording that highlights the quidance upon which this analysis is focused.

Specifically.

The Board will make or rescind nonrural determinations using a comprehensive approach that may consider such factors as population size and density, economic indicators, military presence, industrial facilities, use of fish and wildlife, degree of remoteness and isolation, and any other relevant material including information provided by the public. Other directions to highlight include information would be administrative record, evidence and considerations presented in the proposal, the discretion to modify the geographical extent of the area, and most importantly the Board will look to the Regional Advisory Councils for confirmation that any relevant information brought forth during the nonrural determination process accurately describes the unique characteristics of the affected community or region.

 Guidance from this Council includes, learning more about fish and wildlife use and comparisons with other rural communities on the road system. One member shared on record the best indicators were the historic talks from the people that testified, that gave me the usage, that's what I was looking for. These Council comments, along with guidance from the policy provide direction for the following organization of this analysis. Because both the policy and Council guidance highlight the importance of information provided by the public, the analysis incorporates public testimony provided at the public hearing and the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council meeting from fall of 2019, and both of these events are described in current events on Page 6.

The analysis of the Moose Pass area begins on Page 8.

Content for the following sections rely heavily on information provided by the public and residents of Moose Pass as well as State technical papers, reports and local historical accounts.

If you turn to Page 10 you will find a map of the Moose Pass area describing the census designated places, important mile post markers and

2.

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

Page 218

features that are referenced throughout the analysis. The mile post markers stretch along the Seward Highway and incorporate Moose Pass CDP between Miles 25 and 37, Crown Point CDP between Miles 23 and 25, Primrose between 15 and 23, you should note Mile 15.5 marks the Snow River Hostel and that's the last structure in the Primrose CDP and there are approximately eight miles of uninhabited road stretched between the Snow River Hostel and the first Seward connected settlement within the southern portion of the Bear Creek CDP. Importantly you'll notice that the shaded yellow area describes the proposed Moose Pass community boundary in the original proposal.

13 14 15

16

So now I'm going to draw your attention to the section extent of Moose Pass community, and that's midway on Page 9.

17 18 19

20

21 22

23

2425

26

27 28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35 36

Some Council members and residents of the Moose Pass area requested the Board consider an extension of the geographic definition of the community to include those residents that live beyond the boundaries outlined in the original proposal. Most public testimony at the hearing indicated that a sense of community among the residents is more broad and inclusive and that residents of Primrose and Crown Point CDPs are considered part of the Moose Pass community. In addition to public testimony this section also draws upon local organizations, clubs and commissions that describe the extent of their membership, services and area as well as preliminary research conducted by University of Alaska-Anchorage graduate student Christina Brummer. All sources in this section indicate that the Moose Pass community is expansive and inclusive of residents living from Mile Post 15 of the Seward Highway to Mile Post 37 and in some cases beyond to Summit Lake at Mile Post 45.

41

42

43

If you turn to Page 11. Table 1 describes the Moose Pass area population from all CDPs in 1990, and you'll note the population of the entire area is small, 391 people even when all three places are combined and demonstrates and relative stability of the area population over years.

44 45 46

47

48

On Page 12 you can find a history of the Moose Pass area including Crown Point and Primrose CDPs. All these places have their origins in the developmental phase of mining and railway construction

 Page 219

on the Kenai Peninsula which began in the early 1900s.

At the bottom of Page 13 is the section Moose Pass as a rural community.

Based on policy and Council guidance, a valuable assessment of the status of Moose Pass as rural comes from the community itself. This section summarizes testimony from the public hearing and fall Council meeting. 12 people provided testimony during the public hearing, three of whom attended the Council meeting. All 12 define their home as rural and described a community and a way of life that relied heavily on hunting and fishing, was defined by limited amenities and services and emphasized the rural character of their community as something that they valued and looked to protect.

Beginning on Page 15 is a section use of wild resources.

In this section use of wild resources is demonstrated through public testimony, subsistence surveys and ADF&G permit harvest reports. All sources demonstrate consistent harvest and use of wild foods by residents under the opportunities available to them and public testimony captured the value of being able to gather firewood and food from the lands outside their homes.

On Page 16, Table 2 shows the number of hunting permits issued to Moose Pass residents for all species in any unit of Alaska between 1990 and 2010, and we just cast a really broad net just demonstrating that people valued and participated in hunting and fishing opportunities. It's important to note that most local opportunities are limited through competitive drawing permits open to all Alaska residents as well as non-residents, depending on the hunt. A total of 1,939 permits were issued to residents of the Moose Pass area over the 20 years.

At the bottom of Page 16 is the section communities with rural status in Southcentral Alaska. There are numerous communities and areas within Southcentral Alaska that are designated as rural under Federal regulations. In this analysis we seek to understand Moose Pass in comparison to communities with rural status on the Kenai Peninsula. Nonrural

communities are included in these comparisons to provide context for identifying the threshold between rural and nonrural communities in the immediate area.

3 4 5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

2425

26

27 28

29

30

2.

So if you start on Page 18, Table 3 first -- Table 4 is on Page 19, these tables provide comparative community characteristics between rural communities, the Moose Pass area, and the nonrural communities of Nikiski and Seward. Table 3 provides demographics and population density. Table 4 summarizes the most recent subsistence surveys conducted in each community. As you examine these tables I want to caution that while they provide some data for comparison purposes they might not be super helpful in identifying a rural community from a nonrural community. Please note that density is documented for the U.S. Census only describes the population within a defined unit of land called a CDP and these are varied in size, they're not a good indicator of isolation or access to services. And as you review Table 4 on fish and wildlife use, keep in mind a couple of caveats; the column showing percentage of households surveyed describes the sample achievement for each community, each survey attempts to interview as many as households as possible to ensure accuracy and the most representative data. It's also important to note that Moose Pass, along with Nikiski and Seward on this table are not qualified to hunt hunter Federal regulations, and this can result potentially in reduced opportunity and a more limited harvest. So keep that in mind when you're looking at those numbers.

31 32 33

34

35 36

37

38

39 40

41

42

43 44

45

46

47

48

If this proposal is adopted, residents of Moose Pass will be eligible to practice subsistence harvesting on Federal public lands under Federal regulations inclusive of all rural residents. adoption of this proposal does not guarantee residents will be qualified to participate in all harvest opportunities on Federal lands in their region. that to occur, the community will need to pursue customary and traditional use determinations for fish and wildlife species in their area. If this proposal is not adopted the status of Moose Pass will remain nonrural and residents will not be eligible to participate in resource harvest under Federal subsistence regulations. Residents seeking to harvest wild resources for subsistence purposes would continue to be required to do so under State of Alaska regulations.

The OSM preliminary conclusion is to support Proposal RP19-01 with modification to define the community of Moose Pass as encompassing the Moose Pass, Crown Point and Primrose census designated places.

The Moose Pass area -- Moose Pass shares a rural experience with other Southcentral rural communities, that includes a reliance on wild foods, reduced amenities and services, geographic location and a shared sense of identity as a cohesive rural community. Public testimony, harvest surveys and harvest reports demonstrate consistent participation in hunting and fishing opportunities. All residents providing testimony described the importance of wild foods in their diet and home. Residents also cited access to fish and wildlife as the main reason for living in their community and referred to the high level of fish and wildlife use as a primary justification for their status as rural.

Moose Pass has limited amenities and a geographic isolation that can hamper access to important hub communities with critical services during extreme weather events. The location of the community as situated within a mountain pass requires residents to plan for potential conditions that will limit travel throughout the year. Residents point to a lack of local amenities, services and business as a key distinguishing feather between their community and nearest nonrural hub of Seward, and regardless of the proximity to Seward, most Moose Pass area residents travel into Anchorage or Soldotna for bulk shopping and other important services. Significantly, Moose Pass is surrounded by Federal public lands upon which residents rely for most of their wild harvest. Residents consistently mentioned these lands as bordering their properties providing resources and contributing to the rural character of their community.

Finally, public testimony and available sources indicate that the community of Moose Pass extends beyond the boundaries described in the original proposal. The community of Moose Pass should be defined as inclusive of Crown Point, Moose Pass and Primrose census designated places.

Thank you all for your patience as I wrap up my presentation, I will remind you this is an

```
Page 222
     action item. The Board is looking to you, the Council,
     to recognize the unique characteristics of rural
 2.
     communities in Southcentral Alaska and to provide your
 3
     recommendations on RP19-01 to the Federal Subsistence
 4
     Board.
 5
 6
 7
                     Thank you, and I will take your
 8
     questions.
 9
10
                     MS. STICKWAN: Mr. Chair, I have a
     question.
11
12
                     (No comments)
13
14
15
                     MS. STICKWAN: Mr. Chair, I have a
     question.
16
17
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead
18
19
     Gloria. You go right ahead.
20
                     MS. STICKWAN: Robbin, did the -- the
21
22
     original proposal was for Moose Pass, the proponent's
     name I don't remember but did he agree to include all
23
     these other communities?
24
25
                     MS. LAVINE:
                                  Thank you, Gloria.
26
     Through the Chair. He -- the original proposal was a
27
28
     very discreet bit of land. The Board has the
     discretion to expand the area in question and
29
     discussions from this Council, from some members on
30
     this Council and also based on testimony from area
31
     residents indicated that that -- that the community
32
33
     boundaries were broader than the CDP. And so in --
     through public testimony, through further research it
34
     did indeed seem that the community of Moose Pass was
35
     not just the Moose Pass census designated place as
36
     indicated in the proposal. The community, community
37
     members, people who participate in clubs, attend
38
     schools go to the post office in the old town site of
39
40
     Moose Pass, these are folks from both Moose Pass -- or
     all of Moose Pass, Crown Point and Primrose and they
41
     all consider themselves as residents of the Moose Pass
42
43
     community.
44
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Did that answer
45
46
     your question, Gloria.
47
48
                     MS. STICKWAN: Yeah, it's the public
     testimony I guess, and I guess the person that wrote
49
```

this agreed.

you so much.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I understand where you're coming from Gloria. I mean the Council had no problem with Moose Pass, we didn't go to the Crown Point and Primrose and it sounds like it's an administrative decision after their research so we're going to go through the whole proposal. We'll have all of the normal steps we'll take on this after they're done with their presentation. So we'll go through tribes, ANCSA, all the other agencies and we'll probably end up with some more public testimony. But, yeah, there's definitely some more questions now, it's changed from what we originally worked.

Okay, Robbin, before I move on to my process here, you have a public testimony -- I have it on my agenda of a UAA -- that wanted to make comments, Christine.

MS. BRUMMER: Yes, I'm here.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, you want to go ahead and make your presentation.

MS. BRUMMER: Yes, I'd like to, thank

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

MS. BRUMMER: Hello Council members, my name is Christine Brummer and I'm a UAA graduate student who's working on my Master's Thesis titled Who is Rural Alaska, a case study of rural community practice. And Moose Pass has been used as my case study community and I'd like to share some of my preliminary findings with you today in hopes that the information will assist the Council in making a more informed decision regarding the community of Moose Pass.

I conducted my field work from November 2019 through January 2020, a total of 24 Moose Pass area residents participated in my study. I define the Moose Pass area as that area from Mile Post 37 where the Sterling and Seward Highway meet to Mile Post 15.5 of the Seward Highway, the location of the Snow River Hostel breaking down these numbers into CDPs the participants are as follows: 1 from Primrose CDP; 8

from the Crown Point CDP and 15 from the Moose Pass CDP. I'd like to remind the Council that the CDPs are census designated places, they're not places in which the residents have distinguished for themselves, but that of the U.S. Census Bureau designated.

5 6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

2425

26

27 28

29

30

31

32 33

1

2.

3

My field work consisted of three components including a mapping exercise, a survey and an interview. Each participant was given the same copy of a Moose Pass area map and asked to draw what they considered their community boundary. 23 of the 24 chose to participate in the mapping exercise and of the 23 participants each drew a boundary from Mile Post 37 with five ending the boundary at Mile Post 16.9, which is the Snow River Bridge, three ended the boundary at Mile Post 15.5, and one ending the boundary at the end of the Crown Point CDP. One drew a boundary from the Hope Y to Mile Post 16.9. Three drew the boundary from Mile Post 45, which is Summit Lake. With one ending the boundary at Mile Post 16.9. One ending the boundary at 15.5, and one ending the boundary at the end of the Crown Point CDP. One drew a boundary from Mile Post 50 to Mile Post 15.5. One drew a boundary from Mile Post 33.1, which is Quarter Creek to Mile Post 16.9. One drew a boundary from Mile Post 48 to Mile Post 16.9. Five drew the boundary from the Tern Lake Lodge which is just past Mile Post 37, with three ending their boundary at Mile Post 16.9, one ending the boundary at Mile Post 24, which is the beginning of the Primrose CDP, and one ending the boundary at (Indiscernible) Lake, which is the area in the center of the Moose Pass CDP. One drew a boundary from a little down the road of the Tern Lake Lodge to the old community of (Indiscernible) which is at Mile Post 23.

34 35 36

37

38

39 40

41

42

43 44

45

46

47

48

49 50 All of the 24 participants who participated in the survey and the interview. Participants were between the ages of 36 and 79 years of age. Many came to Alaska from other parts of the United States. Five were from Alaska, they're Alaska born. The participants have lived in Alaska for a total between nine and 70 years. I asked all participants what community would you say you're from, all 24 participants said they were from Moose Pass. I asked what the community -- what community means to the participants if they could define their community they stated that Moose Pass is a tight-knit community where people chose to live a rural lifestyle. People cooperate in common goals that define interests and are

there for one another even when everybody values their privacy and people may not know each other very well. 2 Everyone comes together to discuss and make decisions 3 and to celebrate. There are a lot of personalities in 4 the communities but the residents bond together to 5 enhance the community. Participants explain the 6 7 following as unique characteristics of their community. A melting pot of different people from various places 8 that are very outdoor oriented. It is a shut-in nearly 9 year-long community that is spread out over 20 miles 10 where people are self-reliant, creative and share with 11 one another. Sharing includes fish and meat caught, 12 berries picked and vegetables grown in gardens. 13 Residents have to drive a lot to get to services, 14 amenities and activities. The community is created out 15 of choice and necessity. Response times for utility 16 and medical services is long. It is a place that is 17 largely unregulated and quiet and the community 18 19 interests are accomplished through people giving their Some participants commented about how the 20 geographic or extent with nowhere to go except along 21 22 the highway is unique.

23 24

25

26

27 28

29

30

31

32 33

34

35 36

37

38

39 40

41

42

43

I asked the participants to please define rural, nonrural and urban. Do to some restrictions I will only discuss how residents defined rural as nonrural and urban were often suggested as being the opposite of rural by participants. Rural was explained at that which is not urban, a place that is away from services like gas stations, stores, restaurants, bars, medical, pharmacies, child care facilities and daycare opportunities. A place with no stop lights. Where you have to wait for DOT to plow the road for long periods of time. A place far from urban centers in which getting amenities and services is inconvenient. A place where there is a lot of (indiscernible) population, means a lot of sacrifices, missed opportunities and you just have to create your own source of entertainment, that one wasn't a geographic location that is less human created and more If your house catches on fire it's going to burn down before you get any help. You have to work with what is around you and your residing location. You have limited factors in a rural place.

44 45 46

47

48

49 50 The last question I asked participants was to define their community. All 24 participants stated that Moose Pass was (indiscernible - cutting out) they included that Moose Pass is in the woods but

```
the closest grocery store 35 miles in one direction and
     90 miles away in the other direction. Moose Pass does
 2.
     not have common modern conveniences. There's no law
 3
     enforcement. The community actually relies on the
 4
     Troopers. No trash service. No local government.
 5
     Residents rely on one another. And they have to travel
 6
 7
     to get food, gas and medical services. A participant
     stated that Moose Pass is rural because when their
 8
     truck battery dies, you end up with tinkering it
 9
     instead of driving to Anchorage to get a new one.
                                                        Tt.
10
     is easier to (indiscernible - cuts out) deal with
11
     service. Some of the participants stated that Moose
12
     Pass can easily be cut off from other places, including
13
     urban centers due to road closures and they're self
14
     reliant when this does occur. It is common for people
15
     in Moose Pass to drag around sleeping bags and safety
16
     gear in case of an emergency or road closure.
17
     participant stated that they thought Moose Pass was
18
19
     rural during the winter months and more nonrural during
     the summer months due to the increased population from
20
     tourism. After Labor Day the weather starts to change
21
22
     and the residents living in Moose Pass have less of a
     desire to go into town for things so many just do
23
     without. No one feels sorry for themselves, they just
24
25
     do not want to spend the time or the fuel
26
     (indiscernible - cuts out) to get the things that are
     not essential.
27
28
                     This wraps up my primary findings on
29
     the Moose Pass case study. If you have any follow up
30
     questions I'm happy to answer them, and I thank you so
31
     very much for your time.
32
33
34
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, very,
     very good report. Questions for Christina.
35
36
37
                     (No comments)
38
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Christine, thank
39
40
     you. We'll go ahead and.....
41
42
                     MS. BRUMMER:
                                   Thank you.
43
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: .....go back to
44
     our process here now. I'm going to -- did we have
45
     someone who had a question for Christine?
46
47
                     (No comments)
48
49
50
```

Page 227 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. We're 1 going to start out with consultation. Tribes, is there 2 any tribes that want to speak to this rural 3 4 determination of Moose Pass -- I quess we shouldn't call it Moose Pass now..... 5 6 7 MS. LINNELL: This is Karen Linnell with Ahtna InterTribal Resource Commission. 8 9 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:they got a 10 couple other areas, Crown Point and Primrose so. 11 12 Any tribal comments. 13 14 MS. LINNELL: Mr. Chair. 15 16 17 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead. 18 19 MS. LINNELL: This is Karen Linnell with Ahtna InterTribal Resource Commission. 20 21 22 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Karen, you go right ahead. 23 2.4 25 MS. LINNELL: I had a question as to 26 why there are the Primrose and the other CDPs, why are they separate. We've recently had the same issue come 27 up with our moose hunt and we were talking about using 28 CDPs as boundaries for eligibility to participate and 29 in our community, even though they use the same post 30 office box and attend the same schools they separated 31 because of political and/or differences and became 32 33 eligible for the community revenue sharing stating that separation. So I was just curious as to what the 34 separation is instead of having one Moose Pass CDP? 35 36 37 REPORTER: Mr. Chair, sorry to interrupt but there's some back background noise. 38 39 40 MS. PERRY: I'd just like to remind everyone to hit star-six and if your speakers are on on 41 your computer, please turn those off, I think that's 42 been a source of feedback. Again, star-six if you're 43 44 not speaking. 45 Thanks so much. 46 47 48 MS. LAVINE: Mr. Chair, this is Robbin 49 LaVine.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Robbin.

1 2 3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

Thank you, Mr. Chair. MS. LAVINE: Ms. Linnell. The CDPs are really just helpful as devices to count people. When the first -- when the first aggregation of the community of Moose Pass occurred with Seward in 1990, or a little bit before, you know, the years leading up to that aggregation there were no CDPs for Crown Point and Primrose, so these weren't census designated places. At a certain time the census needed to describe new areas to capture a growing community, or to capture a community that they had kind of missed in earlier times. So you'll see in certain places all throughout the state communities that eventually have grown to include or expand within multiple different census designated places. Like the community of Ninilchik is the Ninilchik and Happy Valley CDPs. The community of Seldovia has a number of different CDPs that describes These CDPs are just ways -- they're its population. devices that are helpful but they should not be defining or limiting. They just capture population numbers.

23 24 25

Thanks.

26 27

28

29

30

31

32 33

34

35 36 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. They capture population numbers and they also do a lot of other strange things. I know Clam Gulch did not -- and Ninilchik was a census designated area or whatever, it was not considered rural. So this does kind of complicate our process here because the RAC, you know, we went through Moose Pass, we visited it, we all agreed to it and everything and so we got a couple add ons here that we need to do our due diligence on and stuff but as we go through it we'll talk through it and see where we end up.

37 38 39

Any other tribes want to speak to this

40 41 42

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, this is Darrel Williams in Ninilchik.

43 44 45

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes, Darrel.

46 47 48

MR. WILLIAMS: Hi. You know I have a comment and kind of a question because, you know, Robbin's really right about using the CDPs and how that

49 50 matter.

pulls into different areas like where we're at, we're more than one CDP. But when you look at the actual 2. eligible rural community. For example here in the 3 4 Kenai Peninsula, I mean the actual way that it is done is we defined what is not rural. You know, if you open 5 the regulations up, you read that section it says if 6 7 you live here you're considered urban. And so really when we look at that it stretches it over into a bigger 8 area, you know, and I'm just kind of curious about 9 these CDPs are generally based on geographical 10 boundaries, is there a philosophy or a process to 11 address that because I could see some trouble coming 12 down the road about questions about well were we 13 included or not included and why and so part of that --14 so I'm kind of curious because of our area but I'm also 15 curious because of the proposal. 16

17 18

Thank you.

19 20

21 22

23

2425

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, Darrel, good question. It's kind of like getting grouped into a service area with Anchor Point. Anyway, yeah, it's a lot of complications there. I don't know if anyone could answer your question there. But any comments on Darrel's question. Comments. Statements.

26 27

(No comments)

28 29 30

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, well, hearing none we're going to go ahead and keep moving. ANCSA Corporations, does any of them want to talk about that, Moose Pass.

32 33 34

31

(No comments)

35 36 37

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: All right. Let's have some agency comments. How about Alaska Department of Fish and Game, what do you guys think.

38 39 40

41

42

MR. BURCH: Hello, Mr. Chair, this is Mark Burch. The Department of Fish and Game doesn't have any comments at this time.

43 44

Thank you.

45 46

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Mark. How about Federal agencies, any comment.

47 48 49

(No comments)

```
Page 230
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hearing none, any
     tribal agency, do you have a comment.
 2
 3
 4
                     (No comments)
 5
 6
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: DeAnna, any other
 7
     Regional Councils or Advisory Groups that commented.
8
                     MS. PERRY: No, Mr. Chair.
9
10
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. How
11
     about any Fish and Game Advisory Committees.
12
13
                     (No comments)
14
15
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hearing none, how
16
17
     about Subsistence Resource Commissions.
18
19
                     (No comments)
20
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Barbara, you
21
22
    don't want to comment on Moose Pass?
23
                     MR. CELLARIUS: No thank you, Mr.
24
25
     Chair.
26
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.
27
28
     How about summary of written public comments, DeAnna, I
     imagine you got some.
29
30
                     MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair. We do not have
31
     any new written comments since the last time this came
32
33
     before the Council. I know this Council received some
     written comments as well as public testimony in some of
34
     the meetings past.
35
36
37
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes.
                                                 Okay, very
38
     good, thank you.
39
40
                     Public testimony, would anyone like to
41
     testify to this matter before us.
42
                     MR. BRYDEN: I would, Mr. Chairman, can
43
44
    you hear me, this is Jeff Bryden.
45
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I can hear you
46
     loud and clear. Go ahead, state your name, I think I
47
48
     cut you off.
49
50
```

MR. BRYDEN: This is Jeffrey Bryden.

1 2 3

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Your voice comes through really good we recognize you, go ahead, Jeff.

4 5 6

7

8

9

10

MR. BRYDEN: Thank you, Sir. Mr. Chairman, I think there's been a little bit of misunderstanding with the Office of Subsistence Management. At no time did I recommend the expansion of our community as I put in the proposal. And I'm on the record specifically for that.

11 12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

2425

26

27 28

29

30

I understand that certain members of this area are defined would like to also be included, which would be the Primrose area, the Crown Point area, but using the definitions and stuff I specifically kept this as a small area of the original Moose Pass on the census information to eliminate opportunities to be denied. By adding these extra areas we are now adding people that have post office boxes in Seward, are using Seward Electric Company, which on the original critierias showed the difference between Moose Pass and I don't understand why the Office of Seward residents. Subsistence Management thinks I thought that was a good idea and I was on the record as such saying I didn't think it was a good idea. I do believe if anybody from those areas would like to put in a proposal to be considered rural also that they could do that and run through the process just as I've done it for the area up here and if they don't want to do it they don't have to.

31 32 33

34

35

38

39 40

41

I'm concerned that by adding those other areas that they'll give reasons to exclude my area now.

36 37

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Jeff, yeah, I'm sure glad you cleared that up because that's the way I understood it and it's the way I understood all of this stuff presented to us in the past and past RAC meetings it was strictly very specific of the Mile Post 35 to whatever, 25, 37, that, yeah, obviously....

42 43 44

45

46

47

MR. BRYDEN: Yes, Sir, Mr. Chairman. Like I said I wrote this proposal specifically so that it didn't have reasons to believe excluded out and if you add those other areas that could get my area now excluded.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Very good, questions for Jeffrey. Council members you got some questions there.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, I think I know how it got in there, Jeff, I'll speak a little bit, but I don't agree with it. I don't know, you know, sometimes -- you know, I've always been kind of like you, the proponent, you're putting it forward, it's for your area, it's not to be altered or changed and if others want to have a determination that's fine, and others have fish proposals or hunting proposals, that's fine, too, but the proponent -- a proposal should go on its own merit, I think.

But anyway thank you very much for the

 testimony.

you can.

Is there any other public testimony.

MS. BRUMMER: Mr. Chair, could I speak again, this is Christine Brummer.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, Christine

MS. BRUMMER: Hi. I just wanted to bring up, I was at the Seward RAC and maybe I'm sticking my foot in my mouth but I just wanted to remind the Council and other people that at that particular RAC meeting when they were discussing the Moose Pass proposal, the Council did tell OSM to go ahead and make a really broad analysis so that you guys had information to make a more informed decision. That's kind of part of the reason, too, that I looked at that larger area of the Moose Pass area when I was doing my thesis too.

So I just wanted to remind everybody about that and maybe that's where some of the confusion's coming in.

And I don't think, from my understanding, that Robbin actually directly stated that Mr. Bryden okay'd it, I think she was just saying that at the public hearing, which I was also at too, that other people in that area had spoken up to say

Page 233 that they were part of the community even though they might be living in the Crown Point and Primrose CDP, 2. that's my take from it. 3 4 5 I just wanted to share those thoughts 6 with you guys. 7 8 Thank you so much. 9 10 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you for making that point. I understand looking at the broader 11 area, I wasn't necessarily meaning by looking at the 12 broader area to add things to the non-determination 13 but, anyway thank you for that. 14 15 16 Is there any other public testimony. 17 MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, this is DeAnna. 18 19 Yesterday Jeff Estes mentioned that he wanted to testify on this issue but I'm not sure if he's on the 20 phone today. 21 22 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Well, are 23 you on the phone Jeff. 2.4 25 26 (No comments) 27 28 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Didn't he testify before DeAnna, did we have something from him before? 29 30 31 MS. PERRY: Not on Moose Pass, Mr. Chair. 32 33 34 MR. ESTES: Yes, this is Jeff. 35 36 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Oh, good, go 37 ahead, Jeff. 38 39 MR. ESTES: Sorry, I thought I unmuted 40 myself. 41 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: 42 Okay. 43 44 MR. ESTES: I'd like to comment that the report and the analysis I thought was 45 extraordinarily -- was done extraordinarily well. 46 also was glad to hear that on your Part D, you're going 47 48 to be monitoring chinook salmon in the Kenai River drainage, which brings down chinook salmon in Moose 49 50

```
Pass which I haven't been able to fish since they got
     discovered that there was chinook salmon spawning in
 2.
     Moose Pass in this CDP and we used to eat smoke salmon
 3
 4
     from that when I was a little kid back in the 50s.
     Anyway, I think it's a very good study. And I don't
 5
     know if you want to include the other people.
 6
 7
     somewhat taken aback by the census calling
     (indiscernible) Crown Point, which are two actual
 8
     separate communities and LakeView is a different
 9
     community and Primrose is another community all
10
     considering themselves part of Moose Pass, but that's a
11
     census and that's a different government agency.
12
```

 $$\operatorname{And}$ that's all I have to say. Good study. And I totally agree with it.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: All right, thank

 you.

MS. HETRICK: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes.

MS. HETRICK: Hi, this is Willow Hetrick, I am also from Moose Pass, if I may, just give a quick summary of my thoughts on this proposal.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: You may.

MS. HETRICK: All right, thank you, Mr. Chair and Council members. My name is Willow Hetrick for the record. Last name is H-E-T-R-I-C-K. Aside from a few years in college outside I've lived in Moose Pass my whole life and all of my family lives there as well which is becoming a bigger and bigger family it seems like by the year.

I just wanted to thank Robbin and Christine for putting together such a great report. My entire family and I participated in Christine's study and we had additional discussions with Robbin on several occasions about the report and I was very happy to read what they came up with. It was very nice and refreshing not to be lumped in and compared to other communities like Seward because we truly think that we are different and we truly love to not be associated with the community of Seward. I think every resident will support me when I say that.

```
Page 235
                     And I just wanted to thank them again
     and I encourage the Council to support this proposal.
 2
 3
                     Thank you.
 4
 5
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
 6
 7
     Willow. Anyone else want to testify.
8
                     (No comments)
9
10
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Regional
11
     Council. Recommendations. It's up to us to see where
12
     we're at. I'll open it up to whoever wants to go
13
14
     first.
15
                     MR. OPHEIM: Mr. Chair, this is
16
17
     Michael.
18
19
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                           Go ahead,
20
     Michael.
21
22
                     MR. OPHEIM: Yeah, you know when we did
     the meeting out there at Moose Pass, you know, there
23
     were people that chimed in saying, you know, that
24
25
     Primrose and Crown Point were part of, you know, they
     felt like they were part of Moose Pass as a community,
26
     but definitely the writer of the proposal was very
27
28
     clear on what he wanted, wanting the Moose Pass area,
     you know, put in by itself for fear of having, you
29
     know, getting excluded otherwise, and that these other
30
     two places could put in their own proposals. I do
31
     understand lumping them together makes it, you know,
32
33
     maybe a little less work for those folks if they do get
     included here. But I would hate for all Jeff's work to
34
     go to not if, you know, they include these other two
35
     and then, you know, he gets excluded because clearly
36
37
     they do live that subsistence lifestyle there.
     know so I wouldn't balk at a modification to remove
38
     those two places and just submit it as the original
39
40
     proposal.
41
                     That's just my thought on it.
42
43
44
                     Thanks.
45
46
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you,
     Michael. Other comments.
47
48
                     MR. HOLSTEN: Mr. Chair, this is Ed.
49
50
```

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

Page 236 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Ed, go ahead. MR. HOLSTEN: Yeah, I agree with everything that Michael stated. The only way I could support this proposal is to leave off Crown Point and Primrose, I don't think those were the original intentions of Mr. Bryden's proposal and I know a lot of those folks down in -- or not in Crown Point, but in Moose Pass, so again I feel like it just would be proper for us to go along with the original proposal brought by Mr. Bryden. Those are my comments. Thank you. CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Ed. Okay, who would like to speak next. MR. WHISSEL: John Whissel, Mr. Chair. MS. STICKWAN: This is Gloria. CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Gloria go ahead. MS. STICKWAN: In the past we talked about this before and we have always said that people that put in for determinations, they should be -- their proposal should be accepted as written because they took the time to do this, they took the time to do the effort of gathering information and the hard work to do this and we respected their wishes, and I think we should continue that. You know the person that wrote this, it took time for him to do this, we should respect his wishes of just including Moose Pass. CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Very good.

Anyone else want to comment on it.

MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chair, this is John Whissel.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes, John.

MR. WHISSEL: So I looked at the proposal and it is clear that the area that the proposer outlined, he wasn't -- it was within a geographical area bounded by mile markers. somewhat prepared for the area to expand because I do

27 28

29

30

31

32 33

34

35 36

37

38

39 40

41

42

43 44

45

46 47

48

49 50 Page 237

have a memory at that meeting in Seward of us talking about the broader area, somewhat favorably, and I do 2. also have a memory of us asking OSM to consider the 3 4 larger area in the analysis. I wasn't necessarily -- I think my take on that was to properly put Moose Pass 5 into its context, from understanding of the surrounding 6 7 area it would be helpful and what I read is that OSM's saying, yes, we consider it to be largely the same 8 place, I think that solidifies Moose Pass' candidacy as 9 a nonrural area, but I don't feel like I want to -- I 10 very well would be in favor of including those other 11 regions in our nonrural determination but I want it to 12 go through the full process, I don't think -- it's not 13 so much to me about rewarding the person that did the 14 work on the proposal, I think we need to help out 15 communities, and because these other areas maybe 16 didn't, you know, think to get included, if they -- if 17 they really should be part of a nonrural determination 18 19 I think it's fine to give it to them but I don't think the public has had the opportunity to weigh in on that. 20 I don't want to just go based on a couple of people 21 22 from the area who are here today, but I would have been much more comfortable if we had expanded it at the 23 meeting in Seward and had a chance to engage the 24 25 community, and come to this meeting with that expanded 26 area in mind.

So I would really prefer -- I would love to give Moose Pass their nonrural determination, but I don't know that I would vote in favor of the other communities, I haven't really given that any thought, or at least not the kind of thought that it would take to vote yes.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Very good comments, good thoughts.

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{Next}},$$ anyone else on the Council want to talk to it.

MR. BLOOMQUIST: Yeah, this is Aaron. I just -- John expressed pretty much everything I was thinking, and I have to dive into a meeting here -- or not a meeting, but in an appointment here for half an hour so I'm going to be out of the discussion for a little bit.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Thank you Aaron. Anyone else on the Council want to speak about

1 it.

MR. HOLSTEN: Yeah, Chair, this is Ed Holsten again.

4 Holsten

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Ed.

MR. HOLSTEN: Yeah, I just wanted to remind some people there was pretty good representation from Crown Point at the public meeting. I sat in on that, that was held in Moose Pass. So they had ample opportunity to state their causes.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, okay.

Anyone else have any comments.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, I'll just make my comments and we'll go ahead and take a motion and we'll vote on this.

You know, I fully support Moose Pass, and Moose Pass alone at this time. I believe is what John said and Gloria and Ed and also Michael, all of them, that, you know, if we're going to have others they should have their proposals and they should have a public hearing, we should have more. I think when we talked about the larger area, I think John was right on, my understanding was a larger area was to solidify and make sure that we, you know, that it really spelled out that Moose Pass is what we were looking at as Jeff presented originally. And so, you know, without adding others, I would have done a lot more detailed and testimony and other things from public on that myself.

But that's my thoughts, and I think you've heard it from most of us so it's up to the Council to make a motion now to see how we want to go on this and I will accept that.

MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chair, this is John Whissel. I move to adopt Moose Pass Federal proposal as written without the expanded area.

Thank you.

```
2.
```

```
Page 239
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, John,
     is there a second to that.
 2
 3
 4
                     MS. SELANOFF: This is Diane Selanoff,
     I'll second.
5
 6
 7
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Diane.
8
                     MS. STICKWAN: This is Gloria, I want
9
10
    to have the names in the motion.
11
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Gloria, I think
12
13
    he made a motion just Moose Pass as is.
14
15
                     MR. WHISSEL: I proposed the original,
16
     we're adopting only the original proposal, not the
     modification.
17
18
19
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah.
20
                     MS. STICKWAN: Okay.
21
22
23
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.
                                                   Okay.
     other discussion.
2.4
25
26
                     (No comments)
27
                     MS. SELANOFF: This is Diane Selanoff,
28
     I'll call for the question.
29
30
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Diane.
31
     Question's been called, all in favor signify by saying
32
33
     aye.
34
                     IN UNISON: Aye.
35
36
37
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any opposed.
38
39
                     (No opposing votes)
40
41
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.
     carries.
42
43
44
                     All right, good work.
45
                     DeAnna, next I've got identify issues
46
     for fiscal year 2020 annual report, do you want to go
47
48
     ahead and lead us on that one.
49
50
```

MS. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is an action item. It's time for the Council to decide on what issues to include in its annual report. Establishing the annual reports is a way to bring regional subsistence uses and needs to the attention of the directors of each of the four Department of Interior Agencies and the Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, and their capacity as members of the Federal Subsistence Board.

2.

For your information guidelines for annual reports can be found on Page 206 of your meeting books and on Page 208 you'll see the Board's reply to this Council's last annual report.

So through the Chair, if Council members have concerns or information that he or she would like to see raised to the Federal Subsistence Board, I'll make a note of those items at this time to include in this coming year's annual report.

Thank you.

2.6

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, DeAnna, yeah, we have our last years, we had Unit 13 moose, we had a lot of stuff on the fish, climate change, we had lots of responses, I'm sure you guys read it all, non-determination process, communities, okay, Council members what would you like to see in our annual report, and, Andy, you want to -- you know, you are our Secretary there so you should record this, or we could have DeAnna record it, but what would you like to include in our next report.

MS. STICKWAN: Someone mentioned

about....

MR. OPHEIM: Mr. Chair, this is

Michael.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Gloria, you want to go ahead, I think someone talked over you there.

MS. STICKWAN: Someone earlier brought concern about vacant seats on our Council.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes, vacant seats not being filled. Okay, we got that down.

Anyone else.

1 2 3

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, Andy here.

4 5

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Andy.

6 7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: More than ever, even more than last year, how climate change, I would like to see that again, that's an important topic to keep reiterating the fact of why we exist is to help change these regulations and seasons, bag limits, everything is not predictable. It used to be, seemed to be, you know, for decades more of a pattern of, you know, oh, this is a pretty much regular 20 year cycle pattern but now it's just like the wind changes and some complete different parameter happens and now this run of salmon or that species or this migratory pattern, or this travel condition, things happen in subsistence that is not as easy to determine as it used to be. So I would like to see that climate change, the importance of being able to adapt our regulations to climate change parameters that are dynamic.

22 23 24

25

26

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Very good. Yeah, that's very important. So we could write that up and we could all the comments you made there and we'll make sure we get that in there.

27 28 29

30

31

MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chair, this is John Whissel. I'd like us to continue to have ocean acidification like directly within our larger climate change discussion.

32 33 34

35

38

39 40 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. After everyone agrees we could add that to the letter also.

36 37

MR. WHISSEL: And -- I'm sorry, my second point I think we would want to highlight is the poor performance of the Copper River sockeye and the need for extra resources to be brought to try to maintain that salmon run.

41 42 43

44

45

MS. SELANOFF: Can we have it for Southcentral region because it just wasn't just the Copper River. I think there's poor performance all over. This is Diane.

46 47 48

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Diane I think you're right on. I think we could say that with the

Kenai, and we could say that with other areas, things are changing drastically, and accountability, so I think that's a good topic. Ocean's and low run returns.

2.

Anyone else got anything they want to put in there.

MS. STICKWAN: Yes, I do.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, go ahead.

MS. STICKWAN: At our Wrangell-St. Elias SRC meeting, which will be brought up later, we asked to postpone the individual C&T because we wanted more information from Wrangell-St. Elias, and we weren't saying no to it we just wanted more information on it and we're asking the Board -- we asked in a letter to the Board that they not take this up at their meeting to make a decision on it. There's no hurry for individual C&T, there's no rush to get it done and that they postpone it until we can make a decision on it at our next meeting, or sometime later.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. That you want the Board not to take action until you've had a chance to review it later -- okay.

MS. STICKWAN: We still had some questions on it and so we wanted the Board to postpone it for now.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. We'll make sure we put it in the letter. And I hope you're capturing all this, DeAnna, we'll help you out if you miss something.

 MR. WHISSEL: Mr. Chair, this is John Whissel. I have one more point and it may or may not be agreeable to everybody but I'd like to bring it up.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

MR. WHISSEL: This one may be controversial but I feel like it would be a good time for us to point out the dangers of the movement at the State level towards essentially prioritizing de facto subsistence activity in non-subsistence areas, which are those areas around our major urban centers.

The State is moving to prioritize, basically personal use because subsistence -- State subsistence activities are prohibited in those areas and I think bringing -- giving a population access that close to home is really, really dangerous for those areas and we'll have some reduced resources there.

So I can understand if nobody wants to touch that one with a 10 foot pole but I think it undermines what we're doing here.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, John, I don't know if -- you know it's kind of funny because I got mine wrote down and mine is not exactly like that but I have a similar concern and maybe we could put them together. But what I would like to note somehow is why are the Federal regulations, you know, getting -- in a lot of areas they're more restrictive than the State and, you know, the State without restricting some of these uses, especially all the fishing proposals we run through are causing problems in the subsistence arena being, so somehow we need to address that and we need our regulations to be firm, to stand out and to hold in our decisions.

So I'm not sure how you write that up, DeAnna, but I would like to see that and I'd like to kind of see that along with John just now stated on his areas that they're making priorities for nonsubsistence. We might have to work on that wording and come back to it.

Is there any other that would like to

talk.

that.

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: I have a comment about

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I don't think there's nothing out there that's unreasonable, we can put them in as our concerns and they're concerns from all the Board and hopefully we all agree with them and we'll go around that table here in a minute and make sure we all agree to everything spoken.

Anyone else.

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chair, Andy, here.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Andy.

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, I was going to make that same comment. I kind of wrote something out here. You know the mandate of ANILCA is subsistence regulations cannot be more restrictive than other regulated uses of the resource and it was very apparent in this meeting, you know, how our -- just like you said, our regs -- our Federal regs becoming more restrictive because, you know, we have some conservation concerns but the fact that the State managers are kind of making political decisions and less practical ones and maybe it's not in favor of these resources existing in perpetuity.

So anyhow I'm on that same train of thought with you guys.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, you put a lot out even than I did, and you're exactly right, that's exactly where I was going. You know it's very commendable that we're willing to take and put restrictions on the subsistence users but the State is not helping us at all, in fact they're hindering us, and they're forcing us to think that we have to restrict Federal when the Federal priority under ANILCA is to get the resources to the subsistence users. And sooner or later the .804 analysis comes in, the restriction of, you know, the commercial and others are going to have to happen so we do need to address that and I think we ought to put that in the letter.

Thanks.

Any other comments.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any other

40 requests.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: And okay this is an action item so DeAnna, do you want a motion to support our listing that we wrote out here.

MS. PERRY: That would be fine. The Council will actually revisit this in the winter

meeting....

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

MS. PERRY:so I know on the concern of vacancies, this Council hasn't talked about it at this meeting so I'll glean from prior testimony. And I think all the other ones were kind of addressed. I know -- I think letter and report has been used interchangeably but at this point everything that's been identified, it's my understanding is an annual report item only. And so if you'd like to do a motion to, you know, for me to draft the annual report, the motion to accept the annual report will come at the next meeting.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{Is}}$ there a motion to draft the annual report as written.

MS. STICKWAN: I'll make the motion to write the annual report but I would first like to have DeAnna resubmit what's -- can she tell us what she has currently.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Do you want to get a second first and then read it back or do you want to just.....

MR. WHISSEL: I second that. I think vacancies should be included. I did speak about vacancies at the meeting.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, John seconded. Okay, we got a motion and seconded to draft the report.

DeAnna, would you try and -- I know you got to work on it, it's not final, but give us the highlights of what we would like in our report/letter.

MS. PERRY: Yes. So Gloria identified concerns of vacancies on the Council. Andy identified climate change and I'll expand on that based on his testimony about everything being unpredictable due to climate change and the conditions, migrations. I'll put together something on that.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Great.

 MS. PERRY: John also wanted ocean acidification to be included in that climate change, specifically for performance of Copper River sockeye and needing extra resources. And then there was a discussion that we're probably going to ask for the Southcentral region overall, not just Copper River.

Gloria identified that the Wrangell-St. Elias SRC had talked about postponing individual C&T. That they were doing a letter to the Board. I know that that's actually an agenda item that this Council hasn't heard yet so my.....

MS. STICKWAN: That's why.....

MS. PERRY:so my official --

19 p

pardon me.

MS. STICKWAN: Well, when we go through it that's what I would want to add in the letter, and I know we're doing this before that, that's why I brought it up and I'd like to see it in the letter if that's okay with everybody.

MS. PERRY: Okay. When you say letter, are you talking about this Council doing a letter to the Board in addition to it being an annual report item, or do you mean the same thing?

MS. STICKWAN: I brought it up to let them know this is what the SRC said and I'd like to have it included in this letter if it's okay with everybody.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yep.

 MS. PERRY: Okay. John identified dangers of the movement we're seeing at the State level, prioritizing de facto subsistence priorities and I do have some information on that. Andy talked about ANILCA and to expound on how that can't be more restrictive than State regulations. And then, Greg, I know you added a little bit to that as well.

So those are the items that I have for a draft annual report that you will see and finalize in the winter.

Page 247 Did I miss anything? 1 2 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: No, you got it, I 3 4 checked everything off my list, I was writing as we talked so I think we got it all. 5 6 7 There's a motion, it's been seconded and this is a draft so it looks like we're going to 8 have time to revise it, polish it and get it right so 9 if someone wants to call the question we'll move 10 forward and we'll go ahead and get that started. 11 12 MR. WHISSEL: My audio cut out, did I 13 hear Board vacancies in DeAnna's runoffs. 14 15 16 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yep, you did. 17 MR. WHISSEL: Excellent. I call the 18 19 question then. 20 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. 21 22 question's been called, all in favor of the outline that we just went through and drafted, aye. 23 24 25 IN UNISON: Aye. 26 27 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any opposed. 28 (No opposing votes) 29 30 31 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. I believe you'll have some more sufficient time to add to that so 32 as you're thinking and you come up with something we 33 could certainly bring it up at the next meeting in our 34 final for the annual report. 35 36 37 Barbara, you got Wrangell-St. Elias, Denali Subsistence Resource Commission, you want to 38 talk to us on that. It looks like you got an action 39 40 item there for us. 41 MS. CELLARIUS: Yeah, I can't remember 42 who's first, whether it was Denali or Wrangell-St. 43 Elias on the agenda -- it is me, okay. 44 45 So there should be a handout, Mr. 46 Chair, in your meeting packet. It's labeled Wrangell-47 48 St. Elias National Park Subsistence Resource Commission. And I'm going to give you a quick overview 49 50

but would be happy to answer any questions. 2 So three of the members of the 3 Wrangell-St. Elias National Park Subsistence Resource 4 Commission are appointed by Federal Subsistence 5 Regional Advisory Councils. We have one each for 6 7 Southcentral, Eastern Interior and Southeast. Stickwan of Tazlina is the current Southcentral RAC 8 appointment to the Wrangell-St. Elias SRC, her 9 10 appointment is expiring in November. And so at your meeting today you have the opportunity to take action 11 on your appointment as a member to the Wrangell-St. 12 Elias SRC. The eliqibility criteria are listed from 13 ANILCA are listed in my handout so obviously Gloria as 14 a member of the SRC is -- or as a member of the RAC is 15 qualified for this appointment. Members of the local 16 Fish and Game Advisory Committee who also engage in 17 subsistence uses in the Park are also eligible. 18 19 20 So I'm going to stop there and hope that you would take action to either reappoint Gloria 21 22 or if you have a preference of appointing someone else, as long as they meet the eligibility criteria, that 23 would be fine too. 24 25 26 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you. What's the pleasure of the Council, do we want to just 27 28 reappoint Gloria and move on or do you guys got another candidate or anyone got any comments. 29 30 31 MR. WHISSEL: If Gloria's willing reappoint her. 32 33 34 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Gloria, I know you're willing, yes? 35 36 37 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: If that was a motion I'll second it. 38 39 40 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: No, but you could 41 just make one if you want. 42 43 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, I make a motion 44 to reappoint Gloria.

45 46 47

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, is there a second to that.

48 49

MS. SELANOFF: This is Diane Selanoff,

```
Page 249
     I'll second it.
 2
                     MR. OPHEIM: I'll second it, Michael.
 3
 4
 5
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Diane seconds it.
 6
     Any discussion.
 7
 8
                     (No comments)
9
10
                     MS. SELANOFF: Call for the question.
11
12
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Question's been
13
     called for all in favor of reappointing Gloria to
14
15
     Wrangell-St. Elias say aye.
16
17
                     IN UNISON:
                                 Aye.
18
19
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any opposed.
20
                     (No opposing votes)
21
22
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I think it's
23
                 Okay, you can carry on now, go ahead.
     unanimous.
24
25
                     MS. CELLARIUS: I believe that Amy
26
     Craver is on the line and that she would cover the
27
28
     Denali SRC appointment.
29
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, I see here
30
31
     down here, Amy go ahead.
32
33
                     MS. CRAVER:
                                  Okay. Good afternoon, Mr.
34
     Chair, and members of the Council. For the record my
     name is Amy Craver.
35
36
37
                     Today I just wanted to report to you
     that the recent Southcentral RAC appointment to the
38
     Denali SRC, Justin Mason, was selected at our last SRC
39
40
     meeting to be our Chair. And then currently the second
     Southcentral RAC appointment is vacant. And this
41
     appointment must be a qualified local subsistence user
42
     and either serve on the -- as Barb was saying, on the
43
44
     Southcentral RAC or on the local Fish and Game Advisory
     Committee. Unfortunately the Denali Advisory Committee
45
     has not met for the past three years. All the
46
     committee members terms have expired and recently I
47
     polled the AC members and no one was interested in
48
     applying for the Southcentral RAC appointments to the
49
50
```

Denali SRC. So currently this second appointment of the Southcentral RAC remains open until the Denali Advisory Committee meets to reappoint new members.

2.

And that's my update.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. So you're going to meet and figure out a candidate and appoint the second one.

MS. CRAVER: The local Advisory
Committee's going -- I'm not sure -- I talked with the
coordinator and they're not sure when the next
meeting's going to be but basically that Southcentral
RAC appointment's going to remain vacant until they
appoint some new people to the Committee because the
current members are not interested in serving on the
Denali SRC.

 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. And I see your Denali thing, you'll be somewhere in the winter here -- okay. So we have no action there but you're going to try and find someone, right?

MS. CRAVER: Correct.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

MS. CRAVER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: All right, I have -- Amy, I have you next on the agenda also, if you guys were done there on those appointments, I have you down for -- Amy, you're going to talk to us on NPS C&T process and guidelines?

MS. CRAVER: Yes. And I guess before I give my presentation on the talking points, this whole thing with the individual C&T was initiated because we have a local subsistence user who is requesting individual C&T and he put the request through the Federal Subsistence Board last year and it was denied because he didn't have a 1344 subsistence eligibility permit so now he's reapplying. So basically what instigated this is to try to be more responsive to subsistence users so that they -- because he wasn't able to hunt this year with his family and so what we're trying to do is just kind of streamline the process so that the Park Service can, when they do get

individual C&Ts, that we can be more responsive rather than telling people that they have to go through the whole Federal Subsistence Board process.

3 4 5

2.

But with that I will just go ahead and go into my briefing.

6 7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

At the August Board meeting the Federal Subsistence Board decided to defer their decision on delegating authority to the National Park Service for determining individual C&T use determination until their January meeting. This deferral was made to give the RACs an opportunity to weigh in before changes in the policy are made. For this reason the topic has been added to the agendas of all the RACs fall meetings.

16 17 18

19

20

21 22

23

2425

26

27 28

29

30

31

32 33

34

35 36

37

To begin, it is important to recognize that eligibility to engage in subsistence activities in National Parks and National Monuments in Alaska is different from that of National Preserves and other types of Federal public lands. To be eliqible in these units one must, not only be a Federally-qualified subsistence user but also have his or her primary permanent home residence located within the resident zone community or have obtained a subsistence eligibility. Additionally, the hunter must also have a customary and traditional use determination for the area and species that they intend to hunt. Customary and traditional use determinations acknowledge the existing pattern of subsistence use. The Board frequently receives requests to evaluate or revaluate these predominately for inclusion of communities or areas. For areas managed by the National Park Service determinations can also be made for individuals according to the CFR for areas managed by the National Park Service where subsistence uses are allowed, the determinations may be made on an individual basis.

38 39 40

41

42

43 44

45

46

47 48 Requests for individual C&T use determinations have been rare in the history of the program. Less than a dozen requests have been made thus far. We have no reason to believe that this will change. Given this rarity and ability to only National Parks and Monuments, the Park Service feels that the Program and its stakeholders would be much better served in a more timely manner if the Park Service Regional Director is given delegated authority to make an individual C&T determination. If delegated, the

process would alleviate the burden on OSM, the Board, provide a more integral for the SRCs, allow requests to be acted upon outside of the normal regulatory cycle and provide mechanisms for documenting and archiving these decisions.

2.

The National Park Service recognizes that with delegation comes responsibility and in coordination with the NPS, Subsistence Advisory Council, OSM, the Solicitor's Office and the InterAgency Staff Committee, the National Park Service has developed a standard operating procedure. If the Board delegates authority for individual C&T use determination, NPS intends to follow these procedures in order that they're responsible for all involved are clearly defined and provide consistency and continuity across Park units to strengthen both the 13440 permit process and the individual C&T process and to provide mechanisms for evaluating and documenting the request and subsequent decisions.

I'm not going to go through every step within the standard operating procedure, I think that's included in your material. And I guess I'll just for time-sake, I can go on, but if anybody has any questions, but ultimately what we'd like is the RAC to make this an action item, if they want to delegate -- recommend delegating authority from the Federal Subsistence Board to the Park Service Regional Director for individual C&Ts on Park lands.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, that's good, is there questions for ${\tt Amy}$ at this time on her presentation.

(No comments)

 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: So you're looking for delegation from the Federal Subsistence Board to the Park Service -- recommendations from the RAC to the Federal Subsistence Board for....

MS. STICKWAN: I got something to say.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead.

MS. STICKWAN: Hello.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead,

Gloria.

MS. STICKWAN: One of the things that we talked about at the SRC meeting was to make a motion to a modified version to include that the SRCs would have -- Subsistence Resource Commissions would have -the same thing as the SRAC different from the superintendent to support our recommendation when C&Ts are done. And then the other thing was to have a definition of C&T in the document itself to clarify. Because one of the things that we got hung up on was one of the members asked if I hunted in the Park would my C&T pass on to my family who moved away, answer was no, it's based on individual's history, and then somebody else brought up, well, what about somebody who's never hunted in the Park, how would they have history, they would be -- they wouldn't be able to have history. And so I think we kind of got wrapped up around that and there was a large discussion on that about C&T and how do you get around that.

And so we just wanted to table this until we could work more on this at the next meeting or sometime later, to work this out, and then -- we weren't saying we don't support it, we were just saying that we wanted to work on it more. That was what we did.

This was a long discussion at our SRC meeting and it just -- we want to work on that more.

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$ CRAVER: Through the Chair, may I respond to Gloria.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead.

MS. CRAVER: So, Gloria, one of the things that's really important to know is that when I put this proposal together working with OSM, I did lengthy interviews with both the individual and his parents and so just like when we determine a C&T for a community, we do the same -- we put the same criteria into an individual C&T. So basically the applicant answered, through these interviews, all eight factors that go into like the community. So we're looking at long-term pattern of use, we're looking at methods and means, and so all the eight factors go into that application. So the basically the individual is tied to their family and their patterned use over time.

MS. STICKWAN: When that question was asked the answer was no, and I think that's what -- it wasn't explained like that to us until -- we didn't understand that or something because that's what we got hung up on.

MS. CRAVER: Yeah, the application process is really, you know, quite lengthy. I mean we're interviewing as family members as we can basically and trying to get as much information about their history of use in the Park and looking at sort of the extended family uses. So it's not just the individual applicant, it's looking at their use in terms of their extended family and multi-generational.

MS. STICKWAN: Any way to put that in

 there?

MS. CRAVER: I think what we need to do is go back and add that and make it more explicit in the SOP.

MS. STICKWAN: I think so.

MS. CRAVER: Because that's.....

MS. STICKWAN: I mean because individual, one person, were a household, their family could have hunted in the Park but -- you know what I'm saying, it would make it more -- rather than -- individual -- individual and their household -- and/or household members.

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$ CRAVER: Yeah, I think that we can make it more explicit in the SOP.

 MS. STICKWAN: And I would like to see a recommendation different to the SRCs on the recommendation from the Superintendent, or the coordinator -- I mean the Regional Director -- that Regional Director give deference to the SRC when they make recommendations on individual C&Ts, similar to what the SRAC does, the Federal Subsistence Board gives deference to the RACs and I'd like to see that added in there.

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MS.}}$ CRAVER: Okay, that seems to be reasonable.

MS. STICKWAN: And the SRACs are going to be taking -- Regional Advisory Councils are going to be taken out of it and I just want to make sure you guys bring it to our attention that at least we'll know who's got individual C&Ts as a RAC member.

MS. CRAVER: Yeah, that seems reasonable, and I think that could just be as part of our Park updates to the RAC.

MS. STICKWAN: Mr. Chair.

MS. CELLARIUS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, the Chair's here, go ahead.

 MS. CELLARIUS: This is Barbara, and it is actually part of the process that is in the SOP, that once an individual C&T determination was made, the affected RACs in the relevant areas would be notified. That is already part of the process.

 $\mbox{ CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Barbara,} \\ \mbox{state that one more time please.}$

 ${\tt MS.}$ CELLARIUS: So part of the process described in the SOP.....

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Uh-huh.

MS. CELLARIUS:for this proposed change would be that there would -- once a determination was made the Regional Advisory Council would be notified.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

 MS. STICKWAN: The problem I see with this is that this document that they've given to the Federal Board, as it is written, and they'll be voting on this document, and that's why the SRC wanted to postpone this, I think to work on it further and see something in writing about what I said before, they could vote on it.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. I think we're getting a wrapped around here but I need to know what I need to do for the Council because we can't make

regulations. One wants to postpone it until they get more information and the other one wants to notify when the SOPs are out, and the changes. The individual C&T is kind of a new thing to me, that seems like it could get pretty intense. I don't know how many people would apply in the Park or if they could apply for individual C&Ts elsewhere.

7 8 9

2.

3

5

6

I do see a hand up from Darrel Williams of a tribe, so, Darrel, did you have a comment to this issue?

11 12 13

14

10

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. Yes, this is Darrel Williams with Ninilchik.

15 16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

2425

26

27 28

29

30

31

32 33

34

You know, one of the things I wanted to point out was it wasn't that long ago when the Federal Subsistence Board was required to have their meetings. Sometimes we would have two fishery cycle in a year and there would always be a fish and wildlife cycle. they changed it to a two year cycle. Now, I think delegating authority to whomever could actually be a problem because if we delegate authority to the inseason manager, we've had a lot of discussions about that and a lot of problems with that, but now we're going to delegate more authority to an individual Federal land agency. A better question that's going to come up is BIA going to agree with the actions of Parks, or is U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service going to agree with the actions of the Parks. I'm wondering if it may be better to tell the Federal Subsistence Board that maybe they need to start meeting more often and addressing these issues other than getting rid of the Federal system one piece of authority at a time.

35 36 37

I just thought that was an interesting comment and I wanted to introduce that.

38 39 40

Thank you very much.

41 42

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thanks. Okay, thank you.

43 44 45

MS. LINNELL: Mr. Chair.

46 47

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead.

48 49

MS. LINNELL: This is Karen Linnell

with Ahtna InterTribal Resource Commission.

2

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Karen.

4 5 6

MS. LINNELL: We also spoke up at the Wrangell-St. Elias SRC. One of the things that we were concerned about, too, is the loss of public process.....

8 9 10

7

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Right.

11 12

13

14

MS. LINNELL:when it goes through this delegation of authority. There's no way for the rest of the community members to have any input into whether there is an individual C&T or not.

15 16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23

2425

26

27 28

29

30

31

And I agree with Darrel, that we're diluting the process by delegating away the authorities of the Federal Subsistence Board. I don't see that it's going to save any work. The OSM Staff is still going to have to do all this research and everything else, it's just -- and, you know, bypassing the RAC system. I still don't understand why it's only happening every If there's an individual C&T they should be two years. able to bring it up at any time and, you know, I see room for abuse when you have temporary folks that travel through, much like Agency Staff or whomever, who move into a community for a job and then they get C&T because they live there but when they move away that they'll be eligible to continue to hunt in that because they get stationed at another Refuge or another Park, to me, I don't think that's correct either.

32 33 34

35 36

37

38

39 40

41

Unlike those folks that have been around since prior to ANILCA's formation, and those family ties prior to ANILCA, those individuals should have that long-term, it's generational but a temporary Staff person who gets an assignment at Wrangell-St. Elias and then moves to Yukon-Charley should not be able to continue to have individual C&T to come back and hunt in Wrangell-St. Elias. That's one of the things that I saw in this that I didn't agree with.

46

47

And, you know, it sounds like a simplification process, but to me it's -- there's more behind it and I would hope that you folks look into it a little more and look at all the possibilities that could happen with this delegation of authority.

I think that the Wrangell-St. Elias SRC was right in asking for delay so that we could delve into it further. But I agree with Mr. Williams, I think that there's too much delegation of authority happening in these instances.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Karen, very good, very good thoughts thank you.

8 9 10

1

2

3 4

5 6 7

Any other comments.

11 12

MS. CRAVER: Through the Chair, may I just respond to Karen.

13 14 15

16

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, you may. We're kind of going to have to make a decision before too long so we can move on.

17 18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27 28

29

30

31

32

MS. CRAVER: I just think it's really important to emphasize that two of the eight factors that go into determining an individual C&T, like the first one is a long-term consistent pattern of use, excluding interruption by circumstances beyond the user's control such as regulatory prohibition, and then the second one is a pattern of use which includes the handing down of knowledge of fishing and hunting skills, values and lore from generation to generation. So the example you were giving, Karen, about somebody temporarily living in the community and then moving, they wouldn't -- based on those two factors alone, they wouldn't be qualified for an individual -- to be even considered for an individual C&T. The emphasis is long-term pattern of use.

33 34 35

> 36 37

38

39 40

41

42

And the example here, with the two individual C&Ts that we're trying to get at Denali, it's basically a family that's lived in Cantwell for three generations and because their sons can't get work in Cantwell they have to work at the mine in Healy, so they live in Healy, but they still hunt with their family on their traditional hunting grounds. So even though they live in Healy they're still totally connected to the family in Cantwell.

43 44 45

46

47

48

MS. LINNELL: So to respond to that. We recently gave Dry Creek a C&T use borrowing a fishwheel from say a community down there in Kenny Lake for less than 20 years. Dry Creek was not even in existence prior to ANILCA and they got C&T. 20 years

Page 259 is nothing when you're looking at the history of these Parks and the formation of and that long-term use, so 2. that is not defined anywhere. And that, to me, is also 3 4 an issue. 5 6 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Well. 7 yeah, that's a lot of thinking for us here. So Amy how soon are you going to need this decision? 8 9 MS. STICKWAN: Mr. Chair, may I speak? 10 11 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, who's this, 12 Gloria? 13 14 15 MS. STICKWAN: Gloria. 16 17 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Gloria. 18 19 MS. STICKWAN: Yes, that's why I asked to put this in our letter, if it was okay with 20 everybody, we wanted to postpone this until we had more 21 22 discussion. This is what the Federal Board will be voting on that's in writing right now, we want to have 23 the ability to change it as an SRC, Wrangell-St. Elias 2.4 25 SRC, before so we're asking to postpone it, and that's why I asked this SRAC if they would do the same thing. 26 27 28 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, I see, Gloria. 29 30 MS. STICKWAN: There's no rush for C&T 31 because there's only like four done so far in our Park 32 33 and there's hardly any individual C&T's done so there is really no rush to get this done. 34 35 36 37 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. 38 Through the Chair, may I 39 MS. CRAVER: 40 respond? 41 42 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: You may respond. 43 44 MS. CRAVER: This is actually very urgent for the hunter that wants this individual C&T. 45 He was very disappointed that at the last -- I think it 46 was the last time the Federal Board met last year he 47 48 was denied. He was denied again this past hunting season. All he wants to do is go hunting with his 49

extended family and he can't legally hunt a moose. He can go with them but it's very urgent to the individual subsistence user. It may not be urgent to other people but it is to this individual. And it's become -- it's very frustrating to not be able to respond to subsistence user's request, to just hunt with -- you know, to continue their tradition with their extended family.

2.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, we understand that Amy, very much so, it's a sad situation. But, you know, the process does have to be followed that everyone's satisfied that we're not doing something that we haven't kind of vetted out. So I'm just trying to figure out exactly, you know, our responsibility at this point.

MS. CELLARIUS: Mr. Chair, this is Barbara. Could I provide some information.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, Barbara, could you help me out.

 MS. CELLARIUS: So a couple things, so the subsistence -- so -- and there might be a table up on the screen for people who are on teams, if you have access to teams you might look at the screen. So if you look at the Advisory Committee review line, there will be public -- so the Subsistence Resource Commission meetings are public meetings under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, similar to the Regional Advisory Council meetings, so there is an opportunity for people living in the communities most closely tied to the National Park or National Monument where the individual C&T would be valid, these are just valid in the National Park Service managed areas. So there is a public comment opportunity.

And then in terms of the timeline, this is going to be -- it's my understanding that the next Federal Subsistence Board meeting it will be the fisheries regulatory meeting in January is when this is going to be on their agenda, you know, and with regulatory proposals it's very common for the RAC to recommend modifications. So, you know, that might be something that the RAC consider.

And that's it.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Someone want to recommend a modification and if not I think we're hung up here so I'm not sure where to go. But any comments from the Council members.

2.

MS. STICKWAN: I just want to say that I stick to my comments, I'd like for our SRC go back and be able to vett it out and they may have a good outcome if we are able to do that. And C&T, the overall process should be looked into and our comments should be able to be put in there and I just want the SRCs put in there.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I understand that Gloria. I think we're kind of at an impasse here. The only thing I can see is if we take no action at this time because we have to get the SRC to fully vett it and get their input.

Anyone on the Council got a suggestion as to how to handle this.

MR. OPHEIM: Mr. Chair, this is

24 Michael.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead,

Michael.

MR. OPHEIM: I don't have a suggestion on how to fix this but I'm just going to drop (ph) from the whole thing, I'm not understanding it really well I guess. So, yeah, I wouldn't have a problem taking no action or anything like that unless somebody can somehow hit me on the head with a magic wand to help me understand it better.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, I'm kind of in the same position. I do understand the urgency of the individual, that's paramount, but the problem is that the SRC needs to have its say on it and there's other input on there in rewriting and modification and so on and so forth and so I'm not sure we're ready to do any of that and I think we have to -- you know, Gloria had asked earlier to put it on hold and so it's up to the Council. I mean we're absolutely stumped and I feel we're probably going to take no action, I mean it's up to you guys, you go ahead, if you want a motion on it, if not we're going to....

Page 262 MS. STICKWAN: Mr. Chair. 1 2 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:just move on 3 4 and wait until we.... 5 6 MS. STICKWAN: Mr. Chair. 7 8 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:get more 9 clarity. 10 MS. STICKWAN: Mr. Chair. I make a 11 motion that we recommend to the Federal Board that they 12 postpone it until it could be vetted out by the SRC. 13 14 15 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Is there a 16 second to Gloria's motion. 17 MR. WHISSEL: I'll second it. This is 18 19 John Whissel. 20 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, John. 21 22 Thank you, John. 23 Any other discussion. 24 25 26 MR. WHISSEL: I have something I might want to discuss. Is there a way for us to postpone --27 I mean obviously the situation is that we -- we're 28 trying to be very careful because we're establishing a 29 precedent and this is how we're going to treat 30 everybody and we don't want to rush that decision 31 because there's an individual that's being held up in 32 bureaucratic framework that he doesn't have any control 33 over, is there a way for us to do what we're doing and 34 somewhere in the manner in which we -- the manner in 35 which we delay this response, somehow indicate to the 36 37 Federal Subsistence Board to get this person processed and done on an individual level while we work out how 38 we're going to apply this. 39 40 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, I'm not 41 sure if we could do that, John, because that might take 42 away from the SRCs thing, but I think if we recommend 43 44 postpone it at the Federal Board because we're not ready to take action until the SRC does and it comes 45 back to us, I think that's the best we can do. We 46 can't tell them, no, take action -- or postpone it, and 47 then on the other hand tell them, no, hurry up and 48

49 50 process the guy. I think you're kind of caught between

Page 263 a rock and a hard spot. 2. MR. WHISSEL: I have nothing but 3 4 sympathy for this guy, it breaks my heart not to be able to help get them some resolution to an ongoing 5 issue but I just don't feel like it's responsible for 6 7 us to push forward on this. 8 MS. STICKWAN: If he has usage of the 9 10 Park he can apply for a permit 1344 and be able to hunt in the Park. 11 12 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: There you go. 13 14 15 MS. CELLARIUS: Mr. Chair, could I respond to Gloria's comment? 16 17 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead. 18 19 MS. CELLARIUS: So having a 1344 permit 20 provides the same eligibility to hunt in a National 21 22 Park as living in a Park Service resident zone, however, it does not substitute for a customary and 23 traditional use determination from the Federal Board. 24 25 So if his community, Healy, does not have C&T for moose in Unit 13, he would still need the individual C&T. 26 it is not a solution for the individual in question. 27 28 Thank you, Mr. Chair. 29 30 31 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. We got a motion and we got a second on it and we're under 32 33 discussion. Any other discussion on the motion to 34 request the Federal Board to postpone. 35 36 (No comments) 37 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hearing none, all 38 in favor aye. 39 40 41 IN UNISON: Aye. 42 43 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any opposed. 44 (No opposing votes) 45 46 47 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Unfortunately we're going to have to see how that rides 48 out. I'm assuming we're running a little late on 49 50

lunch, you guys want to take lunch, we have a lot of agency reports and I estimate, you know, if you give them each 15 minutes it'll be a couple hours, or it could be as little as an hour, but you want to take a break for lunch and come back in an hour.

5 6 7

1

2.

3

MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, this is DeAnna.

8

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, DeAnna.

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27 28

MS. PERRY: Sorry, before we break for lunch I just wanted to revisit the nonrural determination process. I just sent out the analysis to everyone so they would have it handy in their email. It looks like we need to revisit that to provide the Board with a further justification. I know that we have discussed this at length at past meetings and we've discussed some of that here, but the Board is looking to have specific responses or recommendations on the rural characteristics from the Council and so to make this easy, I don't know if the Council would like to look at OSM's recommendation on the last page and the justification that accompanies that and if they want to adopt that justification except for the references to the other communities. I'm comfortable in the testimony that we've heard and the Council discussions in the past, I believe, have highlighted all of those items there in the justification. I think that's where they came from.

29 30 31

32 33 But I believe we need to give a further justification at this meeting because the Board will be taking this up in January and they're going to heavily rely on the Council's input.

343536

37

38

So anyway I sent that out, something to mull over over lunch, perhaps and then, Mr. Chair, if you would like to revisit that I think it would make our record clearer.

39 40 41

Thank you.

42 43

And I apologize.

44 45 46

47

48

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I want you to know that I fully plan to revisit it after lunch or later but you didn't need to go into it now. But anyway we will take that up later. I'm trying to get the opinion of the Board, do you guys want to eat lunch

```
2
```

```
Page 265
     or do you want to skip lunch or do you want to go shoot
     a moose in the Park or what.
 2.
 3
 4
                     (Laughter)
 5
 6
                     MR. WHISSEL: Go eat lunch after we get
 7
     the moose in the Park.
 8
                     MR. OPHEIM: Yes.
 9
10
                     MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes.
11
12
                     (Laughter)
13
14
15
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.
16
17
                     (Laughter)
18
19
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, let's take
20
     one hour for lunch and let's get back here at 1:30.
     First thing when we get back let's take up the
21
22
     justification and I think that we have plenty of
     justification it's just a matter of spelling it out.
23
     We got to see if we can get some help from our people
24
25
     to help on these justifications. I mean if they expect
26
     a volunteer Board to write all this stuff up, this is
     pretty ridiculous. But anyway you guys enjoy a great
27
     lunch and we'll get through it today.
28
29
30
                     Agency reports, you guys standby
     because we're not going to cut you off, you get 15
31
     minutes each after lunch.
32
33
                     (Off record)
34
35
                      (On record)
36
37
                     MS. PERRY: Let me check with the
38
     Council members and make sure everyone was able to
39
40
     reconnect.
41
                     So when I call your name if you can let
42
     me know you're on line that would be great.
43
44
                     Dennis Zadra.
45
46
47
                     MR. ZADRA: Yes, I'm here.
48
                     MS. PERRY:
49
                                 Thank you, Dennis.
50
```

Page 266
1 Michael Opheim, I see that you're on 2 teams and on line. 3
4 MR. OPHEIM: Yep. 5
6 MS. PERRY: Okay.
8 Andy McLaughlin. 9
10 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yep, here.
12 MS. PERRY: Thank you.
13 14 Aaron Bloomquist. 15
16 MR. BLOOMQUIST: Yes, we're here. 17
18 MS. PERRY: Thanks, Aaron.
19 20 John Whissel.
21 22 (No comments)
23 24 MS. PERRY: John are you back with us.
25 26 (No comments)
27 28 MS. PERRY: Okay.
29 30 Ed Holsten.
31 32 MR. HOLSTEN: Yes, I'm here. 33
MS. PERRY: Thank you.
35 36 Diane Selanoff.
37 38 MS. SELANOFF: Here, thank you.
39 40 MS. PERRY: Thank you.
41 42 Gloria Stickwan.
43 44 MS. STICKWAN: Here.
45 46 MS. PERRY: Thank you.
47 48 John Whissel, were you able to join us. 49 50

(No comments)

MS. PERRY: Okay. And Greg Encelewski.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I am here, it's a good thing, I just stepped in, go.

MS. PERRY: Okay, Greg, I just wanted to let you know that eight of your nine seated Council members are on line and you still have a quorum.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, that's good. I went from 40 people this morning to 27 now so anyway we still have a pretty good group. There we go, 28, okay.

All right, before we go into agency reports, we're back in session and we got most of the Council here, I think one should come in any minute, we do want to go back and we want to look at Moose Pass nonrural determination. We don't want to do anything other than solidify our justification. I usually go through the reasons for justifications.

Was it consistent with established fish and wildlife management principles, which I think it was.

Is the recommendation supported by substantial evidence such as biological and traditional knowledge. And that was very clear in the report from Robbin and others and our time there in interacting with the people.

Also will the recommendation be beneficial to determine the subsistence needs of users, yes for sure.

If this is a closure, are necessary conservation -- and that -- we're not -- we don't need to address that.

Discuss whatever relevant factors are mentioned in the OSM analysis. Well, one of the factors that I will mention and then we could ask the Council members to add anything to it, I think we could use our justification from the OSM report that we

agreed on and our last meetings when we went through this. Also that we toured it physically, it's rural, outlook and the outlay and the biology and we also — from all the testimony from Jeffrey and others, so we have quite a record as far as I'm concerned for the justification. But OSM is, you know, they got to prepare this and give it to the Federal Board and all those Federal people, you know how they are, so, you know, none of us are lawyers unless some of you is that I don't know about on the Council, but we do have to justify our proposal.

11 12 13

14

10

2.

3

5

6 7

8

9

So just opening it up, if you got anything you want to add for justification specifically let me know and let's put that on record.

15 16 17

18 19

20

21 22

23

2425

26

27 28

29

30

31

32 33

34

MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair, this is DeAnna. I just wanted to bring folks attention to Page 7 of the nonrural determination analysis that we saw earlier and I do have that on the screen. I think what the Board is looking for is specific comments on the rural characteristics and so that's where, I quess, they're looking for more to build their record. The specific rural characteristics. And those would be on Page 7 about the middle of the page where it says: the Board will make or rescind nonrural determinations, the factors are population size and density, economic indicators, military presence, industrial facilities, use of fish and wildlife, degree of remoteness and isolation, any other relevant material including information provided by the public. Again, as Greg said, we have discussed this at past meetings but this will be the last time that this Council can offer any recommendations to the Board before the Board takes this proposal up in January.

35 36 37

38

39 40

41

42

43

And this is the first time we're going through this new proposal process, so I thank you all for your patience as we do this, this will, you know, be very handily for RACs on down the line that might also be entertaining nonrural determination proposals so it is pretty important and I thank the Council for revisiting this so that we can build a really good record.

44 45 46

47

48

So, again, if there are any comments on those particular rural characteristics, or as Greg mentioned if you want to look at the OSM justification at the end of the analysis, they kind of give a good

example of how they address those.

1 2 3

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair, this

is....

4 5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: You know I don't want to spend a lot of time because I think we've done a very good job on the justification, OSM may not think so but, you know, we could take a picture of the place, it's very rural, all those comments I recall, one of the first comments was, yeah, after they drove out there and got to see it and we had our meeting in Seward, I mean there was no question it was a rural area. And it does get into a (indiscernible) and changes with the other communities, Primrose and Crown Point, but Moose Pass was definitely rural, I don't think anyone had any question of that. I didn't see no airfields or airports in there, I didn't see no military locations, I didn't see very much population and density, very, very sparsely. Economic indicators, it looks like they could need some help. With fish and wildlife, I didn't see many animals running around there so they probably need some. And so I'll shut up and I'll let the rest of the Council add to that.

242526

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, Andy here.

27 28

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead,

Andy.

29 30 31

32 33

34

35

36 37 MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chair. Yeah, it must have been six years ago or something, geez, I don't remember anymore but before it went to this nonrural determination we had this completely other way we were looking at it, you know, what is rural itself and all these defining factors, we went through school and military bases and all sorts of topics, that stuff could be accessed if you're looking for information.

39 40 41

42

43 44

45

46

47

38

But as for use of fish and wildlife, I would just suggest, you know, cultural practices when people are utilizing these resources they're sharing the resources, they rely on those wild resources for sustenance, but not just food, you know, firewood, gathering of things, cultural things, including art work, whatever, with the antler, you know, I mean it's not always just food.

 Page 270

So anyhow there's my input.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, that's good input, all those add to our justification so we could certainly type that in there too DeAnna.

Anyone else got anything specific we want to state for the justification of our vote as a rural area.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, if not, DeAnna, and OSM, I'm sorry but that's as good as it gets from us so hopefully you got enough and if you need more I would think you're going to have to go back to the records and pull it out. But appreciate you bringing the point to me that we got to go through those justifications so very good.

MS. PERRY: Thanks everyone.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you. Okay, agency reports. We got a time limit on here of 15 minutes. If you've got to be a little longer we'll allow, if someone else gives you some of their minutes, if not, you got a problem. But anyway I'm kind of kidding. But we'll go through here, we always kind of put them at the end we don't want to cut anyone short, we don't have but one other action item at the end, is our meeting dates and locations that we got to make sure we take up.

We're going to start off with the tribal governments and the first one up is Ninilchik Traditional Council. Darrel, are you on the line.

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am. Would you like me to just go ahead?

 $\label{eq:CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: You could go} \\ \text{right ahead.}$

MR. WILLIAMS: All right. Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. My name is Darrel Williams with Ninilchik Traditional Council. And I am going to provide the subsistence fishery report for 2020 and give you guys an idea of how things went.

Computer Matrix, LLC 135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Phone: 907-243-0668 Fax: 907-243-1473 1

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

Page 271

So I'll start with managing permits, I think that's probably the best place to start. Usually I like do PowerPoints and stuff but it's a little harder on the phone. But the permit management was really done the same way as we've done in the past. would have a central location for rural residents to be able to sign up. The rural residents would go to the local U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service office to receive their Federal permit and then they would bring them to us if they wanted us to fish the permit for them using the gillnet fishery. And we had sign up sheets there where people could actually sign up. And it was interesting this year because then Covid happened. there's social distancing, those kind of issues that came with that so we ended up using drop boxes where people could drop their permits off in a drop box and be able to address that issue in that way. The interesting part of the permitting this year was the permit structure changed, there was an administrative change, so we ended up with people being issued subsistence fishery permits for Cook Inlet area essentially instead of having one permit for the Kenai and one permit for the Kasilof River, it was just one permit for the user. And it answered some of the different problems we had.

252627

28

29

30

31

32

When you have household limits, and let's say that somebody gets so many fish off of one river, do they -- you know, how many more fish did they get off the other river, having one permit actually simplified that problem to be able to manage harvest so we didn't overharvest when we're fishing for somebody else.

33 34 35

36

37

38

39 40 It's interesting, in 2016, when we got started on this we had 29 permits, and in 2020 we had 133 permits and they're all based off of those household limits, the size of the household, whether it's the individual or an individual with multiple family members determines the number of fish that they're eligible for.

41 42 43

44

45

46

47

48

We were not required to get designated fisher permits this year, that's a change. But I will say we still tracked everything the same way and we still reported every day. Actually just going through that system helped us make sure that we were being responsible and communicating the information effectively to everyone.

The conditions at the site have been roughly static. There's no new changes, there have been no erosion, no degradation of the area associated with use and that's a real positive thing.

The amount of fishing that we would do on a daily basis hasn't really changed. The Kasilof is pretty static in terms of how much time we actually spend fishing the river. The Kenai River is a little different. We tried to time for the run better this year so we'd spend actually less time with the gear in the water and target sockeye, which is the targeted species for this fishery.

In both rivers, the gear was set using sandbags and that way we could actually set the gear, it would be stationary and we could remove the gear in its entirety when we were done for the season. The nets were fished with people with the net whenever the fish was in the water, the nets were never left unattended. We still do the 30 minute pull times. On the Kasilof River we actually remove the net from the water ever 30 minutes. And in the Kenai River we actually walk the net and we actually pick fish out of the net, like constantly until we're done fishing and then we remove the net from the water.

We really caught the same variety of fish that we usually catch. Like, you know, I like to think of this as a random sample in the river. Putting a net out and catching and see what comes up. We still have a few fish that we caught with some deformities, you know, I still lean towards electrofishing injuries, but there are some diseases that can cause that in fish too which may be something that's notable and that could be one of those things that they can look at in terms of a fisheries management plan. Just to throw that out there.

It's also interesting, we've noticed a lot of lamprey in the Kasilof River too, when you talk about lamprey predation, that came up earlier during the meeting, just to throw that in there.

For the Kasilof River, we fished the Kasilof River for a total of 20 days. And so the way it works is the sockeye move into Cook Inlet and they go to the Kasilof River first, then they go to the Kenai River second, so we try to focus our efforts on

the river that has the fish in it. So we started in the Kasilof and then we moved to the Kenai River, following the fish essentially. And in the 20 days we caught 621 sockeye. And we fished from the 16th of June to the 14th of July. So we only had -- or let's see, we had five fish that we didn't actually harvest, so we actually caught 626 and we let five of them go, or sometimes when you're working with the fish in the net and the water, sometimes they just get away so that happens. We used large mesh size and sometimes they do get away. So the actual release wasn't significant.

11 12 13

14 15

16

2.

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

On the Kasilof River in 2020 we had no incidental harvest so generally it seems like we'll pick up one king salmon every year that tends to wander its way into the net, this year we didn't, and that was really good.

17 18 19

20

21 22 So the harvest effort itself ended up being tracked at 75 hours of net time in the water, and that boils down to about eight fish per hour, when we're actually catching fish to get an idea of the impact the fishery has.

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

The Kenai River is a little different, of course. And we tried to watch the run timing when the numbers would come up significantly in the Kenai River that's when we wanted to go fish. And it was interesting this year because the run was a little late. We've seen that before, I mean generally we're talking about July 25th is the peak of the run and now we're seeing it more towards the end of the month and even into August. So we started fishing the Kenai River on the 19th of July and we stopped fishing on the 7th of August. So it ended up being a total of 17 days of actual fishing time. In the 17 days we caught 3,163 fish. We actually were able to retain all the fish we caught. It was kind of funny because the Kasilof River is a slower river and we fumbled a few more fish than that, we were pretty -- we're getting accustomed to handling that net better in the Kenai River. caught 18 coho and we caught one Dolly Varden and it was recorded and submitted. And so the harvest effort on the Kenai River is substantially more, of course. We ended up fishing for 102 hours and that boils down to about 37 fish per hour that we were actually harvesting. Some days were slower, some days were faster on that river and we really tried to work with the run timing to be able to utilize the gear most

effectively in the water and, you know, target our target species and not have a lot of incidental bycatch and that seemed to work out pretty good.

2.

And on August 7th we had filled all 133 permits and we removed the gear from the water. So we were actually able to finish early. You know it's interesting, we spent 20 days on the Kasilof and we catch 600 fish and we spent 17 days on the Kenai and you catch 3,000 fish so there's a significant difference in those two fisheries.

I think that we're getting better at targeting the run and being able to have the gear in the water for less time to be able to meet the subsistence harvest needs and we were able, again, this year to fill everybody's permit and complete the fishery early.

And that's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Very good,
Darrel. Thanks. Very detailed and I would just add,
being from Ninilchik and the Chairman of the Council,
it was very successful not only in being able to catch
the fish but to the community, we do all rural
residents and I'll tell you there's a lot of elders and
a lot of people here that are so thankful and so
appreciative. It's really been a blessing to the
community and it really works well for those that
especially are kind of handicapped, can't get out and
move around, so it's really good. I got some awesome
fish put up but I can't show it to you guys because
we're talking on these Covid phones.

But, anyway, thank you, Darrel, very

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Next, I got Native Village of Eyak. Matt.

MS. LINNELL: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah.

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$ LINNELL: This is Karen Linnell. I have to step out here in a few minutes and I was

 good.

ahead.

Page 275

wondering if I might be able to go first if that's okay with Matt.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: If it's okay with Matt, it's certainly okay with me.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ PICHE: Absolutely fine, this is Matt. No problem.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Karen, go

MS. LINNELL: I appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: No problem.

MS. LINNELL: I apologize. This is Karen Linnell with the Ahtna InterTribal Resource Commission, I'm the Executive Director here.

I just wanted to let you know about our Staffing. Currently we have two wildlife biologists, a fish biologist and an anthropologist on Staff along with a regulatory specialist that we are training to -- alongside with Gloria Stickwan, to learn the process a little more and to take over my position at some in the future.

We have a Partners in Fisheries
Management project grant and that grant will end in
December. We held that SEARC Conference in 2018. We
have built partnerships and we've conducted several
interviews as far as trying to figure -- find out what
the rural users here see as their role in participation
in management decisions and that report will be done
following December when the grant ends.

We have a migratory birds program grant with Fish and Wildlife Service. This last year they adopted a proposal to allow AITRC to issue invitation to hunt for Federally-qualified users on behalf of the tribes.

And then also we have started collecting some citizen data on moose sightings. We're just looking at, over time, that we would be able to see trends in twinning and that kind of thing, and there's a page on our website where folks can just punch in where they were at within the Ahtna

Traditional Territory, where they were at, how many cows, how many calves, how many bulls they've seen, et cetera.

3 4 5

> 6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

2.

We partnered with Ahtna Incorporated and ADF&G on our carnivore stewardship program this year, this is our third year. We just got the data from the 2019 season so we will know here shortly how many bears were in the Mentasta area. This year we expanded it to cover five locations on Ahtna lands and then the Department of Fish and Game is doing a much -- a bunch of sites on their -- on State lands. We're already planning next years season. We're really building on this partnership to get a handle and see what's out there on the land, filling those information gaps that we had said we would do.

16 17 18

19

20

21 22

23

2425

26

27 28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35 36

We also had a contract with ADF&G on their FRMP project, the otolith sampling for the Gulkana Hatchery fish and we collected samples, this is our second season collecting otolith samples from the Chitina River bridge north to Slana. And we thought that season went fairly well even with the slow year this year and folks not fishing, or not getting as many fish, we were able to collect samples not spread out like they usually do because they split the Glennallen Subdistrict into three areas. We just took samples wherever we could this year. I know up in Chistochina on the north end of the river where I'm at, for the middle of June towards the end of July I got 66 sockeye and 16 chinook. A very sad year. It used to be we could get 66 in a day. And so even one day we had four fishwheels, I checked four fishwheels and distributed it for those that had the wheels there and between the four fishwheels there were 40 fish. Like I said it was not a good year for us up on the north end of the river.

41

42

And so we're, you know, looking at that and followed that with kind of a poor hunting season where we have one community that with all the different people in that community hunting didn't get any moose or caribou yet. So that's going on.

43 44 45

46

47

48

We have some cooperative agreements with the National Park Service. One of them is to write the ethnography of the Ahtna people within the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park. And the other one is to look at traditional ecological knowledge on the snow

and ice conditions and our inability to access the Park safely during the winters now. And the other is the use of the caribou within Game Management Unit 11 within the Park boundaries.

4 5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

2425

26

27 28

29

30

31

32 33

2.

3

For an update on our ability to administer a community harvest system hunt, as you know you folks have helped to modify the framework and stuff in the last two years, three years, and the local Subsistence Advisory Committee charter; well, that charter still has not left Alaska. We were able to get our hunt approved by the Federal Subsistence Board in July. We worked on the framework, got that approved. Went through and I thought we had dotted every single I and crossed every T and were anxious and ready to start managing the community harvest hunt by issuing what we're calling a harvest report to qualified users within our eight communities and the Secretary put a halt to it because of the lawsuit between the State of Alaska and the Federal Subsistence Board. We're not sure what we're going to do with that. I think it was a -- unlike what was in the lawsuit there's every right for this hunt to have proceeded and it did not. was some advice given from within the State to the Secretary and he chose not to -- he chose to follow that advice and chose not to allow the issuance of that community harvest permit. It's very disheartening. This has been going on since November of 2016 when we signed the MOA with the Secretary's office with Deputy Secretary Conner and so we issue -- you know so we started coming to you folks in 2017 with the charter, with the framework, the request for the community harvest permit and here it is four years later and we're still not moving anywhere with that.

343536

37

38

39 40

41

42

I'd just like to say that we appreciate your support and your advice throughout this whole process and, you know, we look forward to working with you, our RAC and our representatives on future projects. So I'm not doom and gloom but we do appreciate your diligence and the ability to participate in these meetings and give you a little insight as to what's happening in our communities.

43 44 45

With that, Mr. Chair, that's all I have

46 47 48

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{Oh}}$, and like Mr. Williams, we had a lot of lamprey this year as well. Faye Ewan told me, she$

49 50 to report.

```
Page 278
     said I bet I had close to 100 within that week, so it's
     a very unusual year this year.
 2
 3
 4
                     Anyway I just wanted to say thank you
5
     again.
 6
 7
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Karen.
     Yeah, that's a lot of good report. Also it's kind of
8
     saddening to see what's going on with these fish, you
9
10
    know, and the hunt too. I mean I don't know if you got
     predator problems on the hunt side, I know there are
11
     fish problems. Okay, press on and anything we can do
12
    to help just holler and bring your proposals and we'll
13
    keep moving forward and see if we could help. I'm not
14
     sure what's going on.....
15
16
17
                     MS. LINNELL: So yesterday.....
18
19
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: ....but we're
     here to help, so thank you.
20
21
22
                     MS. LINNELL: So yesterday -- funny,
     you should talk about predators, day before yesterday I
23
     had a bear in my yard, Faye Ewan had a bear in her yard
2.4
25
     and then three, four, five other tribal members
     throughout the whole Valley, up in Chistochina and
26
     Tazlina and in Copper Center had bears in their yard.
27
28
     They're hungry too.
29
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                           Well, they're
30
     competing for the same source we do too so it makes it
31
     tough. I know years ago they changed some of the bear
32
     hunting regs down here and they helped the moose
33
     population a lot when they took some of the bears out.
34
     But anyway that's just -- sometimes those predators get
35
     a little over, you know, out of control.
36
37
                     MS. LINNELL: Well, again, thank you so
38
39
     much for allowing me to go before you and before Eyak,
40
     I appreciate it.
41
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Uh-huh.
42
43
44
                     MS. LINNELL: And I will talk to you
45
     soon>
46
47
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                           Okav.
48
                     MS. LINNELL: Take care.
49
50
```

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Karen.
Any questions for her before she runs off?

MR. BLOOMQUIST: Yeah, this is Aaron, I have one I could probably ask her in private. But I know I collected a bunch of bear hair samples for those guys this year and are they getting numbers yet on the stuff in Copper Center or Glennallen or was that actually Ahtna and not you guys doing that?

MS. LINNELL: No, no, we just are sending the samples out. We're working with ADF&G and actually are going to be sending -- we got a CITES permit so that we could get those samples into Canada for quicker processing. The ones from Mentasta we just got back and I heard a number tossed out with the help of Sue Entsminger but we had over 200 samples taken and so it'll be interesting to see how that turns out. Because the locations were Chistochina, Klutina, Tonsina and Chitina and so we're hoping to see the numbers there. And then that does not include the ones down at lower Tonsina -- or upper Tonsina, Lake Louise area and Sourdough, that was done by the Department.

MR. BLOOMQUIST: Okay, yeah, great. I knew you guys were talking about that CITES permit thing, I'm glad you were able to get that.

 $$\operatorname{\textbf{Thank}}$ you. And I'm sorry for the baby whining in the background.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Alrighty, anyone else, if not we're going to go ahead and move on.

(No comments)

 $\label{eq:CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Matt, do you want to come up now and tune in.} \\$

MS. HETRICK: Hi, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yep.

MS. HETRICK: Hi, this is Willow Hetrick again and I had messaged DeAnna about potentially presenting just real quick to the Council under the Native organizations column but I'm happy to wait until the end of agency reports.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, Willow, I got your notes and I actually penciled you in but Matt's next okay.

MS. HETRICK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead Matt.

MR. PICHE: Okay. Hello, can you hear

10 me okay?

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hear you loud and

13 clear.

MR. PICHE: Excellent. Good afternoon, this is Matt Piche. I am the Partners for Fisheries Monitoring Program biologist and natural resources coordinator for the Native Village of Eyak, Department of the Environment and Natural Resources in Cordova.

I'm here to give a brief report on the Copper River chinook salmon monitoring program results for the 2020 field season. The Baird Canyon chinook salmon tagging site located on the lower Copper River just above Miles Lake operated its research fishwheels from May 10th through July 13th. The Canyon Creek recapture site located immediately below Wood Canyon near Chitina sampled for chinook salmon from May 19th through July 23rd. The total chinook marked in Baird Canyon was 2,337, the total chinook examined for marks at Canyon Creek was 1,182, and the total marked chinook recapture was 116.

Our 2020 mark/recapture results using a (indiscernible) are as follows: Between May 10th and July 13th an estimated 26,293 chinook salmon with a standard error of 2,863 migrated through Baird Canyon measuring greater than 500 millimeters total length. Again, I will repeat the 2020 in-river abundance for Copper River chinook salmon is 26,293 fish. This is not an estimate of spawning escapement. Spawning escapement would be estimated once in-river harvest when the subsistence, personal use and sportfisheries are calculated. In-river harvest will be subtracted from the in-river abundance estimate to determine if the sustainable escapement goal of 24,000 or more chinook salmon has been met in 2020.

Just some comparisons to put the 2020

Copper River chinook salmon abundance estimate into perspective, the 2020 abundance estimate was 40 percent lower than the 2019 abundance, 28 percent lower than the long-term project average from 2003 to 2020, and 21 percent lower than the recent 10-year average abundance. The 2020 commercial catch was 67 percent lower than the 2019 catch. The 2020 Gulkana River counting tower chinook salmon passage was 77 percent lower than the 2019 count, and 41 percent lower than the long-term project average for the counting tower from 2002 to 2020.

11 12 13

14

15

16 17

18 19

20

21 22

23

2425

26

27 28

29

30

31

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

And lastly in 2019 and 2020 the Native Village of Eyak and ADF&G Division of Sportfish radiotagged a sub sample of the chinook salmon and tracked tagged fish through the entire watershed to their spawning tributaries and spawning grounds. This study will provide spawning distribution and run timing throughout the watershed. The 2019 results were similar to the 2003 and 2005 study conducted by ADF&G. The 2020 results are only preliminary so I won't share the numbers until the winter meeting but it does appear some shift in distribution may have occurred which does actually align with some observations mentioned earlier in the meeting by Council Member Bloomquist. particular, preliminary data is showing changes in the Klutina system compared to other study years. This is only preliminary data and it needs to be analyzed further and could change based on the waiting of the We will have the distribution and run timing data finalized by the winter meeting and I look forward to sharing the details of that with you then.

32 33 34

35

Thank you, Chair, and Council members for the opportunity to speak. This concludes my presentation.

36 37 38

39 40 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Matt. I'm sure we've got a few questions for you here. I'll open it up to the Council, you have questions for Matt.

41 42

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$ STICKWAN: It's Gloria. Can I get a copy of what you said?

43 44 45

MR. PICHE: I'm sorry, Gloria, can you repeat that question please.

46 47

48 MS. STICKWAN: Can I get a copy of your 49 report?

MR. PICHE: Yes.

1 2 3

MS. STICKWAN: A summary of what you just said, not an actual real lengthy report, just a summary of what you said.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ PICHE: Absolutely, I can do that for you Gloria.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: yeah, I'm sure we'd all appreciate that that's good, Matt.

MS. STICKWAN: I was curious about what he meant when he said that he heard things during this meeting that appears to be -- that his research will probably be the same as what was said during the meeting, so I was wondering what he meant by that.

MR. PICHE: So I want to speak for Council Member Bloomquist, but I believe in his introduction he was saying that it seems like there was a decent return of chinook salmon in the Klutina and I believe he -- he spends quite a bit of time there, so that just kind of correlates with some of the data that we've seen even though it's a low year for in-river abundance we actually saw a larger proportion of fish migrate up that river, however it's just preliminary data we need to weigh our (indiscernible) strata so it's not finalized yet so that's why I have no numbers for you of the proportion of the chinook actually going up the Klutina at this time.

 MR. BLOOMQUIST: Yeah, this is Aaron. And I think you have me pretty much pegged there, the Klutina and the Tonsina both seem like they have, at least normal numbers if not slightly better than the normal that we've had over the last 10 years.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, that's a good report if you compare it to all the other percentages down so low on everything.

Any other questions for Matt.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you, Matt. Willow, at this time I'll let you go ahead and talk, I got you down as a Native organization.

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

Page 283

MS. HETRICK: Yes, hi, good afternoon, Mr. Chair, Members of the Council. My name is Willow Hetrick for the record and I spoke earlier today on a personal issue, about the Moose Pass proposal. I'm here in a professional context. I'm the Executive Director of the Chugach Regional Resources Commission. We are the InterTribal Consortium in the Chugach region serving seven tribes, Port Graham, Nanwalek, Chenega, Tatitlek, Eyak and Valdez. Our focus is on preserving natural resources in the region for tribal members, which as you can imagine allows us to do many different things and subsistence resource management is one of those.

13 14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

2425

26

27 28

29

30

31

32 33

34

35

Of the tribes that we serve, Port Graham, Nanwalek, Chenega, Tatitlek, and Eyak are part of the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council Committee. I just wanted to inform the Council and anyone else who's listening today that on June 16th the Bureau of Indian Affairs provided a request for proposal titled the Alaska InterTribal Subsistence Cooperative Management Program and we are thrilled to announce that we are one of the recipients of that Bureau of Indian Affairs funding. What we are doing with these grant funds is developing an InterTribal Federal subsistence cooperative management alliance in Southcentral Alaska and this alliance will assist our tribes with navigating the complex Federal Subsistence Board regulatory process through trainings and technical assistance. Some of the specific grant objectives that we have are to hire an InterTribal liaison to carry out program and grant objectives, which has already been completed. We're really excited, we have a tribal member from the Valdez Native tribe, she is working for us full-time as of October 1st.

36 37 38

39 40

41

The second grant objective is to develop a formal InterTribal Federal Subsistence Cooperative Alliance, which was completed at our board meeting last Friday and our board is volunteering to be the alliance for us, which is really great.

46

47

48

The third objective, develop at least two cooperative management agreements, memorandas of action or other types of agreements with government entities in Southcentral Alaska, and we're looking forward to getting these under way ASAP as we only have one year to complete these tasks.

2.

Page 284

Some other things that we'll be doing we'll be attending Federal Subsistence Board and also Southcentral RAC meetings and we're going to be holding monthly alliance teleconference check-ins with our board members. We're also really excited to be working with the UAF tribal management program to plan an online course titled an introduction to the Federal Subsistence Board to provide training to our alliance and any other tribal members that are interested to learn about how to navigate this process.

And lastly we'll be updating our website to reflect all of the above work. So we'll be looking forward to hearing from all of you more often, starting to build a better relationship with this Council and the Federal Subsistence Board. You can contact myself, my email is my first name, Willow at C, as in Charlie, RRC, Alaska, all spelled out dot org, and also our InterTribal liaison that just started last week, her name's Hope Roberts, and her email is Hope@CRRCalaska.org.

So I didn't want to take up any more of your time, I just wanted the Council to know that we received that funding and we're really looking forward to working with you all.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you, Willow. Thanks for keeping us informed of what's going on, you got a lot of stuff going there.

All right.

Next we got special action report here,

MS. STICKWAN: I have a question.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Gloria, go ahead.

MS. STICKWAN: I was wondering if we could get the email address from the coordinator.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, DeAnna, would you send us that email address.

 ${\tt MS.}$ PERRY: For the two ladies who just

I guess Lisa.

```
Page 285
     gave their email addresses?
 2.
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yes.
 3
 4
5
                     MS. PERRY: Can do.
 6
 7
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you.
8
                     MS. MAAS: Okay. Hi, Mr. Chair and
9
10
     Council. This is Lisa Maas, the acting policy
     coordinator and wildlife biologist with OSM. And I
11
     don't really have a report on the special action
12
     requests, they're all summarized on Page 239 of your
13
     meeting materials. I'm mostly just available if you
14
     guys have any questions about any of these special
15
16
     actions since there were quite a few this past year
17
     that affected the Southcentral region. So, again, the
     summary of all these requests -- that includes the
18
     request and then the Board action justification is on
19
     Page 239 of your meeting materials and I'm just
20
     available if you have any questions about these. If
21
22
     not, feel free to move on.
23
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.
                                                  Yeah,
24
25
     they're definitely here in writing what was approved,
     what their action was, they came out in our packet and
26
     so I'm sure the Council's got to see them.
27
28
                     Is there any questions at this time
29
     that you would like to address to Lisa.
30
31
                     (No comments)
32
33
34
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Anyone on the
     Council.
35
36
37
                     (No comments)
38
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, well, thank
39
40
     you for that update and we'll take another look at
     those but appreciate it.
41
42
43
                     MS. MAAS: All right, thank you.
44
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you.
45
46
47
                     Todd Eskelin, you're up next and Todd
     got a moose, I know that. I don't know if it was legal
48
     or not but I know he got a moose.
49
50
```

MR. ESKELIN: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the RAC. For the record my name is Todd Eskelin, wildlife biologist at Kenai National Wildlife Refuge.

As it was for everybody this year, Covid, very big and new challenges for us and specifically at the Refuges, we were, I guess, basically teleworking from early March or mid-March on. So our first real success story was that we were able to find a way to issue subsistence permits remotely and get them signed and returned and seemed to have very few complaints about the process while still, you know, satisfying the legal mandates that were put in front of us for getting signatures and protecting people's personal information and such. So just a big thanks to OSM for working diligently with us to find a system that works for everybody and we were still able to serve the subsistence user. Hopefully you haven't heard any complaints about that process.

You know the summer was also -- we were very delayed in the publication to the Federal Register but not very delayed, our implementation of the new drawing hunts that the Subsistence Board had approved really put us behind the Eight Ball so I was pretty proud that we managed to pull off the drawing for five new drawing hunts in GMU15 this year including one drawing hunt for sheep, two for goats and two for caribou. It required a lot of coordination with ADF&G and the Forest Service. Have to, you know, give big thanks to both the people from those agencies, for working hard to find opportunities in a new system that was really already in place and, you know, fit us in there.

So sticking with permit side of things, with our remote system now we have issued 80 FM1505 subsistence moose hunting permits so far this year. Likely we'll continue to go up a little bit as people who didn't harvest a moose during the State or early hunt season are starting to call me -- and maybe folks hadn't put in for a permit before but now they're looking for their last shot opportunity there so we're getting a few more requests now. But 80 permits is only slightly down from our average of about 90 that we issued over the past three years so I kind of think we'll be right on average with the number of permits issued.

29

30 31

32 33

34

35 36

37

38

39 40 41

42 43 44

45

46 47

48 49 50 Page 287

Moving on to harvest. The drawing 1 hunts were I quess relatively successful. We had one 2 sheep and one mountain goat harvested out of the new 3 4 permitted hunts that we issued. And on the moose hunting, I have a big star by it because we really had 5 unbelievably low moose harvest numbers this year 6 7 relative to the last 10 years. And so as of today, or the completion of the early season we had one cow and 8 one legal bull reported. And then we also had two 9 10 sublegal bulls turned in. And I don't really have direct information that I could provide you with why 11 those numbers were so low. I believe that 15C moose 12 numbers continue to be really high and people are 13 finding moose on State and Native land before they have 14 to go all the way back to the Refuge boundary and I 15 just think that's resulting in a lot more people 16 17 harvesting moose under their State harvest ticket than under the subsistence one. But we will see, we have 18 19 the late hunt coming up October 20th to November 10th and, you know, there's still 75 active permits out 20 there. So we'll see how that late hunt compares --21 22 those late hunt numbers compare but it just seems like there's not a lot of ton of interest right now in the 23 late hunt but we'll see what happens with that. 24 25 26 I think that's all I have for right 27

I think that's all I have for right now. Obviously with the late hunt and we get all the harvest reports in and all the little -- a little more clear place I'll be able to present the numbers better to you at the winter meeting.

 $$\operatorname{But}\ I'm$$ available for any questions anybody has.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Very good, Todd. Any questions for Todd.

MR. HOLSTEN: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, this is Ed Holsten.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead, Ed.

MR. HOLSTEN: Yeah, Todd, just a quick question. The goat that was taken, what unit was that taken in and was it a billy or a ewe.

Thank you.

Computer Matrix, LLC 135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Phone: 907-243-0668 Fax: 907-243-1473

The two units that we MR. ESKELIN: were able to carve out a spot on were 356 and 360, I 2. believe, so 356 would be the Indian Creek Unit north 3 4 side of Tustomena Glacier; 360 is over on the other side of Kachemak. And it was the Indian Creek drainage 5 and it was a billy, and it was a very young billy. 6 7 you know, all things being said it was, you know, probably in a system where the State had already issued 8 those other drawing permits, it probably was the 9 10 perfect animal because the survival rate of young billies is, you know, probably the lowest of the 11 different age classes and so, you know, it was just the 12 best animal that could have been harvested to not 13 stress the system anymore. 14

15 16

So I hope that answers your question.

17 18

19

20

MR. HOLSTEN: Yeah, that's good to hear. I'm just glad a nanny wasn't taken. Okay, thank you, Todd.

21 22

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, good. Any other questions for Todd.

232425

(No comments)

26 27 28

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hearing none, let's move on. We got a report by a whole bunch of you guys, next Milo, Jordan, Forest Service.

29 30 31

MR. BURCHAM: Okay. I was going to start off and see if Dana or Jordan wanted to go first.

32 33 34

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ RHYMER: I can go, this is Jordan Rhymer with the Forest Service.

35 36 37

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Jordan, go

38 39 40

MR. RHYMER: All right. I just prepared a Federal subsistence report kind of what law enforcement did, you know, U.S. Forest Service law enforcement did for the 2020 season.

42 43 44

45

46 47

41

Some of my numbers combine both the Chugach and Tongass so I will let you know on those ones.

48

So this year FY2020, patrolled the

49 50 ahead.

local fisheries, Game Management Areas on both the Chugach and Tongass National Forest in support of the Federal Subsistence Program. We totaled a combined 3,644 hours working in the domain of wildlife which we report biweekly on a spreadsheet, how many hours we logged doing different specifics of our jobs.

6 7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

2.

3

5

We estimated on the Chuqach that we contacted approximately 350 to 400 folks out fishing, hunting, doing subsistence, gathering, all sorts of stuff on the Forest -- on the Chuqach National Forest. We had two major Federal subsistence focused details. Many of you probably remember the Russian River detail that we did last year, we did that again this year. We did it a little bit different. We didn't get the funding to have two separate details for both runs of sockeye on the Russian, but we did have a detailer, he was from the Tongass National Forest, specifically Sitka, and came up and worked with us focusing two weeks on the Russian River. And he wrote a -- quite a few tickets, not specifically to subsistence users, but did write quite a few for various violations, folks fishing without license, taking over limit of fish, leaving trash and debris behind, being away from coolers and such.

252627

Let me look here.

28 29 30

31

32 33

34

35 36

37

38

During that detail we had two -encountered two significant subsistence violations for
which violation notices were issued, one nonrural
sportfisherman, so a guy from Anchorage fishing in the
subsistence area was caught down there and cited, and
then one subsistence fisherman fishing without his
permit at the Russian, and he had, you know, some 20odd fish on the bank when we contacted him and
unfortunately didn't have his permit and didn't have it
filled out and so he was issued a violation notice of
that.

39 40 41

42

43 44

45

46

47

And then we did a second detail over to Cordova, did 10 days in Cordova starting on September 1st, made a lot of compliance checks, checked out a lot of moose, helped with retrieval of some moose, we actually had a moose killed at Alaganik, off the road system there, and the subsistence user wasn't able to locate it so we actually went in and helped him locate it and haul it out of there.

Page 290

We also had some interesting migratory bird act violations this year that the Forest Service assisted U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service with investigating. Two separate instances, folks were gathering seagull eggs down in the area of the Primrose area right there at Snow River, down there there's a big seagull egg area and it's not an area where anybody's allowed to harvest those eggs. So those eggs were seized and U.S.Fish and Wildlife Service issued violation notices for those.

We also conducted six vessel operations between the patrol vessel (indiscernible) focusing on Federal subsistence black bear, goat and deer hunting in Prince William Sound.

 $$\operatorname{So}$$ that's about it for me, if anybody has any questions.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Jordan, that was good. Any questions for Jordan.

MR. WHISSEL: Yeah, this is.....

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Who's next you

or....

MR. BURCHAM: Milo Burcham, program lead for the Subsistence Program on the Chugach National Forest. I'll finish up here with some general happenings on the Forest.

First of all I want to thank Dana Coach, she's been acting in Tom Whitford's position for the past four months I think and she's nearing the end of her detail there. So, anyway, yeah, she's done a great job carrying the program and learning a lot about the program in the process which will help us moving forward, having a better understanding of what this program does.

And I have a lot to echo of what Todd Eskelin said, yeah, we were in a different environment this year having to issue permits in a Covid environment without as much personal contact. We did a pretty good job of it, but not perfect, there were some hiccups, but anyway we're still sorting through that and hopefully we'll get past it.

And also we worked at implementing some new hunts on the Kenai, namely the goat hunt and working with Todd and Jason Harriman with Fish and Game, worked out great, and so anyway we got into some new ground there.

5 6 7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

2425

26

27 28

29

1

2

3

4

I'll start here on this side of the Chuqach around Cordova on the Copper River Delta with moose. We reduced the number of permits issued this year in response to reports of people having a hard time finding bulls at the end of last season so we issued, on the Federal side, 30 bull permits and increased cows just a little bit, to 40. We had 808, I think was the number, anyway, just over 800 applications -- 846 applications, which is down a little bit over recent years for some reason but anyway we issued those permits. The hunt is going now. Don't really have a say as to where harvest is until we get to the end but, anyway, that's ongoing. We worked with Fish and Game to contract some survey work, twinning surveys were conducted on the population that we hunt here last spring and we came up with a bull/cow -- or I'm sorry, a twinning rate of 38 percent, which even as high it's been, that indicates pretty decent nutrition and habitat on the Copper River Delta. We're working with the Fish and Game office to get survey data this fall that'll help fill in some of the blanks over these reports we've had over low bull numbers so hopefully when we come to picking numbers of permits for next season we'll have some good information to go off of.

30 31 32

33

34

35

36 37

38

39 40

41

42

43 44 Deer. We are doing well in the deer department but we weren't able to collect as much information with our deer surveys as we normally do because of Covid. We restricted the number of deer transects, basically just those that we could get in day trips from an open boat out of Cordova and although we saw some carcasses in the process of doing some deer transects the deer pellet densities did not indicate a decline, you know, because we had the first, I'll call it a normal winter after a series of very very mild ones, but anyway there's no indication that there's any big reduction in the population as a result of our normal winter which seemed like a big one all of a sudden.

45 46 47

48

With black bears, just in short, they were happy this year as in contrast to 2018 when there was a berry crop failure it appears, and we had some

2.

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19 Page 292

mortalities of bears in dens and that sort of thing. We had a great berry crop this year. And we've had very few bears in town and that's in contrast to reports I hear from Southeast Alaska, Juneau and Haines area where it seems just a few hundred miles away there was a berry crop failure and Haines has had ridiculous troubles with DLP brown bears in people's yards and such, similar to what we had with black bears in Cordova here two years ago. Our project is ongoing. We're nearing the end of collecting data. Our collars will last one more season. We just had a batch of collars drop off on Knight Island and we'll be making some planes for some late field work to pick up some collars and maintain weather stations on Esther Island. So I'll be working with my Fish and Game partner, Charolette Westing on getting out to do a little bit more field work. And we're starting into analysis on the bear data working with a Fish and Game biometrician and anyway so that project is ongoing but we're nearing the end of actual collecting data from bears.

202122

23

2425

26

27

Salmon. I'll skip past most of that. We don't have in-season reporting. But salmon fishing on the Delta with our subsistence permit is ongoing. I can report for last year's data, we had 120 permits issued, which is a large number and 671 coho and 116 sockeye were harvested under the subsistence permit on the Delta last year.

28 29 30

31

32 33

34

35 36

37

38

Moving to the Kenai. Moose and caribou. There was, you know, changes in the way permits were issued because of Covid concerns, we didn't have the normal townhall style meetings to issue both dipnetting permits for the Russian River and permits for the moose and caribou so Dave Pearson had to react and, you know, be innovative in issuing permits as I mentioned earlier. So far I have not heard of any moose or caribou harvested under the Federal season in Unit 7 there.

39 40 41

42

43 44

45

46

I touched on the new mountain goat hunt, about holding a drawing for mountain goat permits and working with the Fish and Game biologist, Jason Harriman to get that going, and with Todd Eskelin on how to implement it and our first draw for that hunt, so far have not heard of a mountain goat harvested of the two permits that we issued.

47 48

And salmon, I won't say anything more,

Page 293 this is usually reported by the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Russian River salmon harvest on the Kenai. 2. 3 4 And then the main personnel update I'd like to report on is that we've lost Dave Pearson to 5 the program. He took a promotion to a fisheries job on 6 7 the Kenai and so he's no longer working for the subsistence program which leaves a hole on the Kenai 8 that I hope to be able to fill in the near future. 9 10 Any questions please feel free to ask 11 now or shoot me an email or give me a phone call. My 12 contact information is in the agency report that you 13 14 have. 15 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Alrighty, thank 16 you, Milo. Any questions for Milo. 17 18 19 (No comments) 20 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Is Dana going to 21 22 give a report too? 23 MR. BURCHAM: No. Yeah, she just left 24 25 that to Jordan and I. 26 27 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Oh, okay, okay. 28 Well, if there's no question then we'll move on. 29 30 Thank you. 31 (No comments) 32 33 34 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Alrighty. Park Service, Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve, 35 Judy and Dave, you guys are up next. 36 37 MS. CELLARIUS: Mr. Chair, this is 38 Barbara and I just had a couple of things at the end of 39 40 the report. 41 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. I'll add 42 43 you on there. 44 (Teleconference interference -45 participants phones not muted) 46 47 48 MS. CELLARIUS: I'm assuming that Judy and Dave are going to go before me so hopefully..... 49

```
Page 294
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, yeah, I was
     waiting for them but, you know, is Judy here.
 2
 3
 4
                     MS. PUTERA: Yeah, I'm here.
     know if Dave wanted to go first or not but I can go,
 5
 6
     yeah.
 7
 8
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Either or, it's
9
     up to you.
10
                     (Teleconference interference -
11
     participants phones not muted)
12
13
                     MS. PUTERA: Can you hear me?
14
15
16
                     MS. CELLARIUS: I can hear you Judy.
17
                     (Teleconference interference -
18
19
     participants phones not muted)
20
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I can't hear you.
21
22
                     MS. PUTERA: Can you hear me now?
23
24
25
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: A wee bit.
26
                                  Shoot. Hello, is that
27
                     MS. PUTERA:
28
     better.
29
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, that's much
30
31
     better.
32
33
                     MS. PUTERA: Okay, thanks.
34
     teleworking from home.
35
                     So I'll first talk about the Chisana
36
     Caribou Herd. Fish and Game reports GPS radio on two
37
     VHF collars this past spring. For various reasons we
38
     didn't get all the collars out in the spring and so
39
40
     we're planning to deploy the remaining (indiscernible -
     cuts out) collars, at least on the Alaska side of the
41
     range, actually beginning next week.
42
43
44
                     Yukon will be -- the Yukon Department
     of Environment will wait until the spring of '21 to
45
     deploy their share of the collars on their side of the
46
     border. As a consequence we won't be doing a comp
47
48
     count this fall on the Chisana Caribou Herd, we're
     going to just focus all our energy on trying to get
49
50
```

those collars out with the, you know, the limited funding that we have.

2 3 4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

Okay, and moving on to the Mentasta The Park in cooperation with Fish and Caribou Herd. Game concluded the Mentasta Caribou (indiscernible muffled) fall composition count in 2020. (Indiscernible - muffled) the methods that we've been using with our sightability model. So I did want to say, (indiscernible) Table 2 that we increased -- or the population increased quite a bit but I did want to point out that (indiscernible - muffled) June census in 2020 compared to 249 for the 2019. This increase is (indiscernible - muffled) calf production to this year but maybe due, in part, to Nelchina caribou (indiscernible - muffled) returning from the winter range. Some of these weight returning caribou fail to migrate back to their traditional calving grounds, that's remaining (indiscernible - muffled). theory is supported by the presence of radio-collared Nelchina caribou in the Mentasta caribou calving on the range in 2020. So -- and additionally, small groups of caribou could have moved in from other areas such as the controlled use area.

242526

27 28

29

30

31

32

So I just wanted to caution or just say that this might be just a one year phenomenon, and we would want to sort of wait and see what's going to happen next summer and see if those numbers kind of drop back to what we're used to seeing or if they stay the same or if, you know, if they're moving, or deciding to stay in different places, but it is very interesting.

33 34 35

36

37

38

39 40 And also I'd like to point out that Fish and Game is, I think as we speak, putting out a number -- quite a number of GPS collars also on Nelchina caribou so that we'll get, you know, start to get a better picture of, you know, how animals are moving and where they're staying and how long they're staying and that kind of thing.

41 42 43

44

45

46

47

48

Moving on to dall sheep. We finished or concluded the fourth and final year of our distance sampling sheep surveys in Unit -- in count areas three and four, and that's on the north side of the Park there. And -- oh, okay, sorry. We don't have the final data from this year -- or the final results from this year so -- but we will be getting a final report.

That will be available for the spring of '21 -- 2021 -sorry about that, not 21/21 -- 20/21. 2 3 4 We also conducted minimum count dall sheep surveys in count areas 11, 12 in GMU 11 and those 5 are also on the map. Count Areas 11 and 12 have not 6 7 been surveyed since 2017, 2015 respectively. The total number of sheep on each of these (indiscernible -8 muffled, in and out) increase -- and represent the 9 highest number of sheep seen since the late 1990s. 10 lamb/ewe ratios are considerably lower in 2020 than the 11 previous (indiscernible - muffled in and out) however 12 in Count Area 12. The number has nearly doubled from 13 previous survey in 2015. And I did also want to say 14 that though lambs and ewe ratios were also 15 (indiscernible - muffled in and out) -- and actually 16 17 much lower than we've had, I think, in -- like over in the Tok -- for the Tok Management Area, so sort of in 18 19 the region. 20 Oh, I think that's it. 21 22 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. 23 questions for Judy. 24 25 26 REPORTER: I'm sorry, this is the court reporter, and what was your name? 27 28 MS. PUTERA: Judy Putera, P-U-T-E-R-A. 29 30 31 REPORTER: Thank you. 32 33 MS. PUTERA: Yeah, I should have just -- I didn't introduce myself very well. I'm a wildlife 34 biologist at Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and 35 36 Preserve. 37 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, well, 38 thanks Judy. Is Dave going to talk now. 39 40 41 MR. SARAFIN: Yes, I'm here, Mr. Chair. 42 43 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, you go 44 right ahead. 45 MR. SARAFIN: Okay. Yeah, this is Dave 46 Sarafin, fishery biologist at Wrangell-St. Elias 47 48 National Park and Preserve. And this should be brief because I provided you pretty much the season summary 49 50

yesterday, I could touch on it real briefly.

But first of all, fishery research and monitoring projects that we have for the Southcentral is the Tanana Creek salmon weir is funded, however, this year due to Covid risk mitigations and delays and attempt to hire, we had a difficult time finding local rural residents that could run the weir. And in addition to that we had high waters throughout -- pretty much every week of the summer on the creek and so we really didn't have the opportunity even if we had a crew to get the weir in to be fished. But we are, again, hoping to pursue that for next year and a normal year, hopefully we can get it going again.

As I said the fishery summary, I provided yesterday. I can provide more details if anyone wanted.

The other part of my fish report, it does show, you know, from Fish and Game, from their on line site, what the Miles Lake sonar reported this year and I also have some updates from last spring, slight updates in the numbers from the 2019 season for the harvest of each subdistrict in the Federal fisheries. For 2020 we still do not have enough returns in to start expanding an estimate on that. So we're probably at about 35 percent of returns right now and, you know, typically we are -- we get 50 percent harvest reports returned by the deadline of October 31st so as they trickle in throughout the winter we'll get a better idea on what the harvest did.

I've also, last week, put together a preliminary data table that has a breakdown of harvest by gear type from 2010 to '19 that kind of -- just pulled it together and still need to review some of the numbers.

But that concludes my report. If there's any question I'm open.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Dave. Yeah, I'm looking at your stuff here and you got a good report. Is there any questions for Dave on his report from the Council.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, I guess you got off easy Dave.

MR. SARAFIN: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Barbara, you want to go now.

MS. CELLARIUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And just for the record it's Barbara Cellarius again, subsistence coordinator for Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve. You have my written report in your packet. It has the number of permits that we issued for Federal subsistence hunting this year and then some of the projects we had going on, Karen mentioned a couple of those.

I'm happy to answer any questions about the written report or my email's on the handout if you want to send me an email.

I just wanted to mention the Wrangell-St. Elias also adopted its permitting -- with offices closed during the fish permitting season and only having window services during the hunting permitting and we're hopeful that everybody got the permits that they needed. Yeah, the same as other folks, there were a few hiccups but I think it went relatively well.

The Park Superintendent received a short-term delegation of authority letter to implement a regulatory change for a portion of Unit 12 -- for moose in a portion of Unit 12. There was a regulation change that was approved by the Federal Board in April but it didn't go into effect due to the delay in publication of the Federal Register Notice and so we did issue the special action to allow that change to go into effect and as part of that I talked to both the Southcentral RAC Chair and the Eastern Interior RAC Chair. I also talked to Greg about setting the quota for the winter moose hunt in a portion of Unit 11 and that announcement with the quota of seven bull moose for that winter hunt is going to go out today.

 $$\operatorname{And}\ \mbox{I'll}\ \mbox{stop}$ there and see if there are any questions.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Barbara, very good. Any questions for Barbara on her report.

Page 299 (No comments) 1 2 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: All right, well, 3 4 thank you much. You guys did good. 5 I got next on here, I got BLM, but 6 7 before I start with the BLM, could we just take a five minute stretch, get a cup of coffee, stretch, break, 8 whatever, and then we'll get back. We don't have that 9 much more but it's going to take a little while. We've 10 got some -- a few other items to take care of here. 11 12 So let's take five and we'll be back. 13 14 15 (Off record) 16 17 (On record) 18 19 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Alrighty, how is everyone doing, just hanging in here, getting the 20 afternoon blues. 21 22 Actually ready to go. 23 24 25 DeAnna, who do you have with the BLM 26 doing the next presentation. 27 28 MS. PERRY: Valerie Lenhartzen to provide the report. 29 30 31 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. 32 33 MS. PERRY: And I know she was on 34 earlier, Valerie are you still on? 35 36 MS. LENHARTZEN: I am, can you hear me? 37 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I hear you 38 fine Valerie, you go right ahead and we'll listen up. 39 40 41 MS. LENHARTZEN: All right, thank you, Mr. Chairman and Council. I'll just get going here. 42 43 44 So our general update is we continue to work collaboratively with the Alaska Department of Fish 45 and Game to manage the subsistence resource populations 46 among BLM and State lands within GMU 13. 47 48 Currently, unfortunately we don't have 49 50

a permanent wildlife biologist, that sort of fell through here just recently on the new hire. And detailers will be working remotely with a wildlife biologist with us until a wildlife biologist can be found and brought on site.

5 6 7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

2.

3

4

So I just wanted to give a little bit of an update for the 2019/2020 season for caribou harvested. Let's see 106 caribou harvested and 73 moose harvested and that was for last regulatory year. And then I've got some data here for the moose, there's 41 as of 9/30, which was last week on Wednesday when I field reports. We had 46.1 hunt reports returned so we may not have all the information on that but there was 1,288 permits issued for moose, 60 bulls were harvested and of those permits 336 permits were for hunting and that came up with a 17.8 (ph) success rate, which isn't really (indiscernible).

18 19 20

21 22 And then of course we're mid-season or mid-year for our caribou hunt so we had as of 9/30 issued 2720 permits and as of that date 50 caribou were harvested.

23 24 25

26

27 28

29

30

31

32 33

34

35

36 37

38

39 40

41

42

43

So as you all know this year was different for issuing permits. Our office was closed in March to the public and it remains closed. And so we had to come up with a way to issue permits. We were issuing them over the phone to anyone who had been issued permits previously and they had an option of having their permits mailed to them or they could schedule an appointment to pick up their permit. We sent a contingent of BLM Staff to Delta Junction in July where hunters stayed in their car, and then documents were ferried back and forth by Staff in PPE. All new hunters were required to make an appointment so regulations could be explained, qualifying documents checked and permits signed. These precautions were taken and limited exposure, of course, for Staff and for the public. And although these procedures took much more time, approximately more 400 permits were issued this year than were issued last year. We got a lot of people permitted. I don't think that their success has been as great this year.

44 45 46

47

48

So just wanted to cover briefly, I'm sure you're aware these things brought on July 16th, the Federal Subsistence Board approved Temporary Wildlife Special Action WSA20-03 with modification to

close Federal public lands in Unit 13A and B to moose and caribou hunting by non-Federally-qualified users for the 20/21 and 21/22 season. We responded to numerous calls from State hunters wanting to know where they could hunt. Hunters were emailed the Office of Subsistence Management factsheet (indiscernible - muffled) and a copy of our more detailed Federal subsistence maps explaining to them the areas that were closed to non-Federally-qualified users. Basically if they saw the areas where Federally-qualified users could hunt then we told them they can't hunt in these areas because that's what it applies to.

2.

On September 11th, ADF&G issued an emergency order to extend the State season for caribou, all caribou State tags including both (indiscernible - muffled) to allow additional hunting opportunities for State hunters from September 21st through September 30th, and this is the third year in recent five years that the State has extended the caribou hunt into the time period that we normally would just be for subsistence users. This creates a potential for public safety concerns and user conflicts that has also become -- as when the caribou come through the area.

Again, we received many calls from citizens asking about extending the Federal caribou season and/or opening areas for the last season, they were directed to contact OSM for directions on how to submit a special action request.

That is the end of my report.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Alrighty, well, Valerie, I think someone might have a question for you. Anyone on the Council want to ask what the -- I won't tell you what to ask but ask questions of Valerie.

Thank you.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: No questions,

46 okay, well.....

MS. LENHARTZEN: I did -- if I might, Mr. Chairman, I did do a more -- did administer -- the

data base and came up with some numbers that weren't included on your report as far as the five year average, would anybody be interested in that?

3 4 5

2.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead, why don't you give them to us.

6 7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

MS. LENHARTZEN: Okay. So using the years 2015 through 2019, since 2019 was final, the five year average for caribou permits issued was 3,031. The attempted permits, for the five year period was 1,401 and percent attempted was 36 percent. The number of caribou harvested for that five year average was 384. And the percent success rate was 26 percent. So that's 384 harvested for a five year average where in 2019 only 106 were harvested. So that's kind of telling us the number of animals and why are average is so high because, you know, in 2016 and 2017 we had a lot of animals go through and a lot of animals harvested.

19 20 21

Now I'll go to moose.

22 23

2425

26

27 28

29

30

31

32 33

34

35 36

37

38

39

So the five year average from 2015 to 2019 for permits issued was 1,343. In 2019 we issued 1,245 and in 2020 we issued 1,288. And the attempted permits was 631 and 2019 519 permits were attempted. In 2020 for moose 540 permits were attempted. I'm including these additional information for 2020 since the season is over, it may not be complete as we may not have gotten all the hunt reports back. percentage attempted, the average for five years was 47 percent. For 2020 was 42 percent. As well as for 2019 was 42 percent. The number of animals harvested average for a five year period was 82 moose and that number is 73 for 2019 and 63 for 2020, however, like I said not all the hunt reports have been entered or received yet. And then the five year average for success rate was 13 percent, in 2019 we had a 14 percent success rate for permits attempted and in 2020, which again is not complete 12 percent success rate.

44

45

46

So I don't know what all these numbers mean but I know we have numbers that are down this year and I'm not aware of where the animals are on the landscape or where they were when the season ended, the early season for caribou and when the season ended for moose, I think they're more scattered so.

47 48

MS. STICKWAN: I have a question.

```
Page 303
                     MS. LENHARTZEN: Yes.
 1
 2
                     MS. STICKWAN: Mr. Chair, I have a
 3
 4
     question.
 5
 6
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead,
 7
     Gloria.
 8
                     MS. STICKWAN: I was wondering how the
9
10
     hunt went this year, if anybody mentioned to BLM, or
     called BLM about the hunt, about the hunting pressure
11
     during the moose and caribou season, if it was less or
12
     how that worked out?
13
14
                     MS. LENHARTZEN: You know I don't know
15
     firsthand of those calls but I think there probably was
16
     less pressure because the animals were not in the area
17
     where we tend to see the most pressure on the road
18
     system. I don't think they came through, the caribou
19
     in particular, I don't think they were present -- BLM
20
     -- I don't even know if they've come through yet.
21
22
     Sorry I'm not a hunter so I don't know. But I don't
     think there was as much pressure this year mostly
23
     because of where the animals were.
24
25
26
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, that's
     good. Any other questions for Valerie.
27
28
                     (No comments)
29
30
31
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Alrighty, well,
     thank you.
32
33
34
                     MS. LENHARTZEN: Thank you.
35
36
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Next I got the
37
     Alaska Department of Fish and Game if Jackie's
     available for questions, she has no presentation, but
38
     if anyone has questions for the State speak now or
39
40
     forever hold your peace.
41
                     MS. KEATING: Good afternoon, Mr.
42
     Chair. I can just introduce myself briefly and thanks
43
44
     for the opportunity. My name is Jackie Keating, I'm
     the lead researcher for the Division of Subsistence for
45
     Southcentral. And I won't take too much of your time
46
     but we did provide our written update for you on Page
47
     247, I believe. Just to introduce some of the ongoing
48
     projects that we have in the region right now.
49
50
```

questions.

Page 304

We have three projects that are currently funded by the Office of Subsistence Management so we wanted to list those, but they're in the Kodiak/Aleutians region. And we have some other reports that we'll be publishing shortly as well, so we just wanted to make you aware of those and give you our contact information and, of course, happy to take questions if folks have them.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, very good, Jackie. I see you guys are giving some permits to Tyonek, okay.

Any questions for Jackie, any more

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thanks for your report in here. Thanks for the contact info. And if anyone has any questions, like she said, 247, she's got a nice little report there and some nice email addresses, you could terrorize her or you could write her, rather.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. I'm going to flip the page, we're down to the last page. We got OSM, Lisa.

MS. MAAS: Yep, thank you, Mr. Chair, Members of the Council. My name is Lisa Maas. I'm the acting policy coordinator and wildlife biologist for the Office of Subsistence Management.

 First of all, on behalf of OSM, I'd like to thank you and all of the Council members for the work that you do. We recognize it's been very difficult for all of us dealing with the Covid-19 environment.

And as you all know and are experiencing, we're holding all 10 fall Regional Advisory Council meetings via teleconference. This decision was made with the utmost consideration and concern for the health and safety of Council members, families, rural communities, the public and Staff, who are all part of these Council meetings. The health and

safety of everyone is our highest priority. The Center for Disease Control and Prevention guidelines suggest that people avoid travel and refrain from meeting in person to minimize risk and help prevent the spread of Covid-19. The Regional Advisory Councils are the foundation of the Alaska Federal Subsistence Management Program and we recognize holding face to face Council meetings in rural communities across Alaska is preferable for engaging the public most effectively. The Federal Subsistence Management Program is fully committed to resuming in person Council meetings across Alaska as soon as it is possible to do so safely.

2.

Moving on to some OSM Staffing updates.

Since your last Council meeting the following Staffing changes have occurred, or are about to occur at OSM.

Tom Doolittle, the Deputy Assistant Regional Director is retiring this fall.

Sue Detwiler is the relatively new Assistant Regional Director of OSM and she started off in March mid the pandemic so her whole time with us has been virtual teleworking.

Chris McKee, who was OSM's wildlife division lead took a position with the Bureau of Land Management and will serve as their InterAgency Staff Committee member so you'll still be hearing from him in the subsistence world from time to time.

Suzanne Worker, one of the OSM's wildlife biologist took another position with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Ecological Services Program in Portland.

Again, I'm currently acting as the OSM policy coordinator and Katya Wessels, who is a Council coordinator will be acting policy coordinator after me starting in January.

Frank Harris, an OSM fishery biologist transferred to the Kenai Fisheries Office of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and will be working on Kuskokwim fisheries projects so you'll still be hearing from him from time to time as well.

Scott Ayers, another OSM fishery biologist took a promotion with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to work in the Wildlife and Sportfish Restoration Program in Anchorage.

And on to new hires, this is a nice change from people leaving.

OSM has hired two new fisheries biologists, Jared Stone, who you heard from during this meeting, and Cory Graham.

OSM is also currently hiring another administrative assistant position.

And also recently hired Dr. Brad Vickers as the new supervisory anthropologist and he is scheduled to begin in December. So hopefully you'll be hearing from him during the next winter Council meetings.

Some policy changes at OSM.

During the August work session, the Federal Subsistence Board approved changes to the closure policy and the nonrural determination policy which the Councils were previously briefed on. The Board also approved revisions to the special action section of the tribal consultation implementation guidelines. Copies of theses documents are available upon request as well as on the OSM website.

Another update on the Real ID for travel to Council meetings, which I know you guys have heard this before, but there's been a delay, of course because of the pandemic. So over the past two years we've been reminding Council members about the changes in requirements for IDs at airports. The due date was originally October 1, 2020, however, this has been postponed until October 1st, 2021. Note that all Council members will need to make sure they have the correct ID to travel next fall. If you don't have a correct ID, again, please, make sure that you get it before the fall 2021 Council meetings.

Moving on to the lawsuit from the State of Alaska. On August 10th the State of Alaska filed a lawsuit against the Federal Subsistence Board after approved Emergency Special Action, WSA19-14, allowing

the village of Kake to engage in the community harvest of up to four antlered moose and 10 male Sitka black-2. tailed deer. Also included in the lawsuit was 3 4 Temporary Special Action WSA20-03, which closed Federal lands in Units 13A and B to non-Federally-qualified 5 moose and caribou hunters. As part of the lawsuit the 6 7 State asked the Court to issue two preliminary injunctions; one to prevent the Unit 13 closure from 8 taking effect and another vacating the Kake hunt and 9 prohibiting the Board from allowing any additional 10 emergency hunts related to the impacts of Covid-19. On 11 September 18th, the U.S. District Court denied the 12 State's request for a preliminary injunction on the 13 Unit 13 closure. The Court found that because the 14 State has not demonstrated either a likelihood of 15 success or serious questions on the merits of its 16 claims, the Court would not consider the remaining 17 elements of the preliminary injunction analysis. 18

19 20 21

22

23

2425

26

27

28

29

The Court has not yet ruled on the request to enjoin the Kake hunt or the adoption of other Covid-related emergency special actions, however, a ruling on preliminary injunctions does not resolve the litigation. Barring a settlement with the State, the questions raised by the State concerning the Board's authority to take these actions will be argued over the coming months. The Solicitor's Office estimates that briefings should be complete in late winter or spring of 2021 and that the Court will issue its decision in early summer.

30 31 32

33

34

Based on legal guidance, the Program Staff does not comment on any active litigations directed against the Federal Subsistence Board beyond what was just stated.

35 36 37

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{So}}$ that concludes the OSM report and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

38 39 40

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

41 42

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Lisa. Good report, good update, quite detailed.

43 44 45

Questions for Lisa. Any questions on OSM report she just concluded.

46 47 48

MS. STICKWAN: Question.

49 50

Computer Matrix, LLC 135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501

Phone: 907-243-0668 Fax: 907-243-1473

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Go ahead, Gloria. 1 2 MS. STICKWAN: I think she can answer 3 4 it. You said the briefing will only address Kake, is that right? 5 6 7 MS. MAAS: Yeah, thanks Gloria. this is a new process for me, obviously, the details of 8 this litigation. So I guess there's several steps in 9 this process so first the State filed a complaint 10 against the Board, and asked for an injunction, a 11 preliminary injunction and the injunction would just 12 pretty much stop any actions immediately. So the Court 13 already ruled on the Unit 13A and B closures, and they 14 denied that preliminary injunction but the Court has 15 not yet ruled on a preliminary injunction regarding the 16 17 Kake emergency hunt and any other emergency hunts related to Covid-19. But that's not the end of the 18 19 process. 20 So after the Court rules on these 21 22 preliminary injunctions there's a lot more briefings between the Board, the Solicitor's Office, the State, 23 the Courts and it's not expected that the Court will 24 25 issue its final decision on this lawsuit until early summer of 2021. 26 27 28 So hopefully that answered your question, it's kind of a process that, you know, it's 29 new to people that aren't lawyers. 30 31 32 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Did that help, 33 Gloria. 34 MS. STICKWAN: I just asked if they 35 were going to just address Kake and not 13, you know, 36 37 Unit 13. 38 39 MS. MAAS: They are -- I mean both Unit 40 13A and Kake were part of the State's lawsuit. Court already made a ruling on the preliminary 41 conjunction part of Unit 13, but they have not yet 42 ruled on the preliminary injunction regarding Kake. 43 44 CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. All right, 45 46 thank you, Lisa. 47 48 MS. MAAS: Yep, thank you. 49

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Council, we're moving on to future meeting dates. We need to confirm our winter 2020 meeting date and the location was in Cordova. As you know with our action at this Council meeting we'll be welcome with open arms by half of Cordova and the rest will be determined later, I guess. But, anyway, DeAnna, do you want to talk to that date, is it still solid or do we need to do anything else but confirm it.

2.

MS. PERRY: Mr. Chair. We do need to confirm the dates, both for winter and fall. In your meeting book you can see those calendars starting on Page 248 and I also do have it on the screen for those folks on the videoconference. You'll see that February 24th and 25th there in the middle and all I need is a confirmation from the Council that -- or a motion rather confirming those dates and that destination.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, we confirmed the dates, we could confirm them again, because this is the way we do business. But I guess my question to you is, I was wondering if there was any change in the travel, even though February's a long ways out, but Council members any questions on the confirmation of 24th and 25th February, are you good with those dates.

MS. STICKWAN: We don't have anything pressing on the agenda, right.

 $\label{eq:CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, we'll always have something pressing.}$

MR. WHISSEL: They're just fine to me, I move, Mr. Chairman. This is John Whissel.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ WHISSEL: I'm offering my protection if you choose to brave it and come to Cordova.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, well, you've got their ears so you'll be able to take care of us.

Well, is anyone opposed to the confirmation of the 24th and 25th in Cordova.

```
Page 310
                     MS. STICKWAN: Yeah, do we know what's
     on the agenda?
 2
 3
 4
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Well, let's not
     go there, we're not into the agenda, we just need to
 5
     confirm the dates for our meeting.
 6
 7
                     MS. PERRY: Yeah, we haven't even
8
     started an agenda yet, we don't do that until after
9
     this meeting's over and then I send out a call for
10
     agenda items so you all will have an opportunity to
11
     suggest those.
12
13
14
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, anyone
     object.
15
16
17
                     (No comments)
18
19
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hearing no
     objections, are you all in favor of the 24th/25th in
20
     Cordova, to keep that one and then we'll go to the
21
22
     next.
23
                     MR. OPHEIM: Michael, I'm okay with
24
25
     that.
26
27
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Do I have
28
     any objections.
29
30
                     (No comments)
31
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: I hear no
32
33
     objections.
34
                     (No comments)
35
36
37
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: No objections,
     DeAnna, we're confirming by consensus, unanimous that
38
     the February 24th and 25th in Cordova still works.
39
40
41
                     Now, we got to select the fall 2021
                     Someone want to through one out there.
42
     meeting dates.
43
                     MR. OPHEIM: October 6 and 7.
44
45
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
46
                                           Okay.
47
48
                     MR. BLOOMQUIST: This is Aaron, could
     we consider it later in the month if we can but I could
49
50
```

```
Page 311
     maybe make anything work but later in the month is
     better for me.
 2
 3
 4
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: How about 13/14.
5
 6
                     MR. BLOOMQUIST: Yeah, that's probably
 7
     better.
 8
9
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: That work
10
    Michael.
11
                     MR. OPHEIM: Yep, I think that'll work.
12
13
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Anyone else want
14
15
    to speak up for October.
16
17
                     MR. HOLSTEN: This is Ed, the 13th and
     14th are okay.
18
19
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. And it's
20
     okay by me. It's okay by Michael. Okay, anybody --
21
22
     Aaron. Anyone have a problem with October 13 and 14.
23
                     (No comments)
24
25
26
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Nope. Does
     someone want to make a motion for October 13th and 14th
27
28
     for the fall meeting, 2021.
29
                     MR. HOLSTEN: Yeah, this is Ed, I'll
30
     make that motion.
31
32
33
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thank you,
34
     Ed. Is there a second to it.
35
                     MR. OPHEIM: I'll second, this is
36
37
     Michael.
38
39
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Michael seconds
40
     it. Any discussion.
41
                     (No comments)
42
43
44
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Hearing none, if
     someone will call the question we'll vote on it.
45
46
47
                     MR. WHISSEL: Question.
48
                     MS. STICKWAN: Call for....
49
50
```

```
Page 312
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, question's
    been called for. All in favor of the 13th and 14th for
 2.
     fall meeting, 2021, aye.
 3
 4
5
                     IN UNISON: Aye.
 6
 7
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Any opposed to
     that date.
8
9
10
                     (No opposing votes)
11
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, DeAnna, you
12
     got a motion, you got it recorded, you got the fall
13
     meeting, you got verification of your winter meeting.
14
15
16
                     We're now going to go to closing
17
    comments.
18
19
                     Just in....
20
                     MR. ZADRA: Excuse me, Mr. Chair.
21
22
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, go ahead.
23
24
25
                     MR. ZADRA: This is Dennis. I just
26
    want to -- are we going to select a location for that
    fall meeting?
27
28
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: No, I think -- I
29
    mean we usually have it in Anchorage but that's up to
30
     us, I guess we could ask for a different place.
31
32
33
                     MR. ZADRA: Okay. Yeah, I didn't know
34
     if it was in Anchorage or we were going to discuss it,
     that's fine with me.
35
36
37
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I think it
     is, DeAnna, is that correct, that's where we usually
38
    have the fall meeting?
39
40
                     MS. PERRY: Yes. But the Council can
41
     choose any, and, of course, you'll have your next
42
     meeting to confirm that if you change your mind.
43
44
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Well, we
45
     got our next meeting, is that going to work, we'll just
46
     leave it as is.
47
48
                     MR. ZADRA: Yeah, that's fine with me.
49
50
```

```
Page 313
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.
     good. Thank you.
 2
 3
 4
                     Okay, let's see how do I want to do
     this. I'm going to go a little bit different this
 5
     time, I'm going to go closing comments, I just -- I
 6
     used the register from the top down, I'm going to come
 7
     bottom up.
 8
 9
10
                     John, I'm going to let you go first on
    your closing comments, please.
11
12
                     MR. WHISSEL:
                                   Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
13
     Well, we got through a lot of things today and -- or
14
     this session and -- including a really challenging
15
     issue for our town. I thank everybody for giving the
16
     consideration you gave that issue. I know everybody
17
     realizes that no matter what you made half of the
18
19
     community upset and you made the other half happy but I
     don't have any problem with how the decision was made
20
     or the process by which we got to it. And I hope that
21
22
     moving forward everybody is able to accept it and
     consider the fishery on its merits after it begins.
23
     hope it doesn't make any more conflict for our town but
24
25
     I wouldn't imagine this is the last time we'll see it.
26
                     So anyways thanks everybody for taking
27
28
     it on, it's -- I can't tell you what a big issue it is
     for Cordova. There's a lot of people that think it's
29
     incredibly important to both do it and not do it and we
30
     sure -- it feels good to have it resolves.
31
32
33
                     So thanks.
34
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, John.
35
36
37
                     MR. HOLSTEN: Yeah, I just wanted to
38
     thank you, Mr. Chairperson for kind of leading a tough
39
40
     meeting but....
41
                     MR. BLOOMQUIST: You forgot Aaron.
42
43
44
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI:
                                           Well, that's
     okay, Ed jumped in there but you go ahead Ed.
45
46
47
                     MR. HOLSTEN:
                                   Oh, I'm sorry.
48
49
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: No, that's okay,
50
```

you started so let's just go ahead.

MR. HOLSTEN: Yeah, I just wanted to thank you, Mr. Chair for ramrodding this meeting under difficult times. I was hoping to get on it, video, but due to operator error on my part I couldn't connect, but the phone worked all right.

I especially want to thank DeAnna, this is probably one of her tougher meetings she had to set up and orchestrate and I really appreciate DeAnna's efforts on getting a lot of that -- all that meeting material information to us ahead of time via email. So thank you, DeAnna.

And that's all I had to say.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Ed. It was good. Aaron, you're up next.

MR. BLOOMQUIST: Yeah, sorry about that, I was just telling Angie I thought you said Aaron and I didn't even know I was off mute, I thought you said Aaron, and I didn't even know.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay.

 MR. BLOOMQUIST: But anyways, yeah, thanks to everybody just for it seems like this was fairly efficient for what it is, being a teleconference meeting. I had one until 10:00 o'clock last night for my AC too and both of them went better than expected.

 On the other hand I'm continuing to be frustrated probably more and more with, you know, just the general sentiment from a lot of people within the system that want to exclude people that, you know, don't do it their way, and for -- especially when there's plenty of resources. It's frustrating to me to see that when you've got Alaskans, or Americans, or however we want to call ourselves that are, you know, we have relatively abundant resources and people that are -- they don't want people playing in their playgrounds and it -- anyway, so it's something I've been passionate about for 20 years in this state and I'm just going to -- kind of get my feet under this in this Program and it seems worse here than anywhere.

So a little bit of a Debbie Downer in the end but I hope we can work and make sure everybody's needs are met within all these systems and I'll leave you with that.

4 5 6

7

1

2.

3

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, thanks,

Aaron.

8 9

Okay, Andy, you want to go.

10 11

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yeah, sure, thanks,

12 Greg.

13 14

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: You bet.

15 16

17

18

19

20

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: I think the meeting went smooth, way better than I expected it would. It was a bit of a bummer not to be able to bounce around and do some networking and learn some things, you know, in person, when we're at a meeting is much better but at least it worked pretty well.

212223

2425

I was a bit surprised by some of the way the voting was going and some of the agendas that were being served so I just wanted to mention some things if you'll bear with me.

26 27 28

29

30

31

32 33

34

35 36

37

38

39 40

41

Some of the newer Southcentral RAC members, they might want to revisit or reference some orientation handbooks on reviewing the duties of our service that we do to Federal subsistence users under ANILCA, you know, voting for special interest groups and, you know, competing resources in multiple ways, you know, commercial interests or other Federal subsistence users for the same resource. It seems to be there was a bit of a misguided agenda there that, you know, in some cases towards -- some of those efforts should be more appropriately applied toward the State sport and personal use, that harvest the same resource is a better place to take that up with addressing regulations at the State level, it seems like that would be more appropriate arena for that.

46

47

48

We, ourselves, serve qualified Federal subsistence users. So I think we should take care in voting choices that we make so that they serve practical purposes and not so much political ones. You know our job basically is to help people harvest resources whenever possible barring that there's no

conservation concerns. But we're not supposed to be the litmus test for the State needing to do the same. We make our decisions independent of the State and sport and personal use harvest.

4 5 6

7

8

2.

3

So I don't know there needs to be an awareness in our group here of the mandate of subsistence regulations cannot be more restrictive than other regulated uses of the same resources.

9 10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

People who reside in proximity to a resource are -- they're a part of that ecosystem there and we create a proposed system to advise on what was mentioned earlier, a meaningful preference, for the uses of those resources. On future consideration, possibly, is an increased demand on these resources due to Covid-19 possibly having some affects on people's food sovereignty and there's an increase demand for some of these resources that are being harvested.

19 20 21

22

So anyhow also kudos to DeAnna for all the hard work getting this arranged, thank you.

23 24

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you, Andy.

25

Michael.

26 27 28

29

30

31

MR. OPHEIM: Yeah, it was a good meeting. DeAnna did a good job pulling everything together. Agency reports were really good. Would have liked to have seen them up on the screen maybe but, no, they were great.

32 33 34

I tend to agree with Aaron and Andy there, some of the things they were saying.

35 36 37

38

39 40

41

42

It was great discussion and was really good hearing everybody's input on each proposal. That was, I think, one of our better discussion meetings here. So too bad we couldn't do it all in person but this was still a good first run and, you know, if we don't get to see everybody in February, hopefully this will still work for us and it'll maybe be even better.

43 44 45

So, thank you.

46 47

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Alrighty, thank

48 49

50

you, Michael.

Page 317

How about Dennis.

2 MR. ZADRA: Okay, can everyone hear me.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Yep.

MR. ZADRA: Yeah, first of all I am looking forward to the day when we can meet in person once again. I think it's easier and easier to be engaged.

But to go back I do want to just touch on my position on the Cordova proposal. It had nothing to do with special interests or anything like that. My concern is the health of the resource. I — the actual use and what's going to happen with this Federal fishery is going to be negligible but five years from now when we have a personal use dipnet fishery in the same waters, that's going to be detrimental, and that's all I'm trying to prevent. You know it might not happen but I see the way Board of Fish goes, I see what Kenai River Sportsfishing Association is all about and I see also the Chitina Dipnetters Association, and if they can grab a new chunk of water and come in and bring in all these city folks down and catch our fish, I think they're going to take advantage of it.

So, anyway, that's all I got.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Thank you.

I guess my concern and the way I voted

Gloria.

MS. STICKWAN: I just want to say thanks to DeAnna for giving us all the material for the meeting and that the meeting was good discussion.

was that I am concerned about the fishery, I kept saying it over and over and over again and that's what I wanted to state and let everyone know that, you know, it's a concern to me that there's a -- I'm pretty sure there's going to be a chinook shortage. The salmon was -- may have been met through the management objective but it was very close to the very low end of the sockeye run and so that was my concern about why I made the decisions and what I voiced to you, conservation of

48 sockeye, conservation of chinook. It wasn't -- I 49 didn't really want to exclude other people from

good.

Page 318

fisheries but I have to look at the conservation and what I've seen and heard up here in the Copper River, and the harvest levels that people caught, it was low.

2.

That was why -- conservation of fisheries was my concern. We need to look at that.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. Yeah, very

Diane.

MS. SELANOFF: Well, I think this was a very good meeting. We successfully completed it, you know, on our phones and on our computers and everything else. So I want to say we did a good job.

I also made the comment, too, that I was at times concerned that we would put our subsistence users at a disadvantage from the State users and I understand the hardships, I understand the concerns, and I'm glad we were able to get through this process successfully. And I think that, you know, we have a very good board that made some really good decisions, you know, we're fortunate, everyone can stand to their own opinions.

So, anyway, thank you, it was a good

 meeting.

CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, did I miss anyone other than myself on the Council here. I think I got you all.

I'm just going to make a few comments.

 This is a very -- how would I put it, it's a big task, it's a big task to Chair and to pull us together and try to listen to everybody and keep us on track and, DeAnna is very highly efficient, she sends out tons of information, tons of stuff that she wants addressed, sometimes it's a little too cumbersome, and sometimes we don't have enough info to do well but I think what we did and I think I was fair in letting everyone speak and vett everything on both sides of all issues so that's our process, and our process is to listen to the public and to get public testimony and any input put into us, and this is for the Federal priority.

Page 319

And I think Andy McLaughlin nailed it, you know, we need to stay on task of what we are to do, to provide service. And I agree with Gloria, you know, we're looking at hard times and we want to make sure there's conservation of fish. But the conservation issue is not on the subsistence user, the conservation issue is on other user groups. And, you know, I worry of becoming too big a fishery in years down the road. This is only for the Federal subsistence users and so it shouldn't grow exponentially unless the ton of people are going to move there. It's not like a dipnetting on the Kenai, that's a State thing and that's totally out of control, and I don't know that the State would put them in the Copper, I suppose it's possible.

 But anyway I thought there was some very good discussions. I'm very passionate about keeping the process the way it was designed; that Federal-qualified subsistence users has a preference. I don't like putting restrictions on the Federal users. You know I went along with the early reporting, we fought it so hard here on the Kenai, it seems like the Federal subsistence users always got to go through all these hoops, a lot of them don't have it, and they don't have computers or phones and a lot of the other stuff, some of them don't, the true ones anyway. So there is shortage, this is a little stressful time for everyone, I understand that.

I think I will take into account of Cordova, I really feel that this will work itself out. We had the same issues and we were on -- myself and my son, we had to negotiate with 300-some guides, two subsistence users on the Kenai years ago in a work group, it was no fun, but now you have a subsistence fishery that's providing for a whole community in a meaningful manner and it ain't hurting the resource by one percent, it's not even touching anything of what's going by the commercial capture.

So I just want to put that stuff out there, that I think we're all doing good. I think we got a great team here. And I want to give kudos to a lot of you, you bring in a lot of good, I would say educated and local knowledge and it really broadens our discussions and our decisions, so I thank all of you.

And if I was a little short, it's a lot

```
Page 320
     of stress, and I'm a little short at times, but I like
     to be fair too, so I hope I did a good job.
 2
 3
 4
                     Anyway, anything else that needs to
     come before the Council.
5
 6
 7
                     (No comments)
8
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: DeAnna, thank you
9
10
    very much and thank everyone. I want to thank everyone
     that came, participated and hopefully we can move on
11
     and I'm hoping we'll be whooping and hollering in
12
13
     Cordova soon.
14
15
                     MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Greg.
16
17
                     MR. WHISSEL: Thank you, Greg.
18
19
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, we're going
     to stand adjourned. Let's hear a motion, but I know
20
     it's unanimous we're adjourned.
21
22
                     MR. WHISSEL: Move to adjourn.
23
24
25
                     MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Second.
26
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, moved and
27
28
     seconded, by someone and we're adjourned.
29
                     MR. WHISSEL: Whissel moved and I think
30
31
     Andy seconded.
32
33
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay, Andy
     Whissel....
34
35
                     MR. MCLAUGHLIN: I seconded.
36
37
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: Okay. All in
38
39
     favor to adjourn.
40
41
                     IN UNISON: Aye.
42
                     CHAIRMAN ENCELEWSKI: We're adjourned.
43
44
                     (Off record)
45
46
                       (END OF PROCEEDINGS)
47
48
49
50
```

```
CERTIFICATE
 1
 2
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
 3
                                      )
 4
                                      )ss.
     STATE OF ALASKA
 5
                                      )
 6
 7
             I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public in and for the
     state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court
 8
     Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:
9
10
             THAT the foregoing pages numbered 175 through
11
         contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the
12
     SOUTHCENTRAL FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY
13
     COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME II taken electronically on the
14
     8th day of October;
15
16
17
                     THAT the transcript is a true and
     correct transcript requested to be transcribed and
18
     thereafter transcribed by under my direction and
19
     reduced to print to the best of our knowledge and
20
     ability;
21
22
                     THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or
23
     party interested in any way in this action.
2.4
25
26
                     DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 22nd
     day of October 2020.
27
28
29
30
                     Salena A. Hile
31
                     Notary Public, State of Alaska
32
33
                     My Commission Expires: 09/16/22
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
```