

1 SOUTHEAST ALASKA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING
3
4 PUBLIC MEETING
5
6 VOLUME II
7
8
9
10 Alaska Native Brotherhood Meeting Hall
11 Yakutat, Alaska
12 October 28, 2015
13 8:30 a.m.
14
15
16 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:
17
18 Michael Bangs, Chair
19 Arthur Bloom
20 Michael Douville
21 Albert Howard
22 Donald Hernandez
23 Harvey Kitka
24 Cathy Needham
25 Patricia Phillips
26 Robert Schroeder
27 Frank Wright
28 John Yeager
29
30
31
32
33
34 Regional Council Coordinator, Robert Larson
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45 Recorded and transcribed by:
46
47 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
48 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2
49 Anchorage, AK 99501
50 907-227-5312/sahile@gci.net

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

2
3 (Yakutat, Alaska - 10/28/2015)

4
5 (On record)

6
7 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Well, good morning,
8 everyone. Hopefully everybody got enough food. There
9 was lots of pancakes. And thank you, Bert, for that
10 breakfast.

11
12 Okay, Bert.

13
14 MR. ADAMS: So the sourdough the
15 pancakes -- the starter is over 100 years old. Yeah.
16 It was handed down from my grandfather to my mother.
17 And my mother gave me, you know, a starter. She gave
18 my brother a starter. He let his go to pot and I
19 managed to keep mine going, so now I have shared that
20 starter with son, Bert, Junior, and my daughter,
21 Connie. And so they're going to carry on the
22 tradition, you know. And I'm not leaving for a while,
23 but -- you know, even after I pass on. They love the
24 pancakes.

25
26 This morning I heard -- I can't
27 remember who it was -- mention that some people use
28 milk in their pancakes -- in their sourdough. We use
29 water. And the reason why we use water is because we
30 fish on the Dry Bay area on the Alsek, you know, every
31 year. Milk is pretty hard to get in there. And so my
32 mother just started using water. Turned out to be as
33 good as ever. You know, so I know when my father would
34 tease my mother about -- we had it every morning.
35 Okay. Every morning. My brother and I, we would put
36 away a dozen of them at a time. But my father had a
37 question every night, well, dear, are we going to have
38 the hotcakes, pancakes or flapjacks.

39
40 (Laughter)

41
42 So she would say, you know, whatever
43 you want. You know, it's there. And then my dad
44 fished with his brothers and some cousins. It was a
45 company. And my mother was the cook. So we had a cook
46 house and we had bunk houses. All tents, you know.
47 And every morning the guys would get up and they would
48 go grab a cup of coffee. And they would get in front
49 of the river and they would talk story and drink their
50 coffee, you know. And my mom would be in the cook

1 house, you know, slapping flap jacks and scrabbling
2 eggs and cooking bacon. And then she would say okay.
3 She would kind of holler out to them come and get it,
4 you know. And they'd keep on talking. They heard her,
5 but they just, you know, kept on talking. They'd
6 started a story and of course you had to finish. And
7 somebody else had to make a response to that. You had
8 to finish it. And so it took a long time for them to
9 eventually come up.

10

(Interruption)

11

12
13 Well, there you go. While they're
14 fixing that, I'll continue on with my story. I'll make
15 it.....

16

(Laughter)

17

18
19 But one day she hollered out to them,
20 you know -- and I said this this morning. Did you hear
21 me? Come and get it or I'll feed it to the dogs.

22

(Laughter)

23

24
25 And we had two dogs, okay. And they
26 loved pancakes. They would get all of the leftover
27 pancakes, you know. So she hollered out to them and
28 about three times and they were still talking story.
29 And finally she said come and get it or I'll feed it to
30 the dogs. And I mean it. And so when they came, you
31 know, they all had empty coffee cups and they were
32 ready to fill their coffee cups and the pancakes would
33 be flopped on the table. And there was our two dogs
34 sitting on the side of the tent, licking their chops.

35

(Laughter)

36

37
38 So she fed them all of the pancakes.
39 Okay. So the next morning when she got breakfast
40 ready, she hollered out come and get it. Pancakes are
41 ready. Whoosh. Everyone was racing there to get their
42 share, you know, of the pancakes. So she taught them a
43 lesson, you know, and it was really funny, you know, to
44 be able to see those things happening at camp, you
45 know, that is 60 miles away from town. And I loved
46 it.

47

48 And so the tradition that was passed
49 down to me, I still try to carry on. So I hope you
50 enjoy it. And maybe we'll have an opportunity to do

1 this again for you. Gunalcheesh.

2

3 Thank you.

4

5 IN UNISON: Gunalcheesh.

6

7 (Applause)

8

9 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Bert. You
10 forgot to tell them that your grandfather was a
11 Krusteaz family member.

12

13 (Laughter)

14

15 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. We're going to
16 start this morning with some public testimony. And
17 first up, we have Lee Wallace from Saxman.

18

19 MR. WALLACE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
20 Lee Wallace, President of Organized Village of Saxman.
21 I'll be leaving today, so I wanted to make some
22 comments on some non-Agenda items and if I could,
23 Agenda item.

24

25 First of all, here we are in Yakutat.
26 And through conversations I hear there's been
27 telecommunication issues this past fall going to Nome
28 and other areas throughout the State. You know, it's a
29 given telecommunications throughout our State is
30 difficult. Even in urban settings I can say that it's
31 not always the best either. But I do thank you guys
32 for making that effort to go to the villages. I
33 certainly appreciated it when you guys came to Saxman.
34 And so I know the Council believes that it's imperative
35 to go out to the villages when you can. So I
36 appreciate you guys doing that. But I guess a real
37 issue in Alaska is a real need for Tribal governments
38 and municipalities to push for a broadband throughout
39 the State of Alaska. You know, we're all aware of
40 communicating problems that we have when we're going
41 out into the Bush and the rural areas.

42

43 Another item real quickly is -- I see
44 some OSM Staff and other Agency State here is.....

45

46 (Phone interruption)

47

48 MR. WALLACE: That isn't me. I don't
49 have connection. I've got AT&T. Excuse me. That's
50 weird.

1 Throughout these 103 months, Saxman has
2 visited the FSB website numerous times, looking for
3 updates and looking for that. And I guess my comment
4 to the FSB website is to update it more often. Before
5 I came here, I looked at the website and I said okay,
6 here's the latest news. And the title of it was FSB
7 writes letter to Secretaries. So I clicked on it. I
8 said well, maybe that's a new letter to the
9 Secretaries. And no, it was from 2014. Over a year
10 ago. So I would ask that if at all possible, FSB
11 update their website more often.

12
13 Other comment on the letter to Mr.
14 Bangs from the FSB dated September 3rd, 2015 on item
15 number four. You guys had addressed the FSB for
16 improvements are needed on the Board's correspondence.
17 And the reply that they had was they're in process and
18 the solicitor is updating the policy. And I guess one
19 thing I wouldn't want you guys to do is drop the ball
20 and say, you know, be in constant communication with
21 them and say where are you guys with the process.

22
23 Yesterday, I made a request for the
24 Council to write that letter to the Secretaries about
25 moving on the rural determination process. It's been
26 done in the past. I don't know if you guys need a
27 motion or you need a directive for your Coordinator to
28 draft that letter for you folks, but I really encourage
29 it. Because, you know, there was time lines that were
30 supposed to be met and actually we might be behind that
31 time line now with the delays, because the RACs only
32 meeting twice a year and as well as the FSB Board, at
33 the July meeting they definitely had dialogue around
34 the table that, you know, we need to get XYZ done in
35 certain time frames. And I would hope that we're not
36 behind that, but 2017 was the drop dead deadline for
37 things to happen for change. And so we just might be
38 behind that. And so I really encourage this Council to
39 draft that letter.

40
41 When I attended the March meeting up at
42 the FSB, I made comment during our time of Tribal
43 consultation. Because when they start out the
44 meetings, they try to do that Tribal consultation for
45 Tribal governments that are attending. And I made
46 comment at that point where I'm just seeing a lot of
47 over-enforcement on our people back in Saxman and
48 probably other areas around the State also.

49
50 I'll give you examples, Saxman

1 harvesters returning from Hugh Smith, they were turning
2 south -- from the south and they were coming into
3 Mountain Point landing area. Mountain Point and
4 Herring Cove is a really busy place for charter
5 fishermen and sport fishermen. And soon as they see
6 our skiffs coming back with the seines on board, law
7 enforcement zooms up on the harvesters and they want to
8 count the fish they're counting. And yet they don't
9 see any enforcement bothering with the charter
10 fishermen or the sport fishermen. That process needs
11 to be addressed.

12
13 Another example, the fishermen and the
14 harvesters of our way of life were up at Naha Bay.
15 Same thing. There was other user groups fishing in the
16 area, yet they singled out our people and they wanted
17 to count each and every fish that they caught. So they
18 interrupted the fishing activity and they counted all
19 the fish. And they were within the law. They were
20 within the limits. And you know what the parting word
21 of law enforcement to the harvesters. You guys are
22 putting a strain on the system. I'll repeat it. You
23 guys you are putting a strain on the system. I said
24 how absurd. You know, of all the user groups, compared
25 to the commercial fishermen, the charter fishermen, the
26 sport fishermen, our way of life are taking far less
27 than these other user groups.

28
29 And you know what, customary and
30 traditionally they're fishing a river or a stream
31 mouth. And our way of life harvesters are the last
32 ones to partake in the harvest of fish. And I'm
33 talking about sockeye. It's kind of like what I'm
34 hearing about the Kootznoowoo project petition. You
35 know, it's talking about interception.

36
37 And the Kootznoowoo ETJ project
38 petition is very important to our area. You know, if
39 the outcome is in favor of the petition, it will have
40 far reaching effects throughout our Region. Because
41 this is what I'm just talking about, the example I gave
42 in Nana. You know, there's far greater users
43 intercepting the fish before -- we're getting the last
44 chance before the sockeye go up the streams. And we're
45 not putting a strain on the system. It's the other
46 groups.

47
48 You know, there's been much talk around
49 the State about co-management and the need of it. And
50 definitely we are going to be in need of it. And so I

1 encourage when opportunity happens about co-management
2 that it happens.

3

4 And with that -- you know, with the
5 reports I'm hearing around our Region with the small
6 return of sockeyes in our streams, I think there needs
7 to be a lot more FRMPs happening. So I know the
8 budgets are declining, but if at all possible, I think
9 if there is priorities set, I think a lot of more of
10 these FRMPs need to be in place in different streams.
11 So you could have actual good data. I know they're
12 happening in a number of areas in Southeast already,
13 but it sounds like it might be more important to have
14 more of these programs in place.

15

16 I don't know if you guys are going to
17 get to Proposals that I want to make comment on. And
18 the comment is on 16-08. And I don't know if I'll be
19 around for 16-05, but I see OSM is supporting 16-05 and
20 that's deleting some language there. And if you guys
21 do pass 16-05, I would encourage the striking of the
22 same language in 16-08. To me, it makes sense to
23 strike the language about the harvest limit may be
24 reduced to four deer based on conservation concerns.

25

26 That's my final comments. Thank you.

27

28 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
29 Wallace.

30

31 Anyone have any questions for Lee on
32 his testimony.

33

34 (No comments)

35

36 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

37

38 Okay. Next, we have Larry Edwards.

39

40 MR. EDWARDS: Hello. My name is Larry
41 Edwards. I'm from Sitka and representing Greenpeace.
42 I have a couple of slides, so I'll get started while
43 those are being put up.

44

45 Yesterday, there were a couple of
46 questions about deer harvest goals and some discussion
47 about that, so I thought I would give a little more
48 information that might be of interest to the Council.
49 This slide that is moving all around the room, this is
50 from the Board of Game meeting in 2013 in Sitka, where

1 there was discussion of two intensive management
2 proposals. And this is a harvest record for deer in
3 Game Management Unit 3. And you can see that there is
4 a goal set there of 900. I'll back up a little bit and
5 just discuss the goals.

6
7 The Intensive Management Act was passed
8 I think around 1994 and it required the Board of Game
9 to set regulations for population objectives and
10 harvest objectives for all ungulates in the State. So,
11 you know, moose, caribou, elk, deer. Southeast deer
12 were the last objectives to be set. The Board found it
13 challenging, so they put it off as long as they could.
14 In the record that I gave to your Staff, I've got a
15 transcript of this discussion from the 2000 Board of
16 Game meeting when they set the objectives. They didn't
17 want to do it at all. They felt that deer in Southeast
18 was a bad fit for doing this exercise, but they did it
19 because they were required to by that law.

20
21 So for Game Management Unit 3, which
22 includes Wrangell Island, Zarembo, Mitkof, Kupreanof,
23 Kuiu, they set this objective of 900. You can see that
24 it was set just after a peak in harvest. And after
25 that, it's kind of, you know, gone down. It's pretty
26 low levels. It was extremely low levels off to the
27 left. There was a very hard winter around -- I think
28 it was 1979, 1980, and I think probably the winter
29 after that as well. Harvest had been very high before
30 that and the population just totally crashed. And then
31 you see another dip from the peak of 1,167 down to 624.
32 And -- or actually the one I wanted to point out I
33 guess was the dip down to the 376. So that's another
34 bunch of hard winters. So we're dealing with deer
35 winter habitat loss, as well as predation.

36
37 If you go to the next slide, just two
38 real quick ones here. This is a portion of Game
39 Management Unit 3, Mitkof Island. This is the one
40 where we -- I mentioned yesterday, where the Forest
41 Service withdrew that one timber sale. We had raised
42 an issue there over subsistence ability for deer. But
43 you can see how that has crashed, too. Since '97 at
44 least. It's not as long of a record as the other one.
45 And real quickly a similar slide for Kupreanof Island.
46 So you might just kind of keep these things in mind
47 when you're looking at these harvest goals.

48
49 And I have one more from Unit 1A, from
50 the same Board of Game meeting. And you can see at the

1 top the management objective is a harvest of 700. And
2 since '97 it's always been far below that. So I would
3 take these goals with a grain of salt. At the January
4 2015 Board of Game meeting, Greenpeace and two other
5 organizations had Proposal 26, which was asking the
6 Board for deer in Southeast or at least for some of the
7 units. You know, it works better in some units than
8 others I think probably in Southeast, but this out of
9 whack and the Board should just say we don't have any
10 objections for some of these Units. And asking the
11 Board to set some better objectives. It was too
12 complex to get into at that meeting. They said we'd
13 like to look at it in the next cycle, which the
14 Department said they would start working towards. And
15 the Department's opinion of the Proposal was neutral.
16 But it was voted down to be taken up three years later.

17

18 That's all I have.

19

20 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Larry.

21

22 Any questions from the Council.

23

24 (No comments)

25

26 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

27

28 Okay. Now I'd like to ask if there is
29 anyone online that would like to testify this morning.

30

31 (No comments)

32

33 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Well, hearing none --
34 well, we'll wait to see if there's anybody to speak.

35

36 MR. ARDIZZONE: Is there anybody on the
37 line that would like to speak to the Council this
38 morning.

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Is there anybody
43 online.

44

45 (No comments)

46

47 MR. ARDIZZONE: I don't hear anybody.

48

49 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Thank you,
50 Chuck.

1 Okay. I guess we're ready to go into
2 Proposals. And I'd like to start with WP16-03, Unit
3 15. Ms. Susan Oehlers, please.

4
5 MS. OEHLERS: Good morning, Mr.
6 Chairman, Members of the Council. For the record, my
7 name is Susan Oehlers. I'm a wildlife biologist with
8 the Forest Service here in Yakutat and I'll be
9 presenting Proposal WP16-03.

10
11 And this Proposal, submitted by Monte
12 Mitchell, requests an increase to the limit of mountain
13 goats a designated hunter may have in possession from
14 one to three in Southeast Alaska, Units 1 through 5.

15
16 The proponent states that adoption of
17 this Proposal will allow designated hunters to harvest
18 goats efficiently, fulfilling the intention of the
19 Federal Designated Hunter Program, which is important
20 for the less able-bodied hunters, like children and
21 elders. The proponent states that adoption of this
22 Proposal will not prevent other recreational,
23 commercial, and sporthunters from pursuing animals
24 within the quota and season. The proponent also states
25 that the previous concern from the Alaska Department of
26 Fish and Game that the harvest would not be
27 controllable within the point management system should
28 not impede the subsistence hunter's ability to fulfill
29 their harvest.

30
31 Just a little background on regulatory
32 history of mountain goats. So in Units 1 through 5,
33 the State Department of Fish and Game uses a weighted
34 point system whereby males equal one point and females
35 are two points. And the general management guidelines
36 are to maintain a guideline harvest not to exceed six
37 points per one hundred goats observed. And these
38 guideline harvest levels for each management area are
39 generally low, recently ranging from one through ten
40 throughout Southeast Alaska. And once the guideline
41 harvest level for an area is met, an emergency order
42 and special action are issued to close a season within
43 these areas.

44
45 And some background on the regulation.
46 In 2011, Proposal WP12-11 requested that mountain goats
47 be added to the Federal Designated Hunter permit. And
48 with concurrence from the Southeast Council, the
49 Federal Subsistence Board adopted the proposal with
50 modification to limit designated hunters to one

1 mountain goat in possession in order to minimize over-
2 harvest and potential waste, as well as to maintain
3 opportunities for other subsistence and non-Federally
4 qualified subsistence users. Mountain goats were added
5 to the Federal Designated Hunter permit for Units 1
6 through 5 starting in the 2012 regulatory year. There
7 have been numerous emergency orders and special actions
8 in recent years generally for early closure to seasons
9 once the quota has been met and for areas of declining
10 populations where any harvest would cause a
11 conservation concern.

12

13 For effects of the proposal, it's
14 difficult to predict some of the effects; however,
15 harvest of goats by designated hunters has been minimal
16 and it is likely that this pattern would continue.
17 Adoption of the proposal would allow for more efficient
18 and effective harvest and support the traditional
19 practice of hunting for others.

20

21 If designated hunters are allowed to
22 have three harvest limits in their possession at any
23 one time, they may potentially harvest two to three
24 animals out of one herd, potentially resulting in the
25 harvest quota being met sooner or being exceeded in
26 areas of low quotas before in-season closures could be
27 implemented. Designated hunters targeting two or three
28 animals out of one herd may be less selective in the
29 sex of animals taken. A subsequent higher female
30 harvest by designated hunters would result in the
31 harvest quota being reached sooner and may negatively
32 affect the reproduction rate of that population. And
33 finally, opportunity for other users to harvest goats
34 may be reduced.

35

36 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
37 oppose this Proposal 16-03. Conservation concerns over
38 goats in this Region warrant rejection of the Proposal.
39 Many areas in the Southeast Region have low quotas, as
40 low as one point in some cases. Mountain goats are at
41 low densities and/or on the decline in several portions
42 of Units 1 through 5, as evidenced by survey data,
43 lowered quotas, and multiple Federal and State season
44 closures in recent years. Allowing designated hunters
45 to have three goats in possession may concentrate
46 harvest in localized areas which may not be sustainable
47 in some populations.

48

49 And that concludes my presentation on
50 this Proposal.

1 Thank you.
2
3 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Ms.
4 Oehlers.
5
6 Any questions of Ms. Oehlers.
7
8 Robert.
9
10 MR. SCHROEDER: Ms. Oehlers, have you
11 had any direct communication with the proponent to get
12 a little bit more background on where he may be coming
13 from with this Proposal?
14
15 MS. OEHLERS: Through the Chair. No.
16 I have not.
17
18 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Cathy and then Patty.
19
20 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
21 Susan, do we have any kind of breakdown of potential
22 population estimates by Unit, where we could look at
23 which Units might have a greater conservation concern
24 than other Units?
25
26 MS. OEHLERS: Through the Chair. I
27 don't have a specific table. I just basically kind of
28 summarized what's known about the populations under
29 biological background and population trends. I did not
30 do, you know, an exact population table. That may be
31 something when the State comes up, might be appropriate
32 for the State biologist as well. But yeah, I just kind
33 of have some -- mostly summarized in a narrative form.
34
35 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Patty.
36
37 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
38 On page 58, the paragraph says the 2004 population.
39 The last sentence is past high harvest rates of nannies
40 in Unit 4 have impacted recruitment of the population
41 and recent aging of harvested females indicates the age
42 structure of this component increasing, which raised
43 conservation concerns for Managers. What does that
44 mean, indicates the age of this component increasing?
45 What component? The age of the goats are increasing?
46
47 MS. OEHLERS: I believe that's correct.
48 That that would be the increasing age of the females,
49 so potentially indicating lower recruitment.
50

1 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay. Thank you.
2
3 MS. OEHLERS: Thank you.
4
5 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other questions.
6
7 (No comments)
8
9 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Hearing none, thank
10 you, Susan. And thank you for that potluck last night.
11 That was awesome.
12
13 Oh. Excuse me.
14
15 MS. OEHLERS: Thank you.
16
17 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Douville.
18
19 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
20 Since the proponent is asking for a bag limit of three,
21 are they able to harvest these goats when they come
22 down to winter from the beach? Is that something that
23 they're able to do?
24
25 MS. OEHLERS: Through the Chair. I
26 believe so. In certain areas that that would be a
27 possibility.
28
29 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Anyone else.
30
31 (No comments)
32
33 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.
34
35 MS. OEHLERS: Thank you.
36
37 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Is there any
38 consultation reports from the Tribes or ANCSA
39 Corporations?
40
41 MR. LARSON: I am not aware of any, Mr.
42 Chair.
43
44 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. Department
45 of Fish and Game from the State.
46
47 MR. SCOTT: Good morning, Mr. Chairman
48 and Members of the Council. The Department of Fish and
49 Game recommends opposing this Proposal. Mountain goat
50 management is a challenge throughout Southeast Alaska.

1 Everything from getting the right day to fly mountain
2 goat surveys to spreading out our effort both in time
3 and our financial resources. And we do the best that
4 we can with that. That said, we have very confident
5 and driven Staff when it comes to mountain goat
6 research. And we've learned a ton about mountain goat
7 biology and ecology in the last few years.

8
9 I guess a couple of things that are
10 very notable here is our management strategy across the
11 Region. I should have had a map for you. If we put
12 Southeast Alaska up there and looked at all of our
13 mountain goat management areas, it would look like a
14 jigsaw puzzle. We take geographic areas and we cut it
15 up into smaller -- not quite down to drainages or water
16 sheds, but getting pretty close. The intent of that is
17 to provide the maximum amount of opportunity for
18 hunters. We don't want to take a GMU or a sub-unit and
19 have to close the whole area down to mountain goat
20 hunting, so we pick smaller geographic areas that we
21 can manage based on a point system. And when we reach
22 the maximum allowable points in that area, we can close
23 those smaller areas down while continuing to provide
24 maximum opportunity. The point system that we use is
25 we could males as one point, females as two points.
26 And we assess six points total for every 100 mountain
27 goats that we see. And that's kind of important. It's
28 actually the number of goats that we see.

29
30 And so we start off conservatively.
31 And there's a reason for that. Goats are very
32 susceptible to harvest, particularly female harvest.
33 And we've noted that several times in lots of places in
34 Southeast where you -- if you harvest a bunch of
35 nannies, frankly it's going to take a long time for it
36 to come back up. And that just removes that area from
37 additional opportunity down the road.

38
39 I feel like we have a very successful
40 mountain goat management program throughout the Region.
41 And again, it's truly focused on providing the maximum
42 amount of opportunity.

43
44 Now, knowing the author of this
45 Proposal and where he likes to hunt, the mountain goat
46 population is stable. It's not at high density.
47 Certainly not increasing. In northern Southeast
48 Alaska, in many places we have populations that appear
49 to be declining, some of them markedly. And we reduce
50 the amount of points available to hunters as we go.

1 This area -- again, we're kind of back
2 over towards the Chilkat Range, where we were talking
3 about deer yesterday. It's also an area that's getting
4 more and more attention by rural residents. Residents
5 out of Gustavus specifically. It's an area that's
6 accessible by boat and then there's a road system to
7 get to the high country. And from there, they go on
8 foot. By no means is mountain goat hunting easy. You
9 know, it doesn't really matter where you go. Lots of
10 people like to talk about going goat hunting, fewer
11 people do it. But it is a place that people are
12 interested in and starting to utilize the resource
13 there.

14

15 The bag limit of three -- I think the
16 thing that stands out for me is if one person can go
17 take three mountain goats, it's going to impact the
18 availability of goats to other users. And I'd
19 encourage you to keep that in mind. Very few places
20 have available goats that would exceed, you know, six
21 or seven mountain goats in a given geographic area, so
22 if you -- with a bag limit of three, you may take --
23 frankly, you may take all the points. If they're all
24 nannies, that's six. And that's a place that we would
25 probably close the harvest. Or it could be up to six
26 billies or up to three billies. So keep that in mind.
27 I think that's important to note that something like
28 this could truly impact the opportunity for other
29 hunters.

30

31 And the susceptibility to harvesting
32 females and the long term impacts to that is very
33 important. We've learned that mountain goats have
34 extreme site fidelity, meaning that they just don't
35 move around a whole lot. Females and kids and
36 yearlings in particular. Adult males certainly roam
37 and range during the rutting season, but by and large
38 there's a lot of vertical movement with mountain goats
39 seasonally. But they stay in one place. And so if you
40 end up over-harvesting an area, it's going to take some
41 time to rebuild in there.

42

43 And I believe -- one last point. You
44 know, with a larger bag limit like that, one of the
45 things that we do -- we have an extremely good working
46 relationship with mountain goat hunters throughout the
47 Region. We spend quite a bit of time. We're
48 fortunate. It's kind of a smaller community of people.
49 We've learned -- both parties. The Department and the
50 hunters have learned to stay in pretty constant

1 communication during a mountain goat season to find out
2 what's available. Is it still open. How close are we
3 to the maximum allowable points.

4

5 And we've also spent a tremendous
6 amount of time encouraging people to take billies. The
7 harvesting out of the male population with most
8 wildlife species and ungulates, it's something that has
9 the lowest impact. And we want to make sure -- we want
10 to encourage as long as we can and be successful in
11 keeping that going.

12

13 But an increased bag limit, one thought
14 is that it may not be as discriminatory as you're
15 sitting on the hillside watching a group of goats. You
16 don't have to -- you know, with an allowable one bag
17 limit in possession, you have to be kind of careful
18 what you're doing. You want to take the billies. You
19 want to get a big goat. With an additional couple of
20 animals in that bag limit, we're not sure that -- it's
21 a question in my mind, you know, would people spend as
22 much time making sure that they were harvesting the
23 males versus just harvesting the additional goats.

24

25 There's also a question of if you've
26 got three mountain goats laying down on the ground, are
27 you going to be able to get them out before they start
28 to spoil. It's important to -- you know, obviously to
29 do that. Some concern about having additional goats
30 laying on the ground and having to make multiple trips,
31 bears getting to them, and not being able to use the
32 resource. So lots of questions around this.

33

34 The current strategy and the
35 relationship we have with mountain goat hunters
36 throughout the Region seems to be very successful. And
37 again, the State recommends opposing this Proposal.

38

39 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

40

41 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Scott.

42

43 Any questions for Mr. Scott from the
44 Council.

45

46 Frank.

47

48 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
49 You're talking about points, so you said you had like
50 jigsaw puzzle. So does each part of that puzzle have

1 points in it? Is that what you're talking about? Or,
2 you know, and if you harvest from that part of the
3 jigsaw puzzle, then does that reduce the points in it?
4 I'm lost here somewhere.

5
6 MR. SCOTT: Through the Chair. Member
7 Wright, correct. So each jigsaw puzzle piece has a set
8 amount of points available to it. And again it's based
9 on six points per hundred goats we see in that area.
10 And we track that harvest in those smaller geographic
11 areas. And as goats are harvested, we reduce the
12 points to the point, no pun intended. To where we've
13 harvested all of the allowable goats in there.

14
15 And generally these are -- they're
16 small areas within a much larger hunt area. And the
17 intent is to almost micro-manage it so we don't end up
18 having to close a large area and we provide the maximum
19 opportunity for -- you know, for a GMU or a sub-unit.
20 Something like that.

21
22 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So
23 if a hunter takes a goat, so that reduces a point in
24 that area. So if there was only a certain allowed --
25 so do you have a number of points that you're not
26 allowed to take a goat in an area? And when 100 takes,
27 does that lower those points to where they can't take
28 another one, so they wouldn't be able to take three?

29
30 MR. SCOTT: Through the Chair. Member
31 Wright, that's correct. We do have places that --
32 again, trying to maximize mountain goat hunting
33 opportunity, we have places that have one or two points
34 available. Areas that have very low mountain goat
35 densities. But we want to give hunters a chance to get
36 out there and harvest. So there are places that would
37 never get to a three point limit. And if -- you know,
38 for instance, the Chilkat Range, I think the points
39 available are five or six. You know, three goats eats
40 up a lot of opportunity for additional hunters.

41
42 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
43 Another point I have is that, you know, harvesting even
44 one goat is a chore bringing that thing down from the
45 mountain. Even for one person to harvest three, I
46 think that's kind of wasteful. Because if I was a
47 young person and I was going to pack that thing, one
48 goat down is probably pretty heavy. And I'd certainly
49 take a second chance -- a second thought about going
50 back up that mountain again and coming back.

1 That's.....

2

3 (Laughter)

4

5 MR. WRIGHT: So that would be a pretty
6 tough job. Thank you.

7

8 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Frank.

9

10 Anyone else have any questions for Mr.
11 Scott.

12

13 Donald.

14

15 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Thank you.

16 Ryan, do you keep track of what percentage of the goat
17 hunters are out-of-state hunters as opposed to in-state
18 hunters?

19

20 MR. SCOTT: Through the Chair. Member
21 Hernandez, we do. I don't have that readily available.
22 Generally speaking, however, it's localized. Some of
23 the areas are much more popular with guided hunts. In
24 Unit 1C, Table 3 actually has the non-resident
25 component. And there's lots of -- there's a fair
26 amount of guiding for mountain goats, but it is -- it
27 happens in kind of the same areas all the time. The
28 Forest Service permits commercial use, so it's focused
29 in those area.

30

31 So I think it's important to point out,
32 too, that mountain goats are one of the species that
33 non-residents are required to have a guide for. And we
34 have guides throughout the Region both in rural and
35 non-rural communities.

36

37 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Patty.

38

39 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Chairman
40 Bangs. So you say you track the harvest. So let's say
41 Frank's a hunter and he wants to go up to, you know, a
42 low point area. How do you know that he wants to do
43 that?

44

45 MR. SCOTT: Through the Chair. Members
46 Phillips, so mountain goat hunts are all managed by
47 registration permits, with just a few drawing permits.
48 With the registration permits, we have required
49 reporting times. And those registration permits are
50 localized on specific -- not hunt areas, but sub-units.

1 So Unit 1D has its own permit. Unit 5 has its own
2 permit. Unit 1C, those areas. So that gives us an
3 indication anyway of where they're going to go.

4
5 And as a condition of those permits,
6 they have to report within five days of a kill. And in
7 many areas, we actually require that goat hunters come
8 in with the horns for check-in. And we confirm the sex
9 of the animal that was harvested. We measure horn
10 growth. We can age mountain goats counting annuli on
11 the horns. And we keep track of the age structure of
12 the harvest. So there are some checks and balances
13 there.

14
15 But you can imagine with a five-day
16 reporting requirement, which I think is appropriate for
17 mountain goats. As Member Wright pointed out, it's a
18 lot of work to go up and down. If you had three goats,
19 we could easily get to a situation where we could over-
20 harvest pretty quickly. And I can't stress enough how
21 important it is actually to be careful with mountain
22 goat harvest. They're very susceptible to taking too
23 many of them and creating some really long term
24 impacts.

25
26 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Scott.

27
28 Anyone else.

29
30 (No comments)

31
32 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you for your
33 report.

34
35 Okay. Now are there any Federal
36 Agencies comments.

37
38 (No comments)

39
40 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Native Tribal Village.

41
42 (No comments)

43
44 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any Agency Staff

45
46 report.

47
48 (No comments)

49
50 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Anyone online.

1 (No comments)
2
3 MR. ARDIZZONE: Is there anyone online
4 that would like to talk.
5
6 (No comments)
7
8 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Thank you,
9 Chuck.
10
11 Are there any Fish and Game Advisory
12 Committees reports or comments.
13
14 MR. LARSON: No, Mr. Chair.
15
16 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Subsistence Resource
17 Commission.
18
19 MS. CELLARIUS: Mr. Chair, Members of
20 the Council. My name is Barbara Cellarius. And I am
21 the Subsistence Coordinator for Wrangell-St. Elias
22 National Park and Preserve. Typically, this RAC meets
23 before the SRC meeting and so we're not always able to
24 get comments to you for the Unit 5 Proposals that are
25 sort of within the SRC's area of interest.
26
27 In this case, the SRC did meet last
28 week in Tazlina. However, our Yakutat seat on the
29 commission is currently vacant and the commission did
30 not feel comfortable taking action on any of the Unit 5
31 Proposals because they lacked that local knowledge. So
32 I just wanted to share with you their continuing
33 interest in this area, but lacking a member, they
34 didn't feel comfortable making recommendations on this
35 set of Proposals.
36
37 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
38
39 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you for that.
40
41 Does anybody have any questions for Ms.
42 Cellarius.
43
44 (No comments)
45
46 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Thank you.
47
48 Are there any written public comments.
49
50

1 Mr. Larson.
2
3 MR. LARSON: No, Mr. Chair. There are
4 not.
5
6 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Is there any public
7 testimony.
8
9 (No comments)
10
11 CHAIRMAN BANGS: We don't have any
12 slips on this issue.
13
14 So what's the Council's wish.
15
16 Mr. Hernandez.
17
18 MR. HERNANDEZ: Mr. Chairman, I move to
19 adopt Wildlife Proposal 16-03.
20
21 MR. DOUVILLE: Second.
22
23 CHAIRMAN BANGS: It's been moved by Mr.
24 Hernandez and seconded by Mr. Douville.
25
26 Discussion.
27
28 Oh, Mr. Douville.
29
30 MR. DOUVILLE: I'm not speaking to the
31 motion at this point, but I would like to make a
32 request that we have a map with the breakdown of the
33 Units. It would be handy in our books or it would be
34 handy right now. Then it just makes it a little bit
35 easier to grasp things.
36
37 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. That's a
38 very good point.
39
40 Any other discussion.
41
42 Mr. Hernandez.
43
44 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.
45 Chairman. I am going to vote against this Proposal. I
46 think we heard substantial testimony here from Staff
47 that kind of indicates to me that the goat populations
48 region-wide have some areas that do have conservation
49 concerns that will probably be ongoing just due to the
50 nature of the biology of the goats. This Proposal is

1 for all units including all areas and I think it could
2 be detrimental to the conservation concerns in some of
3 those areas. I think it's too broad.

4

5 Also, I agreed with some of the
6 testimony that kind of indicates that although the
7 proponent may think that he is broadening subsistence
8 opportunity, I think in the long run it could actually
9 come as a detriment to some subsistence users, you
10 know, due to the fact that this designated hunter in
11 some of these areas could provide goats to a small
12 number of people that may come at the expense of
13 actually a broader group of people who would be
14 excluded if areas get closed prematurely.

15

16 So for those main reasons, I'm going to
17 vote against it.

18

19 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Donald.

20

21 Any other discussion. I think we've
22 covered the justification.

23

24 Mr. Douville.

25

26 MR. DOUVILLE: I do not support the
27 change. Logistically it doesn't make sense for
28 somebody to shoot three goats. I've hunted goats
29 myself and that was why I asked the question that are
30 these goats available at some point on the beach where
31 perhaps you could do that, but the conservation
32 concerns are just too much to go there.

33

34 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
35 Douville.

36

37 Anyone else.

38

39 Mr. Schroeder.

40

41 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chair, I just
42 second what other Council Members said. I have real
43 concerns about this Proposal potentially encouraging
44 waste and hunting practices that really wouldn't be
45 consistent with the way subsistence users pursue their
46 activities. Because subsistence is essentially not a
47 wasteful activity. And just because of the difficulty
48 of goat hunting, I think that that would be a factor.

49

50 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.

1 Schroeder.
2
3 Anyone else.
4
5 (No comments)
6
7 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Do we have a call for
8 the question.
9
10 MR. KITKA: Question.
11
12 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Question's been called
13 by Mr. Harvey Kitka. All those in favor of passing
14 Proposal WP16-03, goat harvest limit change, signify by
15 saying aye.
16
17 (No aye votes)
18
19 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Opposed, nay.
20
21 IN UNISON: Nay.
22
23 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Motion fails
24 unanimously.
25
26 Okay. I'd like to put out a thanks
27 from the breakfast fundraiser this morning. They
28 raised \$358. So that's -- that was very good. Thank
29 everyone.
30
31 (Applause)
32
33 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. The next
34 Proposal we have up is WP16-04, Unit 1C and 5A, Moose
35 Definition.
36
37 Ms. Oehlers.
38
39 MS. OEHLERS: Good morning again, Mr.
40 Chairman, Members of the Council. For the record, my
41 name is Susan Oehlers, wildlife biologist with the
42 Forest Service here in Yakutat. And I will be
43 presenting on Proposal WP16-04.
44
45 And this Proposal, submitted by the
46 Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council,
47 requests that the term "antlered" be removed from the
48 moose harvest regulations in Unit 5B and Unit 1C
49 remainder.
50

1 The proponent states that the term
2 antlered bull is not effective since Federal
3 regulations require Federally qualified subsistence
4 users to obtain a State registration permit. And the
5 State regulations allow any bull, which is less
6 restrictive, to be taken.

7
8 The proponent states that with this
9 regulatory change, State and Federal regulations would
10 be consistent and have no effect on the moose
11 population because the hunt is already managed as any
12 bull.

13
14 Effects of the Proposal. By removing
15 the term antlered bull from the Federal Subsistence
16 Regulations would improve consistency between the State
17 and Federal regulations for moose in these units and
18 decrease this regulatory complexity for users. Adoption
19 of this Proposal is not expected to affect the moose
20 harvest since it is already managed as in any bull hunt
21 and there is a harvest quota in place for Unit 5B.

22
23 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
24 support this Proposal 16-04. Adoption of this Proposal
25 will reduce regulatory complexity for moose in Units 5B
26 and 1C remainder without resulting in any conservation
27 concern for moose in these units.

28
29 And that concludes my presentation on
30 this Proposal.

31
32 Thank you.

33
34 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Susan.

35
36 Any questions from the Council.

37
38 (No comments)

39
40 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

41
42 Is there any comments from ADF&G.

43
44 MR. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
45 The Department recommends supporting this Proposal. I
46 don't have many comments. There are no, you know,
47 biological impacts to this as we do categorize most
48 hunts as any bull or an antler restricted bull hunt and
49 the definitions are provided and written out very well.
50 I think anytime that we can bring regulations in

1 parallel, it certainly clears up any miscommunication
2 or, you know, any issues, you know, as people try to
3 interpret both the Federal and the State regulations.

4
5 Again, the Department recommends
6 supporting this Proposal.

7
8 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Scott.

9
10 Any questions from the Council.

11
12 (No comments)

13
14 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

15
16 Are there any other Agencies, Tribal
17 comments, InterAgency Staff.

18
19 (No comments)

20
21 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Is there anyone online
22 that would like to testify.

23
24 (No comments)

25
26 MR. ARDIZZONE: Is there anyone on the
27 phone that would like to testify for this proposal.

28
29 (No comments)

30
31 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Hearing none. Thank
32 you, Chuck.

33
34 Is there Fish and Game Advisory
35 Committee comments.

36
37 (No comments)

38
39 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Subsistence Resource
40 Commission.

41
42 Mr. Larson.

43
44 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yes. Is there someone
45 online that wants to speak to this.

46
47 MR. LARSON: Hold on, speaker. I've
48 got to get you on the mic. Hold on.

49
50 Okay. I'm not sure who that was. I

1 think it's a new Fish and Game employee. Can you
2 repeat what you said. I'm sorry.

3

4 All right. I don't know how to work
5 this phone. Anybody know how to get the iPhone on a
6 speaker.

7

8 Hold on a second. Technical
9 difficulties. Sorry about that. Let's try one more
10 time. You're on speaker now.

11

12 MS. KLEIN: Okay. Great. Well, I just
13 wanted to introduce myself and let you know that I was
14 listening in. And I know that there has been phone
15 problems, but my name is Jill Klein and I'm a new
16 special assistant to the commissioner here at Fish and
17 Game. And I just wanted to let you know that I'm
18 listening in and here to help out and would read the
19 State Department's -- or the Department's
20 recommendations. But I think it's more effective to
21 have Ryan -- Scott Ryan at this point because he's
22 there and in person. But just wanted to let you know
23 I'm listening in.

24

25 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you very much.

26

27 MS. KLEIN: Thank you.

28

29 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Mr. Larson, is
30 there any other comments from Advisory Committees or
31 other Councils.

32

33 MR. LARSON: No, Mr. Chair. Nor is
34 there written public comments.

35

36 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Larson.

37

38 What's the wish of the Council.

39

40 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chair, move to adopt

41 WP16-4.

42

43 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Howard.

44

45 Do we have a second.

46

47 MR. DOUVILLE: Second.

48

49 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Seconded by Mr.

50 Douville.

1 Discussion.
2
3 Mr. Schroeder.
4
5 MR. SCHROEDER: All right. Just in
6 order to -- so we have a record of decision on this, it
7 would appear that this regulatory change basically
8 brings Federal regulations into accord with State
9 regulations in a productive way and it avoids possible
10 confusion in the field. Confusion for both hunters and
11 for enforcement officers. And it really is much more
12 of a -- almost a procedural text change than a change
13 in what actually goes on for hunters. So I definitely
14 support that. And I think it's a move that is really
15 good for the Federal program to line up our language
16 with State language where we can, so that it avoids
17 confusion for hunters.
18
19 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
20 Schroeder.
21
22 Anyone else.
23
24 (No comments)
25
26 CHAIRMAN BANGS: I appreciate that,
27 Robert. It's good that we put the justification on the
28 record and explain it even if everyone is in accordance
29 with the -- it was our Proposal, but I'm glad that it
30 was explained on the record.
31
32 So does anybody call for the question.
33
34 MR. DOUVILLE: Question.
35
36 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Question's been called
37 for by Mr. Douville. All those in favor of accepting
38 Proposal WP16-04, changing the moose definition from
39 antlered bull to bull, signify it by saying aye.
40
41 IN UNISON: Aye.
42
43 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Opposed.
44
45 (No opposing votes)
46
47 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Motion carries. Thank
48 you.
49
50 Okay. Moving on here. The next

1 Proposal is WP16-05, Unit 2 Deer In-Season Management
2 Authority.

3

4 Mr. Reeves.

5

6 MR. REEVES: Good morning, Mr.
7 Chairman, Council. The Executive Summary for this
8 Proposal is on page 74 and the analysis is on page 75.

9

10

11 Proposal WP16-05 was submitted by this
12 Council and it's requesting the removal of language
13 stating that the Unit 2 deer harvest limit may be
14 reduced to four deer during times of conservation.

15

16 In 2006, the Federal Subsistence Board
17 increased the harvest limit for deer in Unit 2 and
18 adopted this language as a safeguard in case the Unit 2
19 deer population declined. In 2010, the Board delegated
20 management authority to the two U.S. Forest Service
21 District Rangers in Unit 2. Their scope of delegation
22 for deer allows them to set harvest quotas, to close,
23 reopen or adjust Federal subsistence deer seasons and
24 to adjust harvest and possession limits. With
25 authority delegated to these in-season managers, this
26 safeguard language is no longer needed.

27

28 Removing the language will give the in-
29 season managers more flexibility to provide subsistence
30 opportunity and conservation of Unit 2 deer. Adopting
31 the proposal gives them flexibility in selecting
32 appropriate harvest limits for conservation should the
33 need arise. The Proposal eliminates confusion and
34 management during times of conservation and removes
35 unnecessary regulatory language. This Proposal would
36 have no effect on other uses.

37

38 The recommendation is to support the
39 Proposal as adopting it is consistent with the
40 flexibility that was intended in that 2010 delegation
41 of authority from the Board. It eliminates any
42 confusion in conservation management of Unit 2 deer and
43 strikes regulatory language that is no longer needed in
44 Federal regulation.

45

46 Thank you.

47

48 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Jeff.

49

50 Any questions from the Council.

1 Cathy.

2

3 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
4 Jeff, on delegated authority, do you know if that's
5 something that is now on the record and it's not
6 something that's not revisited where that potential
7 could change in the future? Like right now the Board
8 has assigned delegated authority so that basically
9 these changes can happen directly through that process.
10 Is there a potential that delegated authority will be
11 taken away?

12

13 Or Chuck.

14

15 MR. ARDIZZONE: Through the Chair.
16 Delegated authority can be given or taken at any time
17 by the Board. They usually stay in place unless there
18 is a concern brought by a Council or someone else that
19 it's not being used correctly. But generally the Board
20 doesn't readdress those every few years like they would
21 for closure reviews. We have a number of delegated
22 authorities that have been in place for, you know, ten
23 or more years.

24

25 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

26

27 Mr. Larson has an observation.

28

29 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair, thank you. And
30 I would like to note that the proposed regulation
31 that's on 74 of your book, again that's been mis -- you
32 know, inappropriately formatted. If you wanted to look
33 at the actual changes in the correct format with the
34 strike-through bold, you would need to look inside of
35 the Staff analysis itself. It's on page 76.

36

37 Yeah. And maybe I should speak to
38 that. So typically what we see in our bolded language
39 is additions. Strike-through is deletions. That
40 language that remains the same is un-bolded in italics.
41 It makes it very clear. The proposed language in the
42 Executive Summary is all in bold and you can't really
43 tell that there is no additional language in the
44 Proposal. It's just strike-through. So that makes it
45 much more clear inside of the Staff analysis.

46

47 Thank you.

48

49 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Larson.

50

1 Questions.

2

3 Mr. Hernandez.

4

5 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.
6 Chair. Jeff, I guess I kind of have a question about,
7 you know, what the process is if, you know, in this
8 delegated authority with the District Rangers, what
9 would trigger a District Ranger to change a regulation
10 in-season. And is there a process that he has to go
11 through in order to make a change in-season.

12

13 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman, Mr.
14 Hernandez. Typically, with a delegation type -- you
15 know, or an in-season response, the delegated manager
16 -- of course there's a process where there would be,
17 you know, Tribal consultation and such in order to
18 initiate something like a closure. Like when we did
19 the wolf closures. They have the capability if there
20 was a problem say during the season that, you know,
21 they could immediately shut down.

22

23 This instance, I think where it could
24 pose a problem was say if we ever had a situation going
25 -- where we'd had a bad winter or to and we were going
26 into an upcoming deer season and that for some reason
27 the -- like the State wanted to lower the bag limit,
28 the language that's in regulation, it only -- at this
29 point it's giving those delegated managers two options.
30 They could reduce from five to four or they could
31 reduce from five to zero.

32

33 And so in a sense where if there was
34 say a pre-season action that there could be some kind
35 of opportunity to harvest deer in the unit, but maybe
36 that would only be maybe two deer or two bucks,
37 striking this language then will give the in-season
38 managers the ability, which they do have, to establish
39 that harvest limit prior to the upcoming season.

40

41 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Follow-up?

42

43 MR. HERNANDEZ: Follow-up. Okay. So I
44 guess what I'm hearing is this gives a lot more
45 flexibility into the management -- in-season
46 management.

47

48 And then also I think you said that
49 there would be some -- there would have to be some
50 consultation, correct?

1 MR. SCOTT: Typically, in any of our
2 delegated type of action, there is consultation. It
3 may not -- if it's an emergency case, it may not happen
4 immediately, where if we, you know, say did have to
5 close for a conservation. But we would still consult.
6 So yes.

7
8 MR. HERNANDEZ: And who are they
9 required to consult with?

10
11 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman. Typically,
12 in Unit 2 there, depending on what the, you know, the
13 species is or whatever, we typically consult with the
14 four Tribes on the island. And try to hit some
15 obviously representative Council Members in the area.
16 And in fact, in the case with wolf, we've been trying
17 to hit even, you know, key subsistence users that we
18 know that have, you know, good knowledge of the
19 species.

20
21 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Fish and Game as
22 well?

23
24 MR. SCOTT: Yes. And Fish and Game as
25 well. We're in really good contact with Fish and Game
26 during these times also.

27
28 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Douville.

29
30 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
31 Since we're dealing with a rural priority here and
32 there is wording in Title VIII that before you restrict
33 a rural user, you have to restrict non-rule users
34 first. I don't see that mentioned here. So if you
35 were reducing a bag limit here, you would in effect be
36 doing that. So how is that handled before you restrict
37 somebody in a game unit that's a rural user, how do you
38 address the non-rural.

39
40 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Douville.
41 In one sense, that would depend on the circumstance.
42 We've -- with other species at least in Unit 2, whether
43 it's been fish or, you know, with wolf, we've worked
44 close together with the State. So we've tried to
45 always at least have joint actions happen. This might
46 be a case or even a test case it was before season that
47 perhaps the sporthunting regulations might be cut to a
48 certain level. And we would -- I'm sure the in-season
49 managers and stuff would work to try to still at least
50 have a -- you know, some form of priority.

1 So it could be an example where maybe
2 the unit gets -- the sport hunt got reduced to one deer
3 and Federally qualified rural allowed two. If there
4 was a way to work a priority, we would sure, you know,
5 try to work with the Department on that. We've never
6 been pushed into a situation where we've ever had to,
7 you know, do like a -- I believe is it the .804 where
8 look at other users. Where Unit 2 does have, you know,
9 outside residents -- or, you know, residents of
10 communities outside of Unit 2 that also qualify for the
11 hunt. But something like that I suppose could be
12 considered.

13

14 But I believe that if we ever get to a
15 case, it's going to be one of two things. It's either
16 going to be a -- probably a point where we just have to
17 shut it all down during a season or ideally we'll know
18 ahead of time if it's a pre-season thing, that we'll
19 have time ahead of us to work through users and, you
20 know, the Department and Tribes and such to make sure
21 that there is a priority if it is -- if there could be
22 a priority available.

23

24 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Does that answer your
25 question?

26

27 MR. DOUVILLE: I had difficulty
28 understanding everything you said, but in my opinion,
29 there's a potential conflict here.

30

31 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Larson.

32

33 MR. LARSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
34 Maybe I can speak to this.

35

36 We're talking about in-season actions.
37 These are generally predicated on the notion that there
38 is a conservation concern that's unanticipated. The
39 normal course of events is that if the Council does not
40 meet in an appropriate time, the in-season manager
41 consults with the Chair. If the Council meets and it's
42 appropriate to have a discussion of this item before
43 the Council, then the full Council will hear. But the
44 situation that these rules and regulations are designed
45 to address are unanticipated issues regarding
46 conservation of a species. We must -- and it's in our
47 letter of delegation -- coordinate our in-season
48 management activities with the Alaska Department of
49 Fish and Game.

50

1 So when and if the in-season manager
2 would ever feel a need for action, it would be
3 coordinated with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game
4 and there would be concurrent joint action taken. So
5 this is what if. This is not the plan. The plan is to
6 have regulations brought before the Council to change,
7 but those are more long term and more permanent. So
8 these are unanticipated actions based on a conservation
9 concern that's unanticipated.

10

11 Thank you.

12

13 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Larson.

14

15 Mr. Douville.

16

17 MR. DOUVILLE: Okay. I was only
18 concerned that the rural priority may get sidestepped
19 and I didn't want to see that in any portion of it.

20

21 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mike.

22

23 Cathy.

24

25 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
26 Since this regulation was put in place, Jeff, do you
27 know if the harvest limit was ever reduced to four
28 based on conservation concerns?

29

30 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman, Ms. Needham.
31 No. There has never been any action taken since the
32 implementation of that language to reduce it down from
33 five to four.

34

35 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

36

37 Mr. Schroeder and then Patty.

38

39 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chair, given how
40 Unit 2 deer have been such a hot button issue for the
41 Council for 15 or 20 years, everyone knows that this is
42 extremely sensitive. I would support the change in the
43 language. I think the language change is appropriate.
44 It's really peculiar to have the clause, the hardest
45 one, it may be reduced to four deer. This is just kind
46 of strange wording for a regulation.

47

48 Should we pass this, I would suggest
49 that we include in our justification that the Council
50 would like to meet on any change -- any significant

1 change with deer in Unit 4. And we're able to have
2 noticed meetings. I believe we can have teleconference
3 meetings, which are noticed.

4
5 Is it a three-week notice, Mr. Larson?

6
7 It's something like that. And in the
8 past we've had a number of meetings when there is
9 something that's really important for the Council to
10 get together on outside the meeting cycle. I don't
11 think we have any need to have a special meeting if
12 there are adjustments made for most other in-season
13 management activities other than deer, specifically
14 with respect to possible in-season management actions
15 concerning wolf or other species.

16
17 So I support this change with the note
18 that we would definitely like to meet at the first
19 available opportunity as a Council in an extra online
20 meeting.

21
22 Thank you.

23
24 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
25 Schroeder.

26
27 Any other questions or comments.

28
29 Patty.

30
31 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. I think that
32 the regulatory history on page 77 and 78 is pretty
33 well-written and pretty understandable, but I have a
34 question. And that is -- and I don't want to open a
35 can of worms and I don't want to pit community against
36 community. But let's say if I wanted to -- if we
37 needed to close Noyes Island because too many wolves
38 ate too many deer, does this allow that to happen? Or
39 are you able to do that? I mean and maybe I shouldn't
40 even ask.

41
42 (Laughter)

43
44 MR. SCOTT: I don't have the letter
45 with me, but if I recall it correctly, their delegation
46 is for the Unit. I don't think that they're able to
47 micro-manage bits and pieces within the GMU.

48
49 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other questions.

50

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

4

5 Department of Fish and Game. Mr.

6 Scott.

7

8 MR. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

9 The Department of Fish and Game does support this
10 Proposal and the language change. And they -- I think
11 it really focuses on the ability of the in-season
12 managers to adapt to a fairly dynamic environment as
13 things come up and conservation concerns reveal
14 themselves.

15

16 In the case of deer not specifically to
17 Unit 2, the Department has in fairly recent years taken
18 action to address things like heavy-duty winters, where
19 we know that we've had a significant number of animals
20 die, we'll restrict the harvest to females, generally
21 providing the opportunity to harvest some, but to close
22 the female harvest season at a certain point. And in
23 that case in particular, the Federal Managers continued
24 with that. And it worked out good. So they were
25 provided additional rural opportunity in those cases.
26 And that doe harvest closure remained in place in Unit
27 4 for several years and has accomplished the goal. And
28 this is just to highlight, you know, the ability and
29 new direction really at times when things like
30 significant snowfall happens in a given winter and we
31 want to increase the herd size fairly quickly.

32

33 I also wanted to touch on the
34 relationship with the Forest Service Staff through the
35 Region. We have an excellent working relationship with
36 the Ground Managers. Mr. Reeves, Ms. Oehlers, and
37 throughout the Region. And we are in constant
38 communication really about, you know, various hunts and
39 species and conservation concerns that might pop up.

40

41 So again, the Department supports this
42 Proposal. I do believe that having the flexibility for
43 in-season management is an important component of
44 managing deer, as well as other species. And we
45 continue to work very closely with the Federal Managers
46 on all those issues that come up.

47

48 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

49

50 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Scott.

1 Any questions from the Council.
2
3 Mr. Hernandez.
4
5 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.
6 Chairman. Yeah. That's kind of what I'm thinking
7 about here. Essentially what happened in Unit 4 after
8 those severe winters, 2/06, 2/07, that whole process
9 which most of us are familiar with here on the Council,
10 that is essentially what would now take place in Unit
11 2. It sounds like we've kind of see what happened
12 here. And that's kind of how this would work. You
13 know, there was consultation with the community. There
14 was consultation with Fish and Game. And subsistence
15 priorities were all accounted for. And is that kind of
16 your -- would you agree with that? That that's kind of
17 what would happen now in Unit 2? Just sort of the way
18 it happened in Unit 4 a few years ago?
19
20 MR. SCOTT: Through the Chair. Member
21 Hernandez, I believe that's accurate. And it was a
22 process that -- it worked pretty well in Unit 4. And
23 again I think the proof is in the pudding, where
24 there's quite a few deer running around now in Unit 4
25 and I think that's largely in part of the steps that
26 both the Federal Managers and the Department took to
27 get us there.
28
29 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.
30
31 Any other questions for Mr. Scott.
32
33 (No comments)
34
35 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Ryan.
36
37 Are there any other Agency comments.
38
39 (No comments)
40
41 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any Advisory Group
42 comments.
43
44 Mr. Larson.
45
46 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair, there are no
47 Advisory Group comments, nor is there written public
48 comments.
49
50 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Is there anyone online

1 that would like to speak to this issue.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 MR. ARDIZZONE: I don't hear anyone.

6

7 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Hearing none. And
8 there's no written public comments. And we have to
9 keep in mind Mr. Wallace spoke to this issue during his
10 testimony, so there is some public testimony on this
11 Proposal.

12

13 And now we would look to the Council to
14 make action on this.

15

16 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, I move to
17 adopt 16-05.

18

19 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Howard.
20 It's been moved.

21

22 MR. KITKA: Second.

23

24 CHAIRMAN BANGS: And seconded by Mr.
25 Kitka.

26

27 Discussion.

28

29 Mr. Hernandez.

30

31 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.
32 Chairman. I will be voting in favor of this Proposal.
33 It was submitted by the Advisory Council. I think
34 we've, you know, had a good analysis of what the
35 effects of this Proposal would be. It was -- the
36 original regulation was kind of enacted sort of under
37 some special circumstances, I'd say. Back at the time
38 when we were dealing with some hard issues on Prince of
39 Wales. And the situation's changed since then. This
40 delegation of authority now seems to be firmly in place
41 and is working. It has worked in other areas. And I
42 think we could -- I think we can be assured that all
43 conservation concerns and provisions of ANILCA can
44 still be met by deleting this language.

45

46 Thank you.

47

48 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you for that
49 justification, Mr. Hernandez.

50

1 Any other comments or questions or
2 discussion.
3
4 (No comments)
5
6 MR. DOUVILLE: Call for the question.
7
8 CHAIRMAN BANGS: The question's been
9 called for by Mr. Douville. All those in favor of
10 adopting Proposal WP16-05, the deer season and
11 management authority Proposal, signify by saying aye.
12
13 IN UNISON: Aye.
14
15 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Opposed.
16
17 (No opposing votes)
18
19 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Motion passes.
20
21 Okay. I'd like to get through one more
22 Proposal before we take a break. And that is WP16-06,
23 Definition of Nunatak Bench.
24
25 Ms. Oehlers.
26
27 MS. OEHLERS: Good morning, Mr.
28 Chairman, Members of the Council. For the record, my
29 name is Susan Oehlers. I am a wildlife biologist with
30 the Forest Service here in Yakutat. And I'll be
31 presenting on WP16-06.
32
33 And this -- and I apologize. I omitted
34 the page numbers in my earlier presentations. This
35 begins on page 86 for the Executive Summary and 87 for
36 the analysis in your book.
37
38 And this Proposal 16-06, submitted by
39 the Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory
40 Council requests adding a definition of Nunatak Bench
41 to the Unit 5 Federal regulations.
42
43 There are two regulations in Unit 5
44 that refer to the Nunatak Bench, but that area is not
45 defined. The definition would be added to the Unit 5
46 descriptor and read as follows. In Unit 5A, Nunatak
47 Bench is defined as that area east of the Hubbard
48 Glacier, north of Nunatak fiord, and north and east of
49 the East Nunatak Glacier to the Canadian Border.
50

1 This is an administrative proposal and
2 not related to any particular wildlife population.

3
4 The effects of the Proposal, including
5 a definition of the Nunatak Bench, clarifies the
6 boundaries of the area and eliminates regulatory
7 complexity for Federally qualified subsistence users
8 while also providing clarity to law enforcement. The
9 Federal and State definitions would be slightly
10 different since hunting under State regulation is not
11 allowed in the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park. There
12 are no conservation concerns associated with this
13 Proposal.

14
15 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
16 support Proposal WP16-06. Adoption of this Proposal
17 will provide a definition of an area currently included
18 in regulations, but without a corresponding
19 description. Thus providing clarity on harvest
20 boundaries for both Federal subsistence users and law
21 enforcement. The purely administrative nature of this
22 Proposal, in addition to the lack of conservation
23 concerns associated with this Proposal, further
24 supports its adoption.

25
26 And that concludes my presentation.

27
28 Thank you.

29
30 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Susan.

31
32 Any questions from the Council.

33
34 (No comments)

35
36 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Hearing none. Thank
37 you.

38
39 MS. OEHLERS: Thank you.

40
41 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any consultation
42 comments, Mr. Larson?

43
44 MR. LARSON: There are none.

45
46 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

47
48 Department of Fish and Game. Mr.
49 Scott.

50

1 MR. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
2 The Department supports this. And as Ms. Oehlers laid
3 out, it is an administrative, housekeeping type
4 Proposal. But it also serves to bring area definitions
5 both with State -- the Department and State hunters
6 parallel with Federally qualified hunters as well.

7
8 The Nunatak Bench area is a place that
9 folks have hunted goats traditionally, as well as
10 moose. It's an area that we provide a very late season
11 moose hunt at times when the population will support
12 it. Same with mountain goats.

13
14 So again, the Department supports the
15 Proposal and it's just another opportunity to clarify
16 any differences in the regulatory language between the
17 Federal managers and the State.

18
19 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Scott.

20
21 Any questions from the Council.

22
23 Mr. Hernandez.

24
25 MR. HERNANDEZ: Just one, Mr. Chair.
26 Ryan, yeah. So I just want to be assured that the
27 State doesn't have a problem with the differences in
28 jurisdiction concerning the Wrangell-St. Elias National
29 Park. You have no concerns with that and how that
30 would kind of separate the definition slightly between
31 State and Federal.

32
33 MR. SCOTT: Through the Chair. Member
34 Hernandez, I am not aware of any concerns with that.

35
36 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other questions
37 from the Council.

38
39 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.

40
41 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Patty.

42
43 MS. PHILLIPS: I should have asked Ms.
44 Oehlers. So in this book, the harvest, so will it
45 outline that area in here for future reference for Unit
46 5?

47
48 Oh, thank you.

49
50 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair, if I

1 understand the question, you would like the area
2 defined in the map in Unit 5?
3
4 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.....
5
6 MR. ARDIZZONE: We'll have our GIS
7 person in the office try and work on getting that area
8 defined in the book if that's what you're asking.
9
10 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair. I wondering
11 in future books, then will it show the outline of the
12 Nunatak Bench?
13
14 MR. ARDIZZONE: Yeah. I'll have our
15 GIS specialist work on getting that into the book.
16
17 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you.
18
19 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Patty.
20
21 Any other questions or comments from
22 the Council to the State.
23
24 Thank you, Scott -- Mr. Scott.
25
26 Okay. Are there any other Agency
27 comments.
28
29 (No comments)
30
31 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any Advisory Group
32 comments.
33
34 Mr. Larson.
35
36 MR. LARSON: No, Mr. Chair. Nor are
37 there written public comments.
38
39 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Is there anyone online
40 that wants to speak to this Proposal.
41
42 (No comments)
43
44 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Hearing none, what is
45 the Council's wish.
46
47 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chair, move to adopt
48 WP16-06.
49
50 CHAIRMAN BANGS: It's been moved to

1 adopt by Mr. Howard.
2
3 MR. KITKA: Second.
4
5 CHAIRMAN BANGS: It's been seconded by
6 Mr. Kitka. Thank you.
7
8 Discussion.
9
10 Thank you, Robert.
11
12 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I
13 appreciate the presentation. I think it was very
14 clear. And I think pretty much what we're dealing with
15 is a housekeeping matter that makes our regulations a
16 little bit more understandable to users and avoids
17 confusion in the field. And so I'd be voting in favor
18 of this housekeeping measure.
19
20 Thank you.
21
22 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you for that
23 explanation, Mr. Schroeder.
24
25 Any other discussion.
26
27 MR. HERNANDEZ: Question.
28
29 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Question's been called
30 for by Mr. Hernandez. All those in favor of adopting
31 WP16-06, the definition of the Nunatak Bench, signify
32 by saying aye.
33
34 IN UNISON: Aye.
35
36 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Opposed, nay.
37
38 (No opposing votes)
39
40 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Motion carries
41 unanimously.
42
43 Okay. Thank you. And we'll take a ten
44 minute break.
45
46 (Off record)
47
48 (On record)
49
50 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Thank you.

1 Okay. Now we're going to take up the next Proposal
2 WP16-07, Trapping Beaver with a Firearm. This will be
3 interesting.

4

5 MR. REEVES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
6 Good morning. For the record, my name is Jeff Reeves
7 with the Forest Service. The Executive Summary for
8 this Proposal is on page 91. The analysis begins on
9 page 92 in your materials.

10

11 Proposal 16-07 was submitted by this
12 Council and it's requesting that firearms be allowed
13 for harvesting beaver in Units 1 through 5 under the
14 Federal subsistence trapping regulations.

15

16 During the January 2015, the Alaska
17 Board of Game considered Proposal 15 to allow beaver to
18 be taken with a firearm under the terms of a State
19 trapping license in Unit 2, which this proponent
20 submitted comments of support to. The Alaska Board of
21 Game amended that Proposal to apply to Units 1 through
22 5. The proponent stated that the reasons why this
23 similar change should be made in Federal regulations
24 was to provide consistency in both the State and
25 Federal regulations. And that taking a beaver with a
26 firearm was allowed in other parts of the State. That
27 beaver are often used for food and that there are no
28 conservation issues with beaver in these units. And
29 that any harvesting of beaver with a firearm by
30 trappers is not likely to substantially increase the
31 overall harvest.

32

33 The Federal trapping regulations in the
34 units were adopted from State trapping regulations at
35 the time of Federal management beginning. Although
36 trapping regulations will typically allow a trapper
37 furbearers with a firearm, the harvest of beaver in
38 Southeast Alaska with this method had been prohibited.
39 Additionally, National Park Service prohibits the use
40 of firearms to take free-ranging furbearers under a
41 trapping license. Beaver populations in Units 1
42 through 5 are considered healthy and harvest in these
43 units has ranged from 106 to 515 beaver since 2000.
44 Harvest in Unit 2 typically averages 61 percent of the
45 entire Southeast area harvest and harvest seems to be
46 more of a function of trapper interest in fur prices
47 rather than abundance.

48

49 Allowing the take of beaver with a
50 firearm should not dramatically increase beaver harvest

1 or create conservation issues. The Proposal will align
2 State and Federal regulations and provided Federally
3 qualified users an additional method for harvesting
4 beaver. The Proposal would not apply on National Park
5 Service lands as separate provision currently restricts
6 firearm use on lands within their jurisdiction.

7
8 The recommendation is to support
9 Proposal 16-07 with modification. And the modification
10 language would specify that the firearms may not be
11 used on Park Service lands. So the modified regulation
12 would read in Units 1 through 5 a firearm may be used
13 to take beaver under a trapping license during an open
14 beaver season except on National Park Service lands.
15 Allowing beaver -- or excuse me -- firearms to take
16 beaver will provide for better quality when taking a
17 beaver for food and is allowed in other areas of the
18 State. If adopted as modified, the proposal does not
19 create conservation issues as beaver populations in
20 these units are healthy. This will provide an
21 additional means for harvesting beaver, as well as
22 aligning State and Federal regulations while
23 maintaining the prohibition of firearm use on Park
24 Service lands.

25
26 Thank you.

27
28 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Jeff.

29
30 Any questions from the Council to Mr.
31 Reeves.

32
33 Cathy.

34
35 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
36 When this Proposal came before the Board of Fish, this
37 Council reviewed the Proposal and then made comments at
38 the Board of Fish -- sorry Board of Game -- Board of
39 Game meeting. And I was the Council Member that
40 representing the Council in doing that. And the Board
41 of Game asked a question that I couldn't answer. And
42 that was with respect to beavers, do we know how much
43 of the harvest is taken by subsistence users. Is it an
44 important subsistence species.

45
46 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman, Ms. Needham.
47 Yeah. I don't know if we could totally quantify that.
48 It's probably -- in most cases in every unit it's being
49 taken -- they're being taken by Federally qualified
50 users. I'm sure the State might be able to provide a

1 little bit better depending how -- I guess how detailed
2 the sealing data is.

3

4 Because beavers do need to be sealed.

5

6 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

7

8 Any other questions for Mr. Reeves.

9

10 Don.

11

12 MR. HERNANDEZ: Under subsistence
13 regulations, are the trappers allowed to sell their
14 beaver pelts under customary trade?

15

16 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman, Mr.
17 Hernandez. I don't know of any restrictions to
18 Federally qualified users under Federal regulations
19 about selling their pelts.

20

21 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other questions
22 for Jeff.

23

24 Mr. Schroeder.

25

26 MR. SCHROEDER: Jeff, in many parts of
27 the State, are there hunting regulations for beaver?
28 And I don't think we have those in Southeast, so that's
29 a question. I don't believe we have them in Southeast.
30 And is your feeling that at some time we may address
31 beaver hunting in Southeast, which would eliminate the
32 need for someone to have a trapping license; is that
33 correct? Or fill me in if I'm missing some things
34 here.

35

36 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman, Mr.
37 Schroeder. I suppose that could be the case. So if --
38 I mean there is options for users or even this Council
39 to submit a Proposal should that be allowed. I know
40 from personal experience when I lived in Unit 18,
41 there's both hunting and trapping regulations on it.
42 But that was due to the explosion of the beaver
43 population up there, where the hunting regulation came
44 into play. But it would -- I suppose it would just --
45 it would take a Proposal to look into that.

46

47 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

48

49 Any other questions for Mr. Reeves.

50

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Jeff.

4

5 Mr. Scott, do you have anything from
6 the State?

7

8 MR. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

9 The Department recommends supporting this Proposal,
10 largely again as an opportunity to bring Federal
11 regulations and State regulations in to -- to parallel.

12

13

14 As Member Needham mentioned, this came
15 up at the Board of Game meeting in January of 2015. It
16 was a Proposal that we've seen several times of the
17 years and the Region has generally opposed the harvest
18 of beavers with a firearm. And the two leading reasons
19 for that are waste. Concerns that shot beavers might
20 not be retrievable. And then public safety issues,
21 especially around communities.

22

23 If you do look throughout the State, it
24 is an allowable method for harvest for beavers in many
25 places. And largely those places were based on
26 consumption of the animals. And that all said,
27 ultimately the Board did pass this Proposal in January.
28 And now it is an authorized method to take beavers,
29 which are classified as furbearers and fall under the
30 definitions of a trapping license, that they're needed.
31 So the use of a firearm actually will go into State
32 regulation as an allowable method to harvest this
33 particular furbearer.

34

35 I'd also add that in many communities
36 there's overlapping municipal ordinances and things
37 like that to prohibit the discharge of firearms within
38 city limits or borough service areas and things like
39 that. So there are some protections built in for large
40 communities.

41

42 We don't see a conservation concern
43 with this. Beaver trapping is very popular throughout
44 the Region. And we're actually in hopes somewhat that
45 the number of nuisance permits that we issue for
46 beavers where they're clogging up culverts and flooding
47 out roads and runways. You know, Yakutat's actually an
48 example of that. Some of those would be reduced by
49 providing one more tool for trappers to use to harvest
50 the animals.

1 So again, Mr. Chairman, the Department
2 supports this.
3
4 And I'm available for any questions.
5
6 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Scott.
7
8 Any questions from the Council.
9
10 (No comments)
11
12 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Seeing none, thank
13 you.
14
15 Are there any other Agency comments.
16
17 Mr. Larson.
18
19 MR. LARSON: No, Mr. Chair.
20
21 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Is there anyone online
22 that would like to speak to this proposal.
23
24 (No comments)
25
26 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Hearing none.
27
28 Any Advisory Group comments.
29
30 MR. LARSON: No, Mr. Chair.
31
32 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any written public
33 comments.
34
35 MR. LARSON: No, Mr. Chair.
36
37 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Public testimony.
38
39 (No comments)
40
41 CHAIRMAN BANGS: What's the wish of the
42 Council.
43
44 Cathy.
45
46 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
47 move to adopt Wildlife Proposal 16-07, as amended, to
48 read in Units 1 through 5 a firearm may be used to take
49 beaver under a trapping license during an open beaver
50 season, except on National Park Service lands.

1 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.
2
3 Do I have a second.
4
5 MR. YEAGER: Second.
6
7 CHAIRMAN BANGS: It's been moved by
8 Member Needham and seconded by Mr. Yeager.
9
10 Discussion.
11
12 Mr. Schroeder and then Mr. Hernandez.
13
14 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I think
15 this is another instance of where we're making a -- by
16 passing this regulation, we make life a little bit
17 easier for people who are trapping beaver, so that
18 they'd have the same regulations under State trapping
19 and Federal trapping regulations. And I would be
20 supporting this Proposal for that purpose.
21
22 I'd also note that State-wide, the use
23 of a firearm for trapping beaver is a permissible
24 activity.
25
26 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
27 Schroeder.
28
29 Mr. Hernandez.
30
31 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.
32 Chairman. I'll also be voting in favor of this
33 Proposal. I think I'm going to view it as a
34 housekeeping Proposal to align State and Federal
35 regulations. I believe that any concerns about
36 conservation have probably been dealt with in the
37 process of the State adopting their regulation. I feel
38 confident that as long as this beaver firearm use is
39 done under the trapping regulations, trapping is well
40 regulated. Hides have to be sealed and reported. And
41 taking them with a firearm will probably not cause any
42 conservation concerns.
43
44 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Don.
45
46 Any other discussion.
47
48 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.
49
50 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Patty.

1 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. Well, I
2 didn't realize that the beaver season went to May 15th,
3 so I learned something.

4
5 So are we -- was the motion for the
6 modified? Okay. Thank you.

7
8 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other discussion.

9
10 (No comments)

11
12 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Do I hear a call for
13 the question.

14
15 MR. YEAGER: Question.

16
17 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Question's been called
18 for by Mr. Yeager. All those in favor of adopting
19 WP16-07, as modified, say aye.

20
21 IN UNISON: Aye.

22
23 CHAIRMAN BANGS: All those opposed,
24 nay.

25
26 (No opposing votes)

27
28 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Motion carries
29 unanimously.

30
31 Thank you.

32
33 Next Proposal is WP16-08, Unit 2, Use
34 of Deer Tags.

35
36 Mr. Reeves.

37
38 MR. REEVES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
39 Again, Jeff Reeves, U.S. Forest Service. So the
40 Executive Summary is on page 96. The Analysis is on
41 page 97. I also took a quick glance. You'll notice
42 that this one, it's -- in the Executive Summary, that
43 the proposed regulation, as Mr. Larson has mentioned on
44 a couple, is all in bold. So the actual regulation as
45 it should be is on page 99, when you get to that point.

46
47
48 So Proposal 16-08 was also again
49 submitted by this Council. And it requests that deer
50 harvest ticket number five be validated out of sequence

1 to record a female deer when it is taken in Unit 2.

2

3 The proposal was submitted following
4 concerns brought forth during your winter meeting,
5 where you identified that there was a perceived lack of
6 accountability regarding the take of female deer in
7 Unit 2. Federal regulation allows subsistence users to
8 harvest one female deer from Federal lands after
9 October 15th. Concern exists that some subsistence
10 users are harvesting more than one female deer since
11 deer harvest tickets only require that the month and
12 day of harvest be recorded, but not the sex of the
13 deer.

14

15 Federal harvest of antlerless deer in
16 Unit 2 began in 1995, with a Federal permit required
17 for that harvest through the year 2004. In 2005, this
18 Council submitted a Proposal that all deer hunters
19 would obtain Federal registration permits to hunt in
20 Unit 2. Since the Council desired one harvest
21 reporting means, you also submitted a Proposal to the
22 Alaska Board of Game requiring State-issued
23 registration permits for all Unit 2 deer hunters.

24

25 The intention of the two Proposals was
26 that the Federal Subsistence Board would only act on
27 their Proposal should the Board of Game choose not to
28 act. With no action by the Board of Game, this Council
29 modified the Proposal from a registration permit to use
30 State harvest tickets in a joint State/Federal Unit 2
31 Harvest Report, as recommended by the Unit 2 deer
32 planning sub-committee. The Board adopted this
33 Proposal as modified.

34

35 A similar Proposal to the one on the
36 table was submitted in 2006 requesting validation of
37 harvest ticket number one when an antlerless deer was
38 taken. Although the proponent had suggest that any
39 other harvest ticket could be used as an alternative
40 harvest ticket, there was a perceived loophole seen and
41 the Proposal was opposed.

42

43 In 2011, the Alaska Board of Game
44 replaced the State mail-out deer survey with the deer
45 harvest report card for Unit 1 through 5. The joint
46 harvest report for Unit 2 was no longer necessary. And
47 as a result, the Proposal rescinding the requirement
48 that Federally qualified users complete that joint
49 State Federal harvest report was adopted by the Board.

50

1 Estimated female deer harvest in Unit 2
2 averages about 4.2 percent of the total estimated deer
3 harvest within the unit. State regulation requires
4 that harvest tickets for deer used in sequence and
5 Federal hunters are bound by the State harvest
6 recording requirements unless otherwise specified in
7 Federal regulation.

8
9 This Proposal would provide that
10 exception to Federally qualified users by recording the
11 harvest of female deer out of sequence in Unit 2 and
12 should hopefully provide better control of female deer
13 harvest. Requiring use of a specific harvest ticket
14 for the harvest of a female deer should not cause undue
15 burden on Federally qualified users and may assist law
16 enforcement in monitoring female deer harvest.

17
18 Recommendation is to support Proposal
19 16-08, as the Proposal provides better tracking of
20 female deer harvested in Unit 2 and requiring the use
21 of a specific harvest ticket for the harvest of female
22 deer does not cause undue burden and assists law
23 enforcement in monitoring female deer harvest.

24
25 Thank you.

26
27 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Jeff.

28
29 Is there any questions for Mr. Reeves
30 from the Council.

31
32 Mr. Hernandez.

33
34 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.
35 Chairman. Jeff, you did give an estimate for the
36 number of deer harvested. And I'm just wondering, how
37 did you come about getting that estimate. Essentially
38 since the registration has been eliminated, there's
39 really no reporting requirement. So are you getting
40 that from just hunter surveys or where does that
41 estimate come from?

42
43 MR. REEVES: Mr. Chairman, Mr.
44 Hernandez. And hopefully maybe Mr. Scott could further
45 elaborate when he comes to the table. But basically
46 Statewide now there is a hunt report attached to deer
47 tags. And on each line item on there, you do record
48 whether you took a male or female deer. And so that
49 system is used. It's not a mandatory system, so I
50 believe that there is like a statistical expansion off

1 of the returns. But you can let Mr. Scott explain that
2 because I'm sure he's more familiar.

3

4 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

5

6 Any other questions for Mr. Reeves.

7

8 Mr. Howard.

9

10 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

11 I have a question. You stated that there was concern
12 that subsistence hunters are taking more females than
13 you thought necessary. Where did that data come from
14 and why was it just subsistence hunters and not just
15 hunters in general?

16

17 MR. REEVES: Mr. Bangs -- excuse me --
18 Mr. Chairman and Mr. Howard. In Unit 2, Federal
19 hunters are only allowed up to one female deer. Anyone
20 hunting under non-Federal regulation is only allowed to
21 harvest male deer or bucks. I know there's been
22 concern -- I think Mr. Douville was -- there was
23 concern brought forth to him before this past winter
24 meeting. And I know there's also been folks that have
25 come into my own office and they just -- the concern
26 is, is what's happening is that someone's, you know,
27 Federally qualified harvesting a doe. But since they
28 get it back -- and they're only entitled to one --
29 well, since no one saw them, then they're going out and
30 harvesting another one. And so the Proposal was
31 submitted to hopefully solve that if it was a problem.

32

33 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Follow-up.

34

35 Mr. Howard.

36

37 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

38 That seems to be consistent across the Board. There's
39 no real data supporting it, but there's hearsay that
40 that happens in our community at home also. So that's
41 why I asked the question if there was data supporting
42 that now. You're telling me you're hearing that
43 they're taking one home and then they go out and get
44 another one. So that -- you know, they're -- as far as
45 I understand it, you know, you actually have to have
46 proof of that.

47

48 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

49

50 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

1 Any other questions for Mr. Reeves.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Jeff.

6

7 Mr. Scott, ADF&G.

8

9 MR. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

10 The Department does recommend supporting this Proposal.

11 It's largely -- as laid out by Mr. Reeves, State

12 requirements require deer hunters and harvesters to use

13 their tickets in sequential order -- one, two, three,

14 four. In addition, you have to carry all your unused

15 tickets with you in the field, including number five

16 and six, which typically -- under State regulations you

17 can't take up the sixth deer as an individual hunter.

18

19 I think that using those in sequential

20 order gives Enforcement Agencies, as well as Management

21 Staff the ability just to -- if needed. And it's not

22 needed very often, I don't believe. To be able to

23 monitor where an individual hunter is in their harvest

24 chronology. Have they taken one, two, three, or four.

25 And then the majority of areas are limited to four

26 deer.

27

28 You know, throughout most of the areas

29 under State regulations you can harvest any deer.

30 There are exceptions to that. Unit 3, the Yakutat area

31 as well, and then some areas along the mainland

32 portions of the Region, where it's limited to bucks

33 only. And we take that strategy because of deer

34 densities. Generally speaking, lower number of animals

35 available and we want to conserve that female portion

36 of the population.

37

38 In the case of Unit 2, it's -- I think

39 I made the comment yesterday that the current strategy

40 seems to be working pretty well. Deer numbers seem to

41 be very strong. We've looked at the harvest as well

42 and lots of animals are available to be harvested and

43 hunters are taking advantage of that. The lion's share

44 of the harvest does come from Unit 2 residents, with,

45 you know, a few folks from various communities across

46 the Region.

47

48 The concludes my comments. And as

49 mentioned, the Department supports this Proposal.

50

1 And I'm available for any questions.
2
3 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Scott.
4
5 Any questions from the Council.
6
7 Mr. Schroeder.
8
9 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Scott, is there any
10 problem since the other State regulations require
11 people using deer tags sequentially and this would say
12 no, you don't use them sequentially. We want you to
13 use number five for a female deer. Are we causing some
14 problem that we don't want to cause?
15
16 MR. SCOTT: Through the Chair. Member
17 Schroeder, that question occurred to me as well. I
18 don't believe it will be a big issue predominantly
19 because under State regs it is a bag limit of four deer
20 -- four bucks. And then for Federally qualified, which
21 will -- you know, it identifies the group of people
22 that the regulation will be applicable to. State
23 hunters, one, two, three, four. They've all got to be
24 bucks. Federally qualified hunters, you can use number
25 five to capture the female harvest.
26
27 So the potential is there to be a
28 little bit murky, but I think that it will be fine. I
29 don't see any big concerns with it.
30
31 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Follow-up.
32
33 Bob.
34
35 MR. SCHROEDER: Just the follow-up
36 would be that I think it -- I'm following what you're
37 saying. I think it works good for most people. But
38 then there's always somebody who goes out with their
39 buddy from Angoon after they got their female deer.
40 I'm just thinking of the possibilities. And, you know,
41 just if you've been around long enough, you get these
42 weird enforcement things that aren't intended. And I'm
43 just wondering if you see that that could be a
44 difficulty. I think you're following what I'm saying.
45
46 MR. SCOTT: Through the Chair. Member
47 Schroeder, yeah. I guess maybe to lay out what I think
48 you're getting at, a non-Federally qualified hunter
49 hunts with a Federally qualified hunter. Sees somebody
50 punch tag number five out of order. The potential is

1 there for confusion for sure, but, you know, hunters
2 have a responsibility to also know the regulations for
3 what they qualify for. So I think that it -- there's
4 almost no doubt that it will come up at some point, but
5 I think it will be a minor issue.

6

7

CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Hernandez.

8

9

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.
10 Chairman. I guess I'm kind of in line on what Bob was
11 questioning about there. I guess I'm kind of seeing,
12 you know, a situation like myself and many people in my
13 community. I mean I live in Unit 2 and I hunt Unit 2,
14 but I also go over and hunt Unit 3. So when I'm in
15 Unit 3, I have tags that are -- might be punched out of
16 order. You know, is Enforcement going to question, you
17 know, why I've done that. Am I in violation in some
18 way. So do you see any potential for confusion in that
19 -- instances like that? Or I think what Bob was saying
20 is if somebody hunts Unit 2 and then they go and hunt
21 Unit 4 where, you know, this regulation would not
22 apply. So, yeah.

23

24

MR. SCOTT: Through the Chair. Member
25 Hernandez, I think it does get a little bit more
26 complicated when you start moving around in units, but
27 that occurs now. For instance, if you hunt in Unit 1C
28 where we have a bag limit of four deer and you go to
29 the mainland to harvest two bucks, you only have two
30 deer left in a bag limit. So I can't speak for the
31 Enforcement guys, the wildlife troopers or the Forest
32 Service LEOs that might contact folks out there. My
33 experience has been that if you have a conservation
34 with the hunter and you walk through where you've
35 hunted and -- and hunters are -- you know, they're
36 pretty good about remembering, you know, the big bucks
37 and stuff, where they shot them. And they can usually
38 recite that pretty quickly. I think that as long as it
39 can be explained, I don't know that it will be a
40 significant issue.

41

42

But it does get more complicated as you
43 bounce around GMUs for sure.

44

45

CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

46

47

Anyone else have any questions.

48

49

Mr. Howard.

50

1 MR. HOWARD: Just a question. Mr.
2 Wallace wanted some of the language removed and this to
3 be consistent with the other one we adopted. He wanted
4 the -- the harvest limit may be reduced to four deer
5 based on conservation concerns. He wanted that removed
6 from this. Will you still report that or do you see
7 any issues with that?

8
9 MR. SCOTT: Through the Chair. Member
10 Howard, I'm not sure that I saw that portion of it.
11 And I'm looking quickly to catch back up to you. I
12 think though that, you know, in our discussion in --
13 with one of the previous -- one of the.....

14
15 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Excuse me. I think
16 Mr. Larson can clear it up for us.

17
18 MR. LARSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The
19 issue is with the remaining existing Federal
20 regulations. So if the Board changes existing
21 regulations, then of course that piece, you know, is
22 not valid anymore. So I would -- based on the previous
23 actions of the Council, I would guess that that piece
24 is not going to be there by the time the Board takes up
25 this Proposal. So if that makes any sense.

26
27 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Does that make sense
28 to you, Mr. Scott?

29
30 MR. SCOTT: Yes, Mr. Chairman. It
31 does. It clears my -- yeah.

32
33 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Hernandez.

34
35 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.
36 Chairman. I did have one other question for Jeff,
37 which you might be able to clarify. I guess, you know,
38 one of our concerns has always been, you know, keeping
39 track of how many does are taken. We kind of recognize
40 we have a doe season, but we really don't want it to be
41 too excessive. So I guess I asked Jeff how they come
42 up with these estimates of how many does are taken.
43 And then will this adoption of this Proposal help them
44 in gaining that information in any way.

45
46 MR. SCOTT: Through the Chair. Member
47 Hernandez, I appreciate you asking the question. Our
48 deer management program has experienced an overhaul in
49 the last five or six years, where we've moved away
50 largely from random surveys where we would select 30

1 percent of deer harvest ticket holders and randomly
2 select them. Fire out the surveys. We'd get the
3 information back and then we would use that to expand
4 and we would estimate the harvest. It's a challenge to
5 get those surveys back. And if we were -- we would
6 strive for about 60 percent. You know, if we could get
7 -- generally the first go around, we'd get about 30
8 percent. We'd send out reminders. And we'd slowly get
9 up there to about 60 percent. And that's where
10 statistically we could use that information with some
11 confidence.

12
13 I believe Mr. Reeves mentioned that in
14 2011 we moved away from the random sample or surveys
15 and implemented a deer harvest report card that comes
16 with your harvest tickets now. We still have some of
17 the same challenges where we don't get all of the
18 harvest reporting back as quickly as you might expect,
19 but with some reminders and some encouragement we've
20 actually done pretty well getting hunters to return
21 that information. And on those cards -- I wish I had
22 an example, but maybe you have one with you even --
23 you'll see that the questions are did you hunt -- yes,
24 no. Did you harvest -- yes, no. Where did you
25 harvest. How many days were you there. Sometimes
26 transportation. And then male or female, does or
27 bucks. So we rely exclusively on the information we
28 get back through those harvest report cards.

29
30 And it's something that I think hunters
31 by and large throughout the Region, throughout
32 Southeast Alaska, as well as Prince William Sound at
33 this point are doing pretty well at getting back to us.
34 That said, we still expand those numbers out. If we
35 can get to about 60 percent reporting, we'll take that
36 information. We have the option of using just the hard
37 data that we have back. We're expanding it across the
38 Region. We do expand it out a little bit. So there is
39 an estimate. It's a much more tight estimate versus
40 the random surveys that we really had a hard time
41 getting the information back.

42
43 And in interactions with deer hunters,
44 I think that it's important that the Department, as
45 well as the Federal Managers, we point out how -- you
46 know, how important that data really is to track not
47 only sex ratios in the harvest, but effort in certain
48 areas, how many animals are coming out of certain
49 areas, and things like that. So we use the -- the
50 reporting requirements now, generally we send out at

1 least a single reminder, if not two reminders, and we
2 found that we can get up to a high enough reporting
3 rate that we can confidently use that information.

4

5 So that's how we track the number of
6 bucks, does, and locations of harvest. Everything from
7 GMU down to the watershed, which is -- you know, it's
8 fairly detailed at that point.

9

10 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Follow-up.

11

12 Mr. Hernandez.

13

14 MR. HERNANDEZ: So you feel fairly
15 confident that that 4.2 percent harvest rate that Jeff
16 told us is accurate?

17

18 MR. SCOTT: Through the Chair. Member
19 Hernandez. I do. Yeah. It's -- you know, it's
20 certainly the numbers that we have. And it's calculated
21 from those harvest reports, so I do.

22

23 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

24

25 Any other questions.

26

27 Mr. Howard.

28

29 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Is
30 there a solution you could think of as far as
31 addressing maybe someone from Unit 2 coming up to Unit
32 4 hunting or the opposite? From Unit 4 -- say I go
33 visit my cousin in Hydaburg and he decides he wants me
34 to go hunting with him. Is there something maybe -- an
35 idea you've come up with to keep those tags separate?
36 So you have an idea that I've come down from Unit 4 and
37 he's from Unit 2?

38

39 MR. SCOTT: Through the Chair. Member
40 Howard, I -- yeah. I don't have a great idea. I think
41 though that we have a cushion built in to receiving six
42 harvest tickets in a booklet. And it's still incumbent
43 on the hunter to pay attention to what the bag limits
44 are for the areas that they will be hunting. But by
45 and large, having those six harvest tickets provides
46 the opportunity to move around in the GMUs -- and
47 specifically talking about Federally qualified hunters
48 at this point.

49

50 In addition, there's additional

1 opportunity there both on the State and the Federal
2 systems where we have proxy hunting for deer on the
3 State side and then designated hunters for deer on the
4 Federal side, where the designated hunter or the proxy
5 hunter will actually be using the harvest tickets of
6 the beneficiary. So I think there's lots of
7 opportunities, but it does give a little bit -- it gets
8 murky, as you've pointed out, when people start jumping
9 around the unit. That said, people do it all the time
10 and it's certainly -- you know, I think it's a system
11 that's working fairly well.

12

13 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Scott.

14

15 Mr. Hernandez.

16

17 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you. But I think
18 in order to answer Albert's question, you have to point
19 out that as a resident of Unit 4, you do not have a
20 customary and traditional use designation for Unit 2
21 deer. So if you wanted to go visit your cousin in
22 Hydaburg and hunt under Federal regulations, you would
23 not be qualified. So you would not be able to take a
24 doe. And if you had four tags punched in Unit 4, you
25 would not be able to use that fifth tag in Unit 2. And
26 I mean that just kind of points out why we're going
27 through this discussion on customary and traditional
28 use.

29

30 So in answer to your question, no. You
31 would not be able to hunt for subsistence on Prince of
32 Wales Island.

33

34 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Howard.

35

36 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, his
37 definition of customary and traditional is probably
38 different than mine. You know, who's to say a long
39 time ago my ancestor didn't go down to Hydaburg and
40 visit and hunt.

41

42 So thank you, Mr. Chair.

43

44 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Albert.

45

46 Any other questions for Mr. Scott.

47

48 (No comments)

49

50 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Seeing none. Thank

1 you.
2
3 Is there any other Federal Agency
4 comments.
5
6 Mr. Larson.
7
8 MR. LARSON: No, Mr. Chair.
9
10 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Is there anyone online
11 that would like to speak to this Proposal.
12
13 (No comments)
14
15 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Hearing none. Are
16 there any written public testimony comments.
17
18 MR. LARSON: No, Mr. Chair. There are
19 not.
20
21 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Are there any other
22 group -- advisory group or anything.
23
24 MR. LARSON: No, Mr. Chair.
25
26 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Thank you, Mr.
27 Larson.
28
29 What's the Council's will.
30
31 Mr. Howard.
32
33 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, will to
34 adopt WP16-08.
35
36 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Do we have a second.
37
38 MR. DOUVILLE: Second.
39
40 CHAIRMAN BANGS: It's been seconded by
41 Mr. Douville.
42
43 Discussion.
44
45 Mr. Kitka.
46
47 MR. KITKA: I too would like to see
48 this. We already modified WP16-05 and it's kind of the
49 same thing. And there just needs to be -- to strike
50 out that the harvest limit may be reduced based on

1 conservation concerns. We need to strike it out and
2 kind of mirror the WP16-05.

3

4 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Schroeder and then
5 Ms. Needham.

6

7 MR. SCHROEDER: I won't be in support
8 of this Proposal for a number of reasons. First is
9 that I don't believe that we have serious evidence that
10 we have a concern about excessive doe harvest on Prince
11 of Wales Island. I also had the occasion to work on
12 Prince of Wales Island on deer issues some years ago
13 and one interview project focused with expert hunters.
14 People who'd been around 25, 30 years hunting on the
15 island. And my last question was how often have you
16 been checked by enforcement. And the answer -- and
17 these were interviews that took place in five
18 communities. And virtually all of the people -- the
19 expert hunters had never been checked. So I think it's
20 a bit of an illusion that somehow if we put some
21 handcuffs on people it's going to change what they do
22 out there.

23

24 But my main reason for not voting for
25 this is that people do move around in Southeast Alaska
26 and there will be a fair number of people who hunt on
27 Prince of Wales and then find themselves hunting, as
28 Federally qualified subsistence users or as other
29 hunters, someplace else. And we should not pass a
30 regulation that puts folks in jeopardy. We shouldn't
31 pass a regulation that requires someone to come up with
32 some explanation to an enforcement officer that the
33 enforcement officer may not be able to accept. I mean
34 enforcement -- we don't have enforcement here to
35 comment on this, but enforcement -- if enforcement
36 finds a violation, may not have a whole lot of
37 discretion and say well, I guess I understand the
38 regulations. They're a little confusing. You did what
39 you're supposed to do, but it doesn't line up with what
40 my charge is. And that's just not a good idea to do
41 things that way.

42

43 So unless we have -- the only thing
44 that would override that would be if we had some real
45 serious concern about too many does being taken on
46 Prince of Wales. And I haven't seen that that's --
47 evidence for that has been presented.

48

49 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

50

1 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

2

3 Mr. Bloom and then Mr. Douville.

4

5 MR. BLOOM: Yes. Thank you, Mr.
6 Chairman. There are a couple of comments that have
7 made some confusion in my mind. And I'd like to make
8 sure we get them cleared up.

9

10 Mr. Kitka made a comment and I think
11 there's a lack of understanding that just because we
12 pass one of these Proposals that it is now in effect.
13 Mr. Kitka wanted us -- or was asking about removing
14 certain language from this Proposal. Well, that
15 language will -- my understanding is that will only be
16 removed once the Board approves this Proposal. And I'm
17 not sure that that's totally understood. We're not
18 voting on removing the language from WP05 from WP16-08.
19 So that should be clarified.

20

21 The other thing I'm a little confused
22 about is we're the proponent for this Proposal. Why
23 did we bring it forth if now there seems to be some
24 feelings that it's not a good Proposal. I'm having a
25 little trouble understanding that.

26

27 Thank you.

28

29 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Bloom.
30 That's why we have an analysis done. Because some
31 things we aren't made aware of when we make the
32 Proposal. And this is just my opinion. This is what
33 happens and it's happened in the past. We voted down
34 Proposals that we've submitted in the past as well just
35 because of new information that comes that make
36 something that we overlooked when we submitted the
37 Proposal.

38

39 Anyway, a follow-up.

40

41 MR. BLOOM: Well, I agree with that,
42 except that in this case the OSM is in favor of -- or
43 supported our Proposal. So there's not any really new
44 information that, you know, would suggest that we
45 weren't considering it carefully enough.

46

47 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Well, I think it had
48 more to do with the confusion that was brought forth by
49 the possibility when we discussed possible confusion
50 about enforcement. And in my mind, that brings us

1 question.

2

3

Mr. Douville.

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

MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I intend to support this Proposal. There is no conservation concern. It is not detrimental to subsistence needs or users. And it will not restrict any users. It will simply make the doe harvest more accountable, which may even reduce the doe harvest since you do have to be accountable. So it makes it easier for Enforcement to see. I think it's a good Proposal. But having said that, I did use a deer tag out of sequence this year, but I didn't get arrested.

(Laughter)

MR. DOUVILLE: It was by accident.

Because you scroll down through the numbers and I had my daughter do the tag while I was going to deal with the deer. And she did number two because it was on the end, but actually number one was attached over here. So I went to the trooper and showed him what happened. He said oh, believe it or not, he said you're not the first one to do that. So he signed the tag. And any questions, he said well, refer them to me and everything will be fine.

But thank you.

CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.

Douville.

Mr. Hernandez.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.

Chairman. I too am going to vote in favor of this Proposal. I think it's a needed Proposal. We have a regulation in place that allows the taking of a doe, but we have no way to verify -- or excuse me. Taking of one doe. And but yet we have no way to verify that in the field. And I think it's important that if you have a regulation, you have something in place that allows that regulation to be verified.

So I was satisfied in the testimony from the Staff that, you know, Enforcement is reasonable enough to -- if you explain that you had, you know, hunted in Unit 2 and that's why your tags are out of sequence that they probably would accept that

1 and not cause undue difficulties for people.

2

3 So I'm satisfied with that and I'm
4 going to vote in favor of this.

5

6 Thank you.

7

8 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

9

10 Mr. Douville.

11

12 MR. DOUVILLE: To avoid confusion, I
13 would just request that, you know, this change in
14 regulation should the Federal Board approve, which I
15 anticipate they would, that the Unit 2 hunters be well-
16 informed so that we don't have confusion when they do
17 go hunting.

18

19 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Ms. Phillips.

20

21 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
22 Does it really take a Proposal to have an antlerless
23 tag in Unit 2? I mean it just seems like there's a
24 simpler way to do it.

25

26 But I am going to be voting no because
27 the Staff analysis says the Unit 2 deer's populations
28 are healthy and stable to increasing and at a 12 to 15-
29 year high. When we took over Federal management in
30 1995 we passed a one antlerless deer harvest for Unit 2
31 and it was extremely controversial, but the harvest has
32 only been -- the recorded harvest has only -- reported
33 harvest has only been 4.2 percent, which is -- and if
34 there are unreported harvest, it's probably not an --
35 because we show this 12 to 15 -- our populations are
36 still increasing for the Unit 2 deer overall.

37

38 So if we needed increased
39 accountability, I think there should be just a separate
40 antlerless deer tag.

41

42 Thank you.

43

44 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Patty.

45

46 I'd just like to say I think that we
47 need to address the concerns by Mr. Kitka and Mr. Bloom
48 to make sure that that language is stricken from the
49 Proposal if the other Proposal doesn't pass.

50

1 And I think you had something about
2 that would be an administrative thing, Mr. Larson.

3
4 MR. LARSON: Yes, Mr. Chair. So the
5 point of this Proposal is dealing with what -- whether
6 or not you need to use tag number five for harvest --
7 when you harvest a doe deer in Unit 2. The point of
8 this Proposal is not this other language that may or
9 may not be present or in regulation by the time the
10 Board takes up this portion of it.

11
12 So it is our plan that the Board take
13 up 05 first, so therefore this other language is likely
14 not going to be there. So -- but that's not the point
15 of this Proposal. The point of this Proposal -- and
16 the Council has already made its position known
17 regarding the delegated authority, so yeah. This is an
18 administrative point at this point. So we don't know
19 what this other language is going to be when the
20 Council takes it up -- or the Board takes it up.

21
22 But the point of this exercise is tag
23 number five, whether it should be used for a doe or
24 not.

25
26 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you for that
27 clarification, Mr. Larson.

28
29 Does that address your concerns, Mr.
30 Bloom?

31
32 MR. BLOOM: It's absolutely clear to
33 me. I'm not sure if it's clear to someone else.

34
35 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay.

36
37 I personally am going to vote in favor
38 of this Proposal. I think there's enough safeguards in
39 place that it's not going to be a confusing thing for
40 subsistence users. And I think it will help keep
41 better tabs on how many does are being taken.

42
43 And for as an example, I hunt in where
44 I live on Mitkof Island, where you're only allowed one
45 buck. I could not go to Unit 2 and shoot a doe with my
46 fifth tag and then go back and hunt there. The way the
47 regulations are, you have to make your first deer that
48 deer on that island. You can't hunt somewhere else and
49 then come back and shoot a deer there.

50

1 So there's a lot of safeguards set up,
2 in place, so I'm definitely going to vote in favor of
3 this.

4
5 Anyone else.

6
7 (No comments)

8
9 MR. DOUVILLE: Question.

10
11 CHAIRMAN BANGS: The question's been
12 called for on Proposal WP16-08. I think there's enough
13 in votes here. I think we should call for a roll call
14 vote.

15
16 Mr. Kitka.

17
18 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

19
20 Arthur Bloom.

21
22 MR. BLOOM: Yes.

23
24 MR. KITKA: Frank Wright.

25
26 MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

27
28 MR. KITKA: Patricia Phillips.

29
30 MS. PHILLIPS: No.

31
32 MR. KITKA: Michael Douville.

33
34 MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.

35
36 MR. KITKA: Harvey Kitka. I vote no.

37
38 Robert Schroeder.

39
40 MR. SCHROEDER: No.

41
42 MR. KITKA: Albert Howard.

43
44 MR. HOWARD: Yes.

45
46 MR. KITKA: Donald Hernandez.

47
48 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.

49
50 MR. KITKA: John Yeager.

1 MR. YEAGER: Yes.
2
3 MR. KITKA: Michael Bangs.
4
5 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yes.
6
7 MR. KITKA: Cathy Needham.
8
9 MS. NEEDHAM: Yes.
10
11 MR. KITKA: Mr. Chair, the motion
12 passed.
13
14 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Motion passes eight in
15 the yes and three no. Thank you.
16
17 Thank you, Harvey.
18
19 Okay. So we're down to Proposal WP16-
20 09, Unit 3, Close Marten Trapping Season on Kuiu
21 Island.
22
23 And Mr. Larson is going to give us the
24 Staff report.
25
26 MR. LARSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My
27 name is Robert Larson. I work for the Forest Service
28 in Petersburg. Staff analysis for 16-09 begins on page
29 107 in our Council book.
30
31 WP16-09 was submitted by the Alaska
32 Department of Fish and Game. Requests that the Board
33 close the subsistence marten season on Kuiu Island.
34
35 Reason that is provided is that the
36 Department of Fish and Game believes there's a serious
37 conservation concern for marten on Kuiu Island. The
38 current Federal subsistence trapping season is December
39 1st to February 15th with no limit. The Board has not
40 made a customary and traditional use determination for
41 marten in Unit 3; therefore, all rural residents may
42 harvest marten in that Unit.
43
44 Beginning in 2008 there's been a number
45 of regulatory actions by both the State and Federal
46 authorities to either close or restrict the marten
47 trapping season on Kuiu Island. The State trapping
48 season has been closed continuously since the 2008
49 season. The Federal season was closed for 60 days in
50 2008, for the entire season in 2009, 2010, and 2011,

1 and 2012. The 2013 season was closed between January
2 1st and February 15th and the 2014 season was opened
3 without any restriction.

4
5 These management actions were the
6 result of a seven-year marten research project on Kuiu
7 Island that concluded that the marten population on
8 Kuiu Island has been at a low level. The Federal
9 restrictions on the 2012 and 2013 seasons allowed for
10 the successful conclusion of that marten study.

11
12 Kuiu Island marten population is
13 somewhat isolated from other marten populations and
14 includes both the *Martes americana* and the *caurina*
15 marten subspecies. A map of Kuiu Island and the road
16 system is shown on the third page of the staff
17 analysis.

18
19 Generally, marten harvest levels are
20 directly related to fur prices and winter conditions
21 during the trapping season. The number of marten
22 harvested on Kuiu Island is shown in Figure 1 and has
23 ranged between zero to 51 per year. And that's between
24 1984 and 2014. That is an average of 12 marten per
25 season since the 1995. And that includes only those
26 years when the season was open.

27
28 The number of individuals trapping
29 marten on Kuiu Island has ranged between zero and three
30 per year between '95 and 2014, no more than one of
31 which was Federally qualified.

32
33 Forty-two percent of the marten harvest
34 occurs in December; 17 percent in January; and 41
35 percent in February.

36
37 Kuiu Island has a land area of
38 approximately 379 square miles. Using the most recent
39 estimate of marten density of .7 marten per square mile
40 is an estimated 265 marten living on Kuiu Island in
41 2012. If Proposal 16-09 is adopted, the Federal marten
42 trapping season on Kuiu Island would be closed. There
43 has been a pattern of little trapping on the island in
44 recent years and this closure would have a minimal
45 effect on Federally qualified subsistence users, other
46 than the loss of potential opportunity. Since the
47 number of trappers and resulting harvest is currently
48 at low levels, the closure would not have a significant
49 value as a means of increasing the marten population.

50

1 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
2 support 16-09 with a modification to close the marten
3 trapping season on Kuiu Island beginning on January 1.
4 That would leave a December marten trapping season.

5
6 The justification for that conclusion
7 is that the State season is closed and use by Federally
8 qualified users has been low. Allowing a one-month
9 season for Federally qualified subsistence users would
10 provide some opportunity for the continuation of
11 subsistence use.

12
13 Additionally, sealing of marten is
14 required and that would allow collection of harvest
15 statistics and biological samples that could be used by
16 managers in monitoring this population. A December
17 only season provides a significant reduction in harvest
18 opportunities from what is currently allowable and will
19 provide adequate protections for conservation of marten
20 in Kuiu Island.

21
22 Thank you.

23
24 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Larson.

25
26 Any questions from the Council to Mr.
27 Larson.

28
29 Mr. Schroeder.

30
31 MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Larson, it seems
32 that marten have -- so there are two things I'd like
33 you to comment on. One is that martens seem to have a
34 pretty high fecundity, so that the report says that
35 they have an average litter size of three and that
36 populations rebound rather quickly.

37
38 And also just some perception that
39 marten trapping may be essentially a self-limiting
40 thing and that not too many trappers are interested in
41 trapping where there aren't marten to trap.

42
43 If you could comment on those two
44 factors.

45
46 MR. LARSON: Through the Chair. Mr.
47 Schroeder, those two observations are absolutely
48 correct. Marten have a high fecundity. Their survival
49 of primarily the younger animals is directly related to
50 the amount of food that they have. There's been a

1 problem with the number of voles on Kuiu Island. It's
2 hard to say why that is or whether or not that's going
3 to be a persistent condition. But again the number of
4 animals that are present are very much a result of the
5 amount of food that they have primarily in wintertime.

6
7

8 One of the conditions on Kuiu Island
9 that is particular to Kuiu Island is a low deer
10 population. Without the -- a doe -- or not the doe.
11 But without deer being present and a winter mortality,
12 then there's less opportunity for martens to scavenge
13 deer carcasses.

14
15

16 Now the -- what we have on Kuiu Island
17 is an increase in moose in recent years. It's been
18 quite remarkable. So we've had a series of mild
19 winters. It's not unreasonable to think that the deer
20 population will in fact increase on Kuiu Island at some
21 point.

22
23

24 And your other observation is also
25 correct. Is that trappers trap where there are animals
26 to trap. And where there are none or low numbers, then
27 it's not attractive for trappers.

28
29

30 Thank you.

31
32

33 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

34
35

36 Anyone else.

37
38

39 Mr. Kitka.

40
41

42 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just
43 out of curiosity, when were marten introduced to Kuiu
44 Island? Were they introduced to that island the same
45 time as the other islands? Mainly because when they
46 got introduced, we noticed we lost all our grouse,
47 which was part of our subsistence food.

48
49

50 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair, neither of the
51 subspecies of martens that happen to be present on Kuiu
52 Island were introduced. These are martens that have
53 been here and they're not a product of some
54 introduction.

55
56

57 Thank you.

58
59

60 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Anyone else.

1 Patty.

2

3 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. So if it
4 were closed to Federally qualified harvesters, would
5 the non-Federally qualified harvesters still be allowed
6 to trap marten?

7

8 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. No. The State
9 marten trapping season is currently closed. The
10 Federal marten trapping season is open. And it's open
11 from December 1st through February 15th right now.

12

13 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Would the in-season
14 manager close it to Federally qualified if there seemed
15 to be an issue with catch rate or on that?

16

17 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair, in-season
18 management of marten is the purview of the Board. It
19 has not been delegated to in-season managers.

20

21 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

22

23 Mr. Kitka.

24

25 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
26 didn't see anywhere in here on the graph of whether the
27 closing of the hunting of marten has caused an increase
28 in the marten. And it seemed like there must be
29 something else causing the problem with the marten
30 disappearing besides the trappers. The trappers seem
31 like they're just a minute amount of the problem. It
32 would seem like something else was causing the problem.
33 Any idea what could have caused it?

34

35 MR. LARSON: It is true that trapping
36 at this level is -- it's not contributing to the cause
37 of -- to the poor reproductive success of martens on
38 Kuiu Island. Reproductive success is due to food. And
39 I am not aware -- and I don't know that anybody is
40 particularly aware of what causes the differences in --
41 and these are primarily small animals that is the
42 preferred prey of marten, what -- you know, why those
43 abundances go up and go down. But we do know that
44 there is a lack of deer right now on Kuiu Island and
45 that may have some effect.

46

47 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

48

49 Mr. Schroeder.

50

1 MR. SCHROEDER: Just improving my
2 understanding of marten, Bob. Is there some notion of
3 what portion of marten can be safely harvested from a
4 population that would be matched by reproductive
5 success?
6

7 MR. LARSON: I think the answer is
8 probably yes. And I think that it is dependent on the
9 productivity of the marten population. Marten
10 populations that have an inherently low productivity
11 rate would in fact, you would have a lower allowable
12 harvest rate for trappers. And conversely if they were
13 very productive and there was lots of marten being
14 produced every year, you could have a higher
15 reproductive rate.
16

17 In this case, in Kuiu Island we have a
18 marten population that has been studied fairly closely.
19 And there was some really good work done regarding the
20 population dynamics of martin on Kuiu Island. And we
21 see a marten population that is a fairly low
22 reproductive rate and a low density of martens. A low
23 food supply. You would think that it would be
24 appropriate to have a low harvest rate in this case.
25 And what we're seeing is under our current situation,
26 we have a low harvest rate. So.....
27

28 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Larson.
29

30 Anyone else have any questions.
31

32 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.
33

34 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Patty.
35

36 MS. PHILLIPS: So on the harvest
37 history, page 114, I mean it's saying that the
38 population is 265, an estimate. And that 12 marten per
39 season since 1995. And 42 percent in December. So
40 that makes it five marten. Okay.
41

42 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
43

44 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Patty.
45

46 Anyone else have any questions.
47

48 Art and then Mike.
49

50 MR. BLOOM: Thank you. Has Kuiu Island

1 been overall heavily logged?

2

3 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. The northern
4 portion of Kuiu Island has been heavily roaded and
5 logged. There is a wilderness area in the middle
6 portion and the southern portion, really has very poor
7 timber. It has not been logged. So depending upon
8 which part of the island you're talking about, it's
9 either not suitable for logging, it's part of a
10 wilderness area or it's part of an intensive logging.

11

12 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Follow-up, Art?

13

14 MR. BLOOM: Yeah. I think it's just
15 important for all of us to again recognize here we're
16 talking about a subsistence resource and the effect of
17 large scale logging on these resources. Or at least
18 something to take away from -- to keep in mind here.

19

20 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Art.

21

22 Mr. Douville.

23

24 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
25 Just as a guess, I would assume that most of the study
26 has been centered on the north end, roaded portion of
27 the island.

28

29 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. That's
30 correct.

31

32 MR. DOUVILLE: How much of the study
33 includes the south part of the island, which, you know,
34 approximately is three-quarters of the area.

35

36 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. As far as I
37 can remember -- and my recollections may not be exactly
38 true, but it's my understanding and my recollection
39 that the study is pretty much confined to those areas
40 accessible by road.

41

42 Thank you.

43

44 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Do you have a follow-
45 up?

46

47 MR. DOUVILLE: Yeah. Well, accessible
48 by boat is the whole island.

49

50 MR. LARSON: No. Excuse me. By road.

1 So it's on the roaded side, which is the top third.
2 Those other two-thirds do not have roads.

3
4 MR. DOUVILLE: So we're restricting a
5 whole area that we really have no data for. But this
6 Proposal would do that.

7
8 I guess I have a couple other questions
9 for you. We had a higher harvest back when -- and I
10 would assume that was when the logging was taking place
11 and there was loggers probably present to do the
12 trapping. And did we know anything of marten popu --
13 well, we don't on the south end. But we don't know
14 what those populations were. We kind of know what they
15 might be today, but we don't know what they were and
16 what the feed was like back then. So.....

17
18 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
19 Douville.

20
21 Any other questions for Mr. Larson.

22
23 Cathy.

24
25 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So
26 Mr. Douville's comment, is the table -- in regard's to
27 Mr. Douville's comment, is the table, Figure 1 on page
28 114, marten harvest by all users?

29
30 MR. LARSON: Yes. I think that that is
31 all users. Yes. And I would like to say that early on
32 in the study you'll see -- and I'm not looking at the
33 table, but there is a little bump in the marten
34 harvest. Some of that I believe may be due to the fact
35 that they were -- the Fish and Game Department was
36 requiring additional bodies for their study and they
37 were paying extra dollars not only for the hides, but
38 for the bodies themselves. And I believe that probably
39 encouraged a few more trappers to show up there.
40 So.....

41
42 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Cathy, follow-up?

43
44 MS. NEEDHAM: Okay. So then in respect
45 to Patty's comment earlier about the total number -- or
46 the average number of marten harvested, that was by all
47 users. And then the marten harvest for the State --
48 under State regulations closed in 2010, which means
49 that in the past five years, a total of five marten
50 have been harvested by Federally qualified subsistence

1 users?

2

3 MR. LARSON: The -- yes. So since
4 2012, I believe is the right year that it was opened
5 again. So.....

6

7 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Anyone else.

8

9 Mr. Howard.

10

11 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
12 You're saying the only data you have are from harvest
13 levels now. I've trapped around Angoon in the '90s and
14 I also trapped up on the Yukon River with a former
15 father-in-law. Now, common practice that I learned
16 from him was, you know, you'll trap one area one year
17 and then you won't go back and let that rebuild on its
18 own. Now, looking at these and thinking about the
19 State shut down the area in 2010. That means there's
20 less users in the area, which means you have less
21 harvest naturally.

22

23 Now, the other thing that controls the
24 amount of harvest is the price. Now, in recent years
25 the price of pelts have been pretty high, but I'm
26 wondering, do we have any of that data that supports
27 this data?

28

29 The amount of users in the area. I
30 mean you can't -- unless you're sitting there watching
31 them trap, you don't really have anything supporting
32 how many people are actually trapping in this area.
33 Because trappers do move from one area to another.

34

35 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. Marten are one
36 of those species that we require sealing, so they all
37 need to be presented to the Department of Fish and Game
38 for sealing. And at that point, they have -- there's a
39 record taken for where they're harvested and when
40 they're harvested and by whom they're harvested. So
41 there is -- I think that that harvest statistic is --
42 you know, is as accurate as it could be. These are
43 commercially sold pelts. And that -- you know, that
44 number is important. And they take a lot of effort to
45 make sure that it's complete and accurate.

46

47 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Follow-up, Albert?

48

49 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, I have a
50 hard time closing an area with this type of

1 information. It isn't very consistent. Mr. Douville
2 made a point and if you look at map one, there's no
3 logging roads on the two-thirds south of it, which to
4 me probably indicates there may be more, you know,
5 marten in that area. I mean I just kind of -- from my
6 own experience, I guess I'm -- there's no data
7 supporting this to close it for Federal subsistence
8 users because there isn't even any data that shows that
9 the impact of closing the State had a positive impact.

10

11

12 I mean like any of these Proposals, Mr.
13 Chairman, I'd like to see the impact of our Proposals.
14 You know, some mechanism in place that shows the
15 actions this Board has taken and what impact it had on
16 the residents and subsistence users. I mean so I guess
17 to say it's hard to support this when there's no data
18 here that says, you know, we should close this to
19 subsistence users.

20

21 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

22

23 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Larson, do you
24 have any response?

25

26 MR. LARSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We
27 know quite a bit about the marten population on Kuiu
28 Island. We know more about that population than we do
29 most. And it has shown clearly that there is an issue
30 with those marten. They have exhibited a fairly long
31 term, consistent pattern of low productivity. The
32 State has thought that that was enough of a concern to
33 close the State season. We are also concerned with the
34 low productivity rate. We would like to have a low
35 harvest rate until there's some evidence that the
36 population is more productive and it's rebounded to a
37 higher level.

38

39 The OSM conclusion allows harvest --
40 some harvest opportunities so that we could in fact
41 measure the abundance of martens on Kuiu Island through
42 an indexing of being able to monitor the harvest. So
43 in that case, the State is not going to continue the
44 marten harvest on Kuiu Island. We have what we have.
45 Now what we want to do is have some ability to monitor
46 that harvest so in fact we could act responsibly now,
47 but be able to gather sufficient information so we
48 could relax the restrictions at some point.

49

50 Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Larson.

2

3 Ms. Needham.

4

5 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Do
6 we know -- since the State closure, we have five marten
7 that were harvested in 2014 by Federally qualified
8 subsistence users. Do we know if all five of those
9 marten were harvested in December?

10

11 MR. LARSON: I'm trying to recollect
12 the dates that they were harvested in. And I just am
13 unable to give you an exact response that is -- but I
14 believe that there were some harvested outside of
15 December. Yes.

16

17 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Howard.

18

19 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
20 Just a follow-up to her question. Do we know how many
21 subsistence users were a part of the harvesting of
22 five?

23

24 MR. LARSON: Yes. That's easier.
25 There was one person.

26

27 MR. HOWARD: And a follow-up to that.
28 How many trappers were there before they closed it in
29 2010?

30

31 MR. LARSON: There was no more than
32 three ever in recent years.

33

34 MR. HOWARD: Recently.

35

36 MR. LARSON: No. Total.

37

38 MR. HOWARD: Total.

39

40 MR. LARSON: Yes. No more than one in
41 recent years were Federally qualified. In some years
42 there was two non-Federally.

43

44 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Follow-up. And then
45 Mr. Bloom.

46

47 MR. HOWARD: Well, since there was one,
48 I have a hard time picturing one guy wiping out a whole
49 population of marten on an island. So I'll be voting
50 against this.

1 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2

3 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

4

5 Mr. Bloom.

6

7 MR. BLOOM: Thank you. We just
8 confirmed what I think I'm hearing and have read here.
9 First of all, that the southern portion -- the unlogged
10 portion of Kuiu Island is very poor habitat for marten.
11 That the number of trappers has been zero to three for
12 recent years, of which only one at a maximum was a
13 Federally qualified user. So that the effect of this
14 Proposal would at the most be affecting one subsistence
15 trapper. Are those correct? That I heard that all
16 correctly?

17

18 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair and Mr. Bloom.
19 The last two portions of your statement I believe are
20 correct. I don't know that we have definitive
21 information regarding the quality of habitat in --
22 regarding, you know, the suitability to support a
23 marten for the lower portion of Kuiu Island. I do know
24 that the timber quality for much of that lower island
25 is less than the upper portion of the island. But I
26 don't know that we're ready to say that it's -- you
27 know, can support half as many marten or a third as
28 many or that kind of a qualification.

29

30 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Follow-up, Mr. Bloom?

31

32 MR. BLOOM: Just a quick follow-up.
33 I'm not a trapper, but I do know trappers in Tenakee
34 Inlet. And also what I've read here is that marten
35 generally occur very close to the beach. And I know
36 that the trapping generally takes place in good beach
37 timber. Nice guard timber. And so if that's missing
38 from the southern portion of Kuiu, it would be a pretty
39 logical assumption that that's not good habitat for
40 marten, in my opinion.

41

42 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Hernandez.

43

44 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.
45 Chairman. I mean if I could respond that, you know,
46 I've spent a fair amount of time on south Kuiu Island
47 tramping around in the woods down there. I would
48 characterize Kuiu as having exceptionally good timber
49 on the north end. That's part of the same karst
50 formation that runs down through Prince of Wales

1 Island. That's the reason that logging started there
2 in the early '70s and was so intensive under the Pulp
3 Company contract. They targeted the best timber. So
4 north Kuiu I would characterize as exceptionally good
5 habitat. South Kuiu I would say is very good habitat.
6 Just had a lot of issues as far as logistics and
7 economics of logging due to the fractured countryside
8 there.

9
10 So I don't think south Kuiu is
11 necessarily a habitat issue for marten myself. I think
12 it's very good. It's just access is a big issue. It's
13 fairly remote. Obviously the trapping that was done on
14 the north end, probably a lot of it was done from that
15 road systems.

16
17 So yeah, if that helps at all.

18
19 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
20 Hernandez.

21
22 Any other questions for Mr. Larson.

23
24 (No comments)

25
26 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Seeing none. Thank
27 you, Bob.

28
29 Go on to the State ADF&G. Mr. Scott.

30
31 MR. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
32 will just read a paragraph here from the letter that we
33 sent in requesting this Proposal and then try to
34 address some of the many questions. That was a great
35 discussion with Mr. Larson.

36
37 So for more than a decade ADF&G
38 research has indicated that the Kuiu Island marten
39 population has remained chronically low and since at
40 least 2001. A recently completed seven-year study of
41 Kuiu Island marten indicates the island's marten
42 population remains stagnant at low levels, low
43 densities. The State marten trapping season on Kuiu
44 Island was closed by emergency order in 2008 and has
45 remained closed by regulations since 2009. The closure
46 of the State trapping season was in direct response to
47 chronically low marten abundance, low marten survival,
48 and low prey abundance, low recruitment of juvenile
49 martens into the breeding population.

50

1 The State believes additional mortality
2 resulting from trapper harvest could be additive to an
3 already high natural mortality rate for marten on the
4 island, further exasperating the current conservation
5 concerns for Kuiu marten.

6
7 So as Mr. Larson pointed out, we're
8 very fortunate that Kuiu marten is one -- actually Kuiu
9 Island is one of the few places throughout the Region
10 that we know very much about marten populations. The
11 other area is Chichagof Island, around the Hoonah area.
12 Those two areas have both been studied extensively.
13 A graduate student recently completed his masters
14 degree and his focus was on marten populations on Kuiu
15 Island.

16
17 We did focus on the road system for two
18 reasons. One, financially and logistically we could do
19 it there. The other reason is that trappers will also
20 take advantage of those road systems and utilize them
21 extensively.

22
23 So a couple of things that really come
24 to mind when we talk about marten populations in
25 particular. First, marten are strongly correlated with
26 high value contiguous habitat requirements, old growth
27 timber, and fairly large tracks of old growth timber.
28 On the north end there's been quite a bit of timber
29 management over the years and in the Staff analysis
30 you'll find that there has been a reduction in old
31 growth timber and high value habitats by, you know,
32 roughly 29 percent over the last 50 years or so. You
33 know, things have changed. And if you get an
34 opportunity to see the northern end of Kuiu, you can
35 see the patchwork of various timber management
36 practices and treatments. Everything from fairly
37 recent small cuts to older second growth cuts that are
38 now in stem exclusion stages, where essentially nothing
39 grows on the ground there.

40
41 Another issue that has come up and
42 we've documented through the graduate work was a low
43 abundance of prey species on the island. In
44 particular, vole populations. But other small mammals
45 as well. As part of the graduate work, to go out and
46 live capture marten, radio collar them, and then
47 conduct multiple replicates of telemetry flights to
48 determine movement patterns, habitat selection, things
49 like that. The Staff would also trap small mammals and
50 catalog the abundance of those animals.

1 Another issue that's been mentioned
2 here is the low number of deer that are found on Kuiu
3 Island. It is an area that, you know, historically
4 supported quite a few deer. There was lots of
5 discussion on what causes the ongoing low density of
6 deer on the island. Everything from predation and
7 timber management. And marten take advantage of that.
8 And they move down to lower elevation in the winter and
9 they follow deer. And deer carcasses can oftentimes
10 provide a food source. There's other animals that
11 provide some of that food as well.

12
13 As a side, I conducted an alpine deer
14 survey on Kuiu Island in August of this year and it was
15 a -- I mean a dramatic change moving from the southern
16 end of Admiralty Island where I would count 200, 250
17 deer in the alpine in a couple of hours to six. And
18 they were all standing there, you know, together in one
19 place. And we never detected, you know, deer in other
20 locations of the survey. That's just a snapshot in
21 time, but it's suggestive if nothing else.

22
23 The other -- couple other things I
24 would encourage you to consider is that, you know, over
25 time we have measured the density of animals on Kuiu
26 Island as far as marten go. And we compare them to
27 other places we know something about marten. In this
28 case, Chichagof Island. On Kuiu, densities range from
29 .25 to .7 martens per square mile, whereas in other
30 habitats or other locations, Chichagof you would see,
31 you know, .44 up to 1.4 animals per square mile.
32 Again, two different places, but the populations -- you
33 know, that's a marked difference in the density of
34 animals.

35
36 Another interesting thing to consider
37 is the survival of marten that we've documented on Kuiu
38 Island. In some places survival has been measured as
39 high as 75 percent, which is very good. And then 66
40 percent if you have a trapping season on top of it.
41 Again, 66 percent survival is pretty good. And on Kuiu
42 Island it's been measured between 12 and 63. Sixty-
43 three is pretty good, but if you spend too much time in
44 those percentages of survival, you obviously aren't
45 going to get a whole lot of recruitment.

46
47 Kuiu Island as it's been described to
48 me -- I've spent some time talking to our area
49 biologist out of Petersburg -- logistically, it is
50 challenging, as Member Hernandez mentioned. The cost

1 of fuel and the time to get there, it doesn't attract a
2 lot of attention by any one user group, whether it be
3 folks trapping under State regulations or Federally
4 qualified trappers. Hence we end up with one individual
5 taking five animals in a season.

6
7 So in that regard, another thing that
8 drives marten prices -- and we've seen it recently here
9 -- is fur price. Over the last three or four years we
10 saw a steep increase in the dollar amount that marten
11 hides were bringing. Upwards of \$200 a pelt. And
12 that's pretty impressive actually for marten. That has
13 since come down once the market got flooded a little
14 bit and we had some -- you know, international actions
15 actually have impacted fur markets and that's come down
16 to -- I can't tell you what it was necessarily last
17 year.

18
19 But historically, you know, a high
20 marten or a high dollar marten hide would be 100 bucks.
21 When you get to \$200, you start to see a lot of people
22 who want to go out trapping. So we have to at least
23 have to keep that in mind, that there may be a time
24 that things come up and people decide that they want to
25 go out and do that.

26
27 I want to make sure I hit all the high
28 points here. I believe that's all I have for now. The
29 Department supports the original Proposal asking the
30 Council to close the marten season. And I'm available
31 for any questions.

32
33 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

34
35 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Scott.

36
37 Any questions.

38
39 Mr. Bloom.

40
41 MR. BLOOM: Thank you. You keep
42 referring -- and in your letter you referred to the
43 island. But does that mean -- do you know much about
44 the southern portion of the island? And if you did, I
45 mean I'm wondering why the Department didn't recommend
46 just closing say the northern portion of the island.

47
48 MR. SCOTT: Through the Chair. Member
49 Bloom, we don't know a lot about the southern end of
50 the island. Again, our work has been focused primarily

1 on the north end because of access and logistics. I
2 would offer though that trappers will take advantage of
3 that access as well.

4

5 One thing we did consider was closing
6 the road system. Implementing a controlled use area
7 for trapping, where you would close a buffer. You
8 know, basically you'd prohibit the use of road to trap.
9 This didn't look like it was going to be very effective
10 because as has been pointed out here, oftentimes marten
11 will be found during the winter specifically, which is
12 trapping season. Will be found down near the beaches.
13 A little bit closer to the beaches.

14

15 So in answer to your question, we don't
16 know much about the southern end. But I think it's
17 indicative, too, that the harvest has predominantly
18 come from the northern end.

19

20 CHAIRMAN BANGS: A follow-up, Art?

21

22 MR. BLOOM: Quickly then. Could you --
23 in regulation, could you have closed just a portion of
24 the island? Say with, you know, a GPS or certain
25 landmarks, so that you could have closed the northern
26 portion of Kuiu and not have to get into roads?

27

28 MR. SCOTT: Through the Chair. Member
29 Bloom, we could have. And I don't recall the meat of
30 the conversation why we didn't go through that, other
31 than those roads provide the access to trapping areas.

32

33 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Cathy and then Patty.

34

35 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
36 Did the Department consider OSM's preliminary
37 conclusion to modify the Proposal that the Department
38 put forward in keeping the trapping season open in
39 December? And if they did, did they support or oppose.
40 And if they opposed, what were the reasons.

41

42 MR. SCOTT: Through the Chair. Member
43 Needham, I don't recall that conversation. I apologize
44 for that. But generally speaking, we've moved to --
45 we've asked the Board of Game to maintain the closure
46 throughout the island.

47

48 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Follow-up, Cathy?

49

50 MS. NEEDHAM: To clarify, I mean this

1 particular Proposal that you put forward towards us.
2 Because the OSM conclusion out of that was to keep the
3 trapping season open in December.

4
5 MR. SCOTT: Through the Chair. Member
6 Needham, thank you for the clarification. We had some
7 discussions. I had a discussion with the area
8 biologist out of Petersburg. And I think that it's not
9 a bad modification. As we mentioned, you know, it
10 would still provide -- I think the Staff analysis says
11 42 percent of the animals are harvested in December, so
12 it certainly would allow some opportunity there. But
13 the Department feels pretty strongly that there's a
14 conservation issue on Kuiu Island and hence the reason
15 for the original Proposal.

16
17 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

18
19 Patty.

20
21 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
22 Can we get a copy of the letter? I mean I don't have
23 it in our book. Thank you.

24
25 MR. SCOTT: Through the Chair. Member
26 Phillips, it's actually in the Proposal book that came
27 out quite a while ago. Not necessarily the Staff
28 analysis book, but in the actual Proposal book, page
29 11. I'll share my copy with you if you want.

30
31 MS. PHILLIPS: I didn't bring my
32 Proposal book, Mr. Chair.

33
34 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Patty.

35
36 MS. PHILLIPS: I'd like a copy of the
37 letter.

38
39 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Can you get a
40 copy?

41
42 MR. SCOTT: I wrote it so I can
43 remember.

44
45 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Is there any other
46 questions.

47
48 Harvey.

49
50 MR. KITKA: I keep going back to

1 whether trappers have had a minimal effect on this. I
2 sure would like to know whether there's any study on
3 the density of wolves because I know that you're
4 talking a deer population that is disappearing as well.
5 So there has to be something there that is causing it
6 besides maybe -- besides the logging. There has to be
7 something that's causing the population to decline.
8 And trapping is such a minimal amount of it, I just
9 wonder if there's something else causing it. And I
10 would assume that there must be something that's
11 predators to them.

12

13 MR. SCOTT: Through the Chair. Member
14 Kitka, certainly you are correct. Wolves have been
15 documented. We receive a lot of anecdotal information
16 about the number of wolves and increasing wolves and,
17 you know, there's lots going on there. In addition,
18 there's a high density of black bears on the island.
19 And we've demonstrated in several locations that black
20 bears are a predator of especially deer fawns, which
21 will ultimately impact recruitment. So you're right.
22 There is quite a bit going on. And as in the case in
23 most places, it's probably a combination of factors
24 leading to, you know, cycles in various populations.

25

26 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other questions.

27

28 Mr. Hernandez.

29

30 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.
31 Chairman. Kind of a follow-up to what Harvey brought
32 up there. And I'd like to ask Mr. Scott -- yes. Kuiu
33 Island, it's a very interesting place really because it
34 did have a very, very healthy deer population. It
35 crashed 40 years ago and has not rebounded. One of the
36 reasons I've spent time over there over the years is
37 I'm constantly looking over there to see if that's a
38 good alternative deer hunting spot. And I just would
39 say no, it's -- they're not coming back.

40

41 I do see, you know, to me it appears to
42 be a healthy wolf population. I've always wondered
43 what's sustaining that healthy wolf population when the
44 deer numbers are so low. As you mentioned, there's
45 also a good black bear population. I think one of the
46 things I've observed is there does seem to be a heck of
47 a lot of beaver. Some really extensive beaver colonies
48 in places over there. Could help sustain a wolf
49 population.

50

1 But my question is I thought I heard
2 somewhere that there was going to be a -- probably a
3 graduate student or somebody doing a wolf, bear
4 research project on Kuiu Island. I just wonder if you
5 know about that and if you could tell us about it.

6
7 MR. SCOTT: Through the Chair. Member
8 Hernandez, so Kuiu Island is one of the -- I guess
9 there's lots of parts to this response. It's one of
10 the places that I recall as an area biologist first
11 hearing about black bear hair showing up in wolf scat.
12 You know, predominantly cubs is at least what we
13 thought. There has been some reports where wolves will
14 take adult bears as well. Certainly, wolves will take
15 advantage of available prey species, so everything from
16 salmon to beavers to apparently black bears and the few
17 deer that are available there.

18
19 The other thing that's occurring there
20 and we're documenting more and more, we were fortunate
21 to have people on the ground on Kuiu Island for several
22 years during the marten work, an increasing moose
23 population where the animals are showing up more and
24 more often. There has not been any wolf work per se on
25 Kuiu Island. Potentially there will be. Kuiu Island
26 falls in game management Unit 3, which is one of the
27 areas that's been identified for intensive management.
28 Kuiu has not been identified as a treatment or a
29 control area for those efforts. It doesn't mean that
30 we might not get there at some point.

31
32 There was an extensive black bear
33 project done by a PhD student several years ago. Lilly
34 Peacock conducted it. Kuiu Island was found to have
35 some of the highest density of black bears anywhere,
36 period. And some of the productivity there. Not only
37 that, but they're big bears, too. Big, male bears.

38
39 So those are things that we know, you
40 know, about the island at this point. And I hope that
41 that got to where you -- or answered your question. If
42 I missed a part, please, you know, refresh my memory.

43
44 MR. HERNANDEZ: I said I thought I
45 heard that there was going to be an upcoming research
46 project. Are you aware of anything there?

47
48 MR. SCOTT: Through the Chair. No,
49 Member Hernandez. I'm not aware of any upcoming
50 research projects on Kuiu.

1 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Schroeder.

2

3 MR. SCHROEDER: I'm wondering. I
4 looked and noted that our Federal trapping seasons
5 generally run from December 1st to February 15th for a
6 wide range of species in Southeast Alaska. Is the
7 trapping effort in this area exclusively marten or are
8 trappers harvesting other animals as well?

9

10 MR. SCOTT: Through the Chair. Member
11 Schroeder, I don't have empirical data for you on that.
12 However, certainly trappers would take advantage of
13 beach sets for wolves, things like that. So it's
14 likely that other species are being harvested in those
15 areas as people are spending time there.

16

17 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other questions
18 for Mr. Scott.

19

20 (No comments)

21

22 CHAIRMAN BANGS: I have one question.
23 With the dwindling State budget, do you find that will
24 have an effect on the ability of these studies that are
25 going on with radio collaring and monitoring? What
26 little is being done, is that going to be affected by
27 the cuts in the budget?

28

29 MR. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
30 Yeah. It will for sure. You know, as our financial
31 resources become more limited, we will have to be more
32 diligent where we allocate time and resources. And as
33 this Council is aware, we have some fairly high profile
34 species and locations right now. Unit 2 wolves,
35 intensive management programs in Unit 3. In some of
36 those places. So while I can't say for sure, you know,
37 how it's going to ultimately look, it is something we
38 have to be careful with. We're fortunate that recently
39 we were able to cooperate with the University of
40 Wyoming. And actually the individual was a Staff
41 Member with the Division and went back to school. And
42 so we were able to accomplish a lot of that work fairly
43 reasonably, you know. But it's something we're going
44 to have to watch into the future.

45

46 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you. In your
47 opinion, would the data gathered from a one month
48 season conducted by non-Federally qualified trappers
49 trapping marten, would that be a benefit to the State
50 at this point, if you're not able to do as much

1 research as you'd like to do?

2

3 MR. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
4 It's an excellent question. You know, and it's a
5 question that comes up pretty often. If we don't have
6 a season, how do we know what's going. If we don't
7 have a project there. Looking into the future, it is
8 -- it's been a discussion topic that we would have to
9 go back and at least come up with a monitoring scheme
10 to measure the abundance, not dissimilar from what
11 we're trying to do on Prince of Wales Island with Unit
12 2 wolves, develop an economic process to be able to
13 accomplish that probably not annually, but every two or
14 three years. Whatever it might be.

15

16 So in this case, I do think a one month
17 season would be beneficial. If the data's there, we're
18 going to use it for sure.

19

20 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Thank you.

21

22 Any other comments.

23

24 Mr. Howard.

25

26 MR. HOWARD: You kind of touched on the
27 question I was going to ask about the benefits of
28 having one trapper there. It seems to me like there's
29 a lot of effort here to close trapping down for one
30 person. Just the other thing that's sitting in the
31 back of my mind is traditional knowledge. Has any of
32 that been applied to this. The reason I ask that is
33 when I was trapping with a former father-in-law in the
34 Yukon River, there wasn't much lynx around. There was
35 a lot of rabbits around and he said well, the lynx
36 population will make a comeback because the rabbits are
37 here.

38

39 So there's got to be like discussion
40 around the table. There has to be another reason for
41 this population of marten to be on the decline now.
42 I'm sitting here in the back of my mind and the
43 Chairman touched on it a bit, that the State's revenue
44 source is running out, so it almost benefits the
45 Department to keep this open for the one trapper so you
46 have an idea and a finger on the pulse, so to speak, as
47 to what's happening with the marten on the island.

48

49 So do you see a benefit to keeping one
50 trapper on the island?

1 MR. SCOTT: Through the Chair. Member
2 Howard, again if there's somebody trapping and they're
3 harvesting or not harvesting for that matter, there's
4 two mechanisms that we collect trapping information.
5 Both from sealing certificates where for certain
6 species trappers that harvest animals are required to
7 present them to the Department for sealing. And then
8 we also conduct a trapper questionnaire annually
9 Statewide. And so we -- you know, those are the data
10 points that we use.

11
12 It's a challenge for the Department
13 where we are mandated to conservatively use the
14 wildlife resources. That's not to not use them.
15 That's the wise use of using them. When we find a
16 place like Kuiu Island or even other places where we
17 believe we have low densities of animals, the habitat
18 may have some issue, prey populations may have some
19 issues, we're left to wrestle with data collection
20 through trapping, through hunting or other means, as
21 well as trying to be responsible to what we think is
22 happening with the wildlife resource. In this case, we
23 believe that the densities of marten in that area are
24 very limited.

25
26 You asked about traditional use. The
27 answer is yes. We all use that at times. And knowing
28 that one of the prey species of marten is the small
29 mammals. Voles in particular in this case. We have
30 reason to believe that they will come back. Voles
31 populations cycle throughout the Region. So almost
32 undoubtedly we're going to see a cyclic nature. I
33 think historically in this location we've been able to
34 document low densities of marten. And we want to be
35 careful with that, as we have been with other species
36 in the Region.

37
38 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

39
40 Follow-up, Mr. Howard?

41
42 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
43 As far as sealing these animals go, as an example, we
44 had guys go to the Tenakee Inlet area and trap because
45 that was the place to be at the time. So what's to say
46 that, you know, we didn't catch the marten in Tenakee,
47 but we sealed them in Angoon. So what's to say, you
48 know, you don't have other users that aren't reporting
49 that.

50

1 MR. SCOTT: Through the Chair. Member
2 Howard, I can't say that doesn't happen. We call it
3 bootlegging. You know, it's -- you know, but that
4 comes across for anything. For any hunt or trapping.
5 You know, I believe most trappers are pretty standup
6 people. Folks who put a lot of time and effort into
7 it. They're an amazing source of knowledge. As you
8 pointed out, the traditional knowledge. And having
9 good rapport and good relationships with trappers is
10 kind of the key to that. The other part of that is
11 trappers are required to submit them or present them to
12 the Department within 30 days of the harvest or the
13 close of the season. So there's actually a very long
14 lag time before, you know, we're actually going to know
15 what the harvest looks like. And that's consistent for
16 most furbearer species.

17
18 But, you know, regulations keep honest
19 people honest and other folks are going to probably
20 continue doing what they do.

21
22 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

23
24 Patty.

25
26 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Chairman
27 Bangs. So the effect of the Proposal is only to close
28 the season for marten. And all other furbearers remain
29 open to trapping.

30
31 MR. SCOTT: Through the Chair. Member
32 Phillips, that is correct.

33
34 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other questions
35 for Mr. Scott.

36
37 (No comments)

38
39 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Scott.

40
41 Okay. I don't think we have any other
42 Agency Reports.

43
44 (No comments)

45
46 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Larson.

47
48 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair, there are no
49 Agency Reports.

50

1 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Public comments.
2 Written public comments.
3
4 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair, there are no
5 written public comments.
6
7 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Is there anybody
8 online that would like to speak to this Proposal.
9
10 (No comments)
11
12 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Hearing none. There
13 is no Advisory Group, public testimony or written
14 public comments, so what is the will of the Council.
15
16 Mr. Hernandez.
17
18 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.
19 Chairman. I would move to adopt Wildlife Proposal 16-
20 09, as amended, so it would allow for a trapping season
21 for marten on Kuiu Island from December 1st to December
22 31st.
23
24 MR. DOUVILLE: Second.
25
26 CHAIRMAN BANGS: And we have a second
27 by Mr. Douville.
28
29 Discussion.
30
31 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.
32
33 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Patty.
34
35 MS. PHILLIPS: I would support the
36 original Proposal, but I will not support an amended
37 Proposal. Our charge is to protect the continued
38 viability of wildlife populations. And in my opinion,
39 there is substantial evidence supporting chronically
40 low and not viable populations on Kuiu Island.
41
42 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
43
44 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Patty.
45
46 Any other discussion.
47
48 Mr. Douville and then Mr. Bloom.
49
50 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1 I will support the Proposal as modified. There is a
2 conservation concern; however, it is addressed by the
3 very short season. And it may give some indication as
4 to health of the population down the road. It would be
5 beneficial to a small number of subsistence users. And
6 no other users are included, so it would not restrict
7 anybody. It does offer some small opportunity. And
8 there is two-thirds of the island which you don't know
9 anything about. It hasn't been studied. So in
10 addition to that, I don't know how much of the study of
11 the road system on the north end was even included.

12

13 As far as the testimony for logging
14 made everything crash, well, that's not true. Like we
15 have an island where there's considerable logging and
16 on Dall Island is a good example. We have a guy down
17 there and he just does really well. So -- but this isle
18 does have a healthy wolf population. And the deer are
19 down, but that's another thing. But the wolf can
20 remain fat and healthy when you and I can't even get a
21 deer. And in any case, I will support it.

22

23 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
24 Douville.

25

26 Mr. Bloom.

27

28 MR. BLOOM: Yes. More as a point of
29 order, I think we should have taken the original motion
30 first on the floor. And then it could have been
31 modified. And we could -- this way, now that we have a
32 modified version on the floor, those who maybe were in
33 favor of the original motion won't even have a chance
34 to vote on the original motion.

35

36 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Well, Mr. Bloom, this
37 motion contains the original motion, but it's modified
38 to give us -- if this was to fail -- correct me if I'm
39 wrong. If this fails, then the season's closed. So
40 her issue would be addressed through this failure of
41 this motion unless we re-adopted another motion to
42 accept the original Proposal. So I think the original
43 motion was made to accept -- we'll either vote this up
44 or down. And then if somebody wants to make a motion
45 to adopt the original Proposal, they can; is that
46 correct?

47

48 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair, just for
49 clarity, there is a season right now. If the Council
50 doesn't take any action, that season would remain in

1 effect. I didn't think that's what I heard, so I just
2 want to make sure.

3

4 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Ms. Needham.

5

6 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
7 think maybe Mr. Bangs misspoke, but his concluding
8 statement was that -- I think was correct in that if we
9 oppose the as-modified version, somebody else could
10 introduce the original motion. And then that would --
11 if that was passed, it would close the season, which is
12 what he got to. But I think he misspoke when he said
13 that it would be closed earlier.

14

15 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yeah. I apologize. I
16 meant to explain that you could re.....

17

18 MS. NEEDHAM: But I also had comments,
19 too.

20

21 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yes. Cathy.

22

23 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
24 would support the Proposal as modified for the reasons
25 that Mr. Douville stated. And I would also add that I
26 think that it gives opportunity for some information to
27 be collected during the December harvest, if there is a
28 harvest. I think that over the past few years harvest
29 has been substantially low. I do recognize that there
30 is a conservation concern, but I think with that low
31 potential harvest we could get information.

32

33 And I would also point out that if
34 harvest levels become concerning in-season, there is
35 that safeguard of in-season management closures to
36 happen if we're seeing a lot of marten being taken in
37 the first part -- in December for that. And so I think
38 it's -- the as-modified version is a good stepping
39 stone and doesn't unnecessarily restrict subsistence
40 users. Because it's -- you know, it's always really
41 difficult for this body to be closing down Federally
42 qualified subsistence users in our Region if we don't
43 have to.

44

45 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Cathy.

46

47 Any other discussion.

48

49 Mr. Chuck Ardizzone.

50

1 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Chair, just for
2 clarification, there is no in-season manager for
3 marten. If there was any in-season management action,
4 there would have to be a submittal of a special action
5 to the Board for Board action to do anything with the
6 marten season, just for clarity.

7
8 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Has that ever
9 occurred.

10
11 MR. ARDIZZONE: I believe we have
12 addressed some marten special actions, I believe, in
13 the past.

14
15 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair.

16
17 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Larson.

18
19 MR. LARSON: Yes. The in-season -- the
20 management of marten in-season has not been delegated
21 from the Board. In previous years when there was a
22 special action request submitted, it went to the Board
23 for action. So there's not a local in-season manager.
24 There is an opportunity for in-season management, but
25 it's done by the Board.

26
27 Thank you.

28
29 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you for that
30 clarification.

31
32 Any other discussion.

33
34 Patty.

35
36 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair, new
37 information was given me from Chuck about if no action
38 was taken, then the season -- extended season, which is
39 December, January, February would remain in effect.
40 And I would support the modification rather than to
41 have the extended season, December, January, February.
42 But my preference is the continued -- to protect the
43 continued viability of marten populations, I would
44 support the original Proposal. But given that no -- if
45 no action was taken, I will support the modification.

46
47 Thank you.

48
49 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Patty.

50

1 Mr. Bloom.

2

3 MR. BLOOM: Thank you. As a point of
4 order, can I request a two-minute break to talk to Mr.
5 Larson.

6

7 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Two minutes.
8 Remain in your seats, please, so we can get back to it
9 in two minutes.

10

11 (Pause)

12

13 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. We have a
14 clarification by Mr. Larson.

15

16 MR. LARSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The
17 question was whether or not it's appropriate and
18 allowable to have the Council have a motion to accept
19 the recommendations made by the OSM preliminary
20 conclusion. It's always been our practice to allow the
21 Council leeway to decide what is the mechanism that
22 they want to move forward. So you can. And it's your
23 decision to use either the Proposal as originally
24 submitted as the mechanism to move forward or the OSM
25 preliminary conclusion as the mechanism to move
26 forward. That becomes the main motion. At this point
27 it is up to the will of the Council. They could amend
28 the Proposal to suit their needs. That amendment would
29 then become the main motion and that would be the point
30 of discussion and final action by the Council.

31

32 If the Council decided that when they
33 were all done with their deliberations and they voted
34 either to support or to not support the final action,
35 then that motion can be reconsidered if you are on the
36 prevailing side and if you had the majority of the
37 Council wishing to do that.

38

39 So in this case we have a motion to
40 accept the OSM preliminary conclusion as the main
41 motion. That's the motion that's before the Council.
42 They can deal with it as they wish -- amend or not,
43 pass or fail.

44

45 Thank you.

46

47 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you for that
48 clarification, Mr. Larson.

49

50 Is there any more discussion.

1 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.
2
3 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Patty.
4
5 MS. PHILLIPS: I am going to vote no on
6 the modified Proposal. I'm going to err on the side of
7 continued viability of marten populations.
8
9 Thank you.
10
11 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Patty.
12
13 Mr. Howard.
14
15 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
16 I'm also going to vote no. And I have several reasons
17 for this. One reason -- and I'll use an example. I
18 first started trapping. Trapped for two weeks. Didn't
19 catch nothing. Took my dad out with me. He reset all
20 my traps and then I had more furs than I wanted to deal
21 with. So when you're telling me that this is all based
22 on what's caught there, how do we know this one trapper
23 isn't a rookie like I was. So that data there in
24 itself isn't supported.
25
26 The other reason I'm not really going
27 to support this in any language is it's one trapper.
28 And I haven't heard his voice today. Now, part of what
29 we're supposed to is consultate with the local
30 residents of the area being affected. Now, I strongly
31 believe in that because, you know, to me, when I took
32 an oath as a veteran, you're supposed to defend the
33 Constitution of the United States. When you take your
34 oath as a City Council Member, you do the State
35 Constitution as well as the Federal Constitution. So
36 in that in itself, are we protecting this guy's right
37 to subsist. Do we know what he's doing with his hides.
38 Is he only catching five because that's all he needs.
39
40 So there's too many variables here that
41 don't support this. Taking away one person's ability
42 to do whatever he's doing. I'd like this Council to
43 consider this one person and the fact that maybe he
44 didn't make enough money to come here and speak for
45 himself.
46
47 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
48
49 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Howard.
50

1 I would ask Mr. Robert because he
2 speaks a little more clearly on the way this Proposal
3 -- what's going to happen if this Proposal goes through
4 a clarify things.

5
6 Mr. Larson.

7
8 MR. LARSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And
9 I too agree that it's good to back up and see the big
10 picture. So the current situation is that there are no
11 restrictions to the Federal marten season on Kuiu
12 Island. The current regulation is that it opens on
13 December 1st and it closes on February 15th, without a
14 seasonal restriction.

15
16 The original Proposal by the State is
17 to close the season. The modification that is now
18 before the Council as its main motion is to leave
19 December open and close the season that starts in
20 January and ends on February 15th. So a positive vote
21 would restrict January-February 15th portion of the
22 season. A negative vote would allow the season to stay
23 the same.

24
25 Thank you.

26
27 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you for
28 clarifying that, Mr. Larson.

29
30 Any more discussion.

31
32 Mr. Howard.

33
34 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. One
35 point I forgot to mention was the fact that I did trap,
36 I realized it wasn't worth doing after two or three
37 years. So you've also got to give that one trapper the
38 benefit of the doubt. When it's not worth doing, leave
39 it up to him to decide it's not worth me doing.

40
41 You know, I still say we're charged
42 with the duty that he should be allowed to represent
43 himself. And maybe he can't afford to. Time and time
44 again, you know, I've dealt with the State on my levels
45 and I wasn't able to afford to go jump through every
46 hoop they wanted me to. I think we should leave it up
47 to him to decide whether or not he wants to trap or
48 not.

49
50 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

1 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Howard.

2

3 Mr. Hernandez.

4

5 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.
6 Chairman. I made the motion to support this with the
7 modification and I be will voting in favor of that. I
8 believe that there is a conservation concern that needs
9 to be addressed. I think the modification was a good
10 compromise to shorten the season but still allow some
11 opportunity for subsistence users. And I see through
12 the testimony that by having the season open would
13 provide that opportunity and also be a means to gather
14 information. I hadn't considered that originally, but
15 I can see that would be beneficial as well.

16

17 So like I said, I will be voting in
18 favor. Should the motion fail, I would probably ask
19 for a reconsideration and put back on the table the
20 original motion to close the season all together
21 because I think we do need to address the conservation
22 concern. I think leaving the season open in its
23 present form is probably not healthy for the marten
24 population.

25

26 Thank you.

27

28 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
29 Hernandez. And I agree with you. I think the
30 information that could be gathered during that one-
31 month season could be very valuable to understanding
32 the trends of that population and yet still keep in
33 mind that we are concerned about the conservation of
34 it. And so I'm going to be voting in favor of the
35 modified Proposal as well.

36

37 Any other discussion.

38

39 Mr. Bloom.

40

41 MR. BLOOM: Sorry to belabor this, Mr.
42 Chairman, but as a point of order question, if the
43 motion fails, the only people that can ask for that
44 reconsideration have to be on the prevailing side; is
45 that correct?

46

47 MR. LARSON: That is correct.

48

49 MR. BLOOM: So if Mr. Hernandez votes
50 in favor and the motion fails, he cannot ask for

1 reconsideration.

2

3

CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other discussion.

4

5

MR. KITKA: Question.

6

7

CHAIRMAN BANGS: Question's been called
8 for on Proposal WP16-09. And the Proposal has been
9 modified to allow for a trapping season -- closure of
10 the regular season and modify it to allow trapping in
11 the month of December. All those in favor -- maybe we
12 should take a roll call vote on this because it's going
13 to be split.

14

15

Is that okay, Mr. Kitka? A roll call?

16

17

MR. KITKA: Arthur Bloom.

18

19

MR. BLOOM: Yes.

20

21

MR. KITKA: Frank Wright.

22

23

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

24

25

MR. KITKA: Patricia Phillips.

26

27

MS. PHILLIPS: No.

28

29

MR. KITKA: Michael Douville.

30

31

MR. DOUVILLE: Yes.

32

33

MR. KITKA: Harvey Kitka. I vote yes.

34

35

Robert Schroeder.

36

37

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes.

38

39

MR. KITKA: Albert Howard.

40

41

MR. HOWARD: No.

42

43

MR. KITKA: Donald Hernandez.

44

45

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.

46

47

MR. KITKA: John Yeager.

48

49

MR. YEAGER: Yes.

50

1 MR. KITKA: Michael Bangs.
2
3 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yes.
4
5 MR. KITKA: Cathy Needham.
6
7 MS. NEEDHAM: Yes.
8
9 MR. KITKA: Mr. Chair, the motion
10 passed with two.....
11
12 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Motion carries nine to
13 two.
14
15 MR. KITKA: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)
16
17 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mr. Kitka.
18
19 Okay. We're done with the Proposals.
20 And we'll be breaking for lunch and a field trip. The
21 lunches are made up I believe in the kitchen. And I'd
22 like to reconvene at -- what time is it now, 1:00
23 o'clock?
24
25 MR. LARSON: It's 1:00 o'clock now.
26
27 CHAIRMAN BANGS: How about 3:00
28 o'clock. That will give us time to go do our little
29 field trip and eat our lunch. And then be back here,
30 reconvene for at least a couple of hours. We can get
31 further along in the Agenda.
32
33 Thank you.
34
35 (Off record)
36
37 (On record)
38
39 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. We're going to
40 resume with the review of the 2016 Fisheries Resource
41 Monitoring Plan. Jennifer Harden and Terry Suminski.
42
43 MS. HARDIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
44 Members of the Council. My name is Jennifer Hardin and
45 I am the Anthropology Division Chief from the Office of
46 Subsistence Management. And today I'm really happy to
47 be able to bring you some information about the
48 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program. This
49 information begins on page 118 of your book.
50

1 This afternoon I'd like to present some
2 information about the 2016 Fisheries Resource
3 Monitoring Program and discuss the Fisheries Resource
4 Monitoring Program. And if I say FRMP, that's what I'm
5 referring to. So discuss the Monitoring Program's
6 Proposal cycle and some of the modifications that we've
7 made to the process and that have been implemented this
8 year. So we'll go over that a little bit. And mainly
9 those modifications have to do with how Proposals are
10 received and reviewed.

11
12 And then finally Terry and I will
13 present the rankings of the Southeast Region's
14 proposals. Rankings that were developed by the
15 Technical Review Committee for the Fisheries Resource
16 Monitoring Program. Next slide.

17
18 So just as a brief overview, the
19 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program. Our mission is
20 to identify and provide information needed to sustain
21 subsistence fisheries on Federal public lands for rural
22 Alaskans through a multi-disciplinary and collaborative
23 program. The FRMP was first implemented in 2000. And
24 you can find -- if you're interested in looking at the
25 history of the program, the historical overview also is
26 on page 118.

27
28 But just some brief information. Since
29 2001, about \$103,000,000 has been allocated to fund a
30 total of 431 projects throughout the State. The
31 program generally funds two types of projects.
32 Generally speaking, stock status and trends projects
33 and harvest monitoring and traditional ecological
34 knowledge projects. But we really, really are
35 interested in also seeing projects that combine those
36 projects, so we're starting to receive more of those.
37 Since the beginning of the program we have really
38 emphasized collaboration and partnerships, so we'll
39 talk a little bit more about that as I go on. Next
40 slide.

41
42 Here are -- on the screen you'll see
43 just some general funding and policy guidelines that
44 help structure the program. These are mainly in place
45 to ensure that we're prioritizing high quality projects
46 that address important subsistence questions in the
47 State. So for example, we accept Proposals for
48 projects of up to four years. Studies must not
49 duplicate existing projects because we want to make
50 sure we're covering new ground. And we try to ensure

1 that a majority of the Monitoring Program funding is
2 dedicated to non-Federal agencies, again with an
3 emphasis on partnerships and capacity building.

4
5 Long term projects are considered on a
6 case-by-case basis and we have funded several of those.
7 But there are some activities that we don't consider as
8 part of the Monitoring Program and those are listed in
9 number five. And you'll see that things like habitat
10 protection, mitigation, restoration, hatchery
11 propagation. I won't go through the whole list, but
12 I'll just point out that we generally don't fund those
13 projects because we don't want the Monitoring Program
14 to duplicate responsibilities and efforts of government
15 agencies that are already in place. Next slide.

16
17 So we thought we'd just go through the
18 cycle -- the FRMP cycle pretty quickly. But the first
19 step in the cycle when we accept Proposals starts with
20 you all. It starts with OSM working with the Councils
21 to develop priority information needs for each Region.
22 Those are really the heart of the Proposal cycle. They
23 drive what Proposals that we'll accept and that we're
24 seeking. And the Councils have a central role of
25 course in developing these. We really want people to
26 begin working with Councils and local communities,
27 Tribes -- whichever partners they're looking to work
28 with very early. So we hope that people are doing that
29 much before when the notice of funding availability
30 comes out. And we look for that when we review the
31 Proposals.

32
33 We also want to facilitate this early
34 involvement, so the Office of Subsistence Management
35 provides some technical assistance. And we'll also
36 have a training session -- or several training sessions
37 at the Winter All-Councils Meeting to go over kind of
38 the specifics of the program and talk about tips for
39 developing Proposals and submitting them. Next slide.

40
41 So the next step in the process is
42 Proposal submission. And this we've had -- we made a
43 few modifications to this process. One of the
44 modifications is that we need to receive a complete
45 project by the deadline, so everything must be in place
46 and submitted by the listed deadline.

47
48 And each project must address five
49 specific criteria. And they're listed there. They
50 include strategic priority and priority information

1 needs. We're looking to make sure that projects that
2 are submitted have a direct association to a Federal
3 subsistence fishery of course and they're addressing
4 important subsistence questions. We also look at
5 technical and scientific merit, so investigators need
6 to demonstrate that the project is technically sound.
7 We ask people to talk about the investigator's
8 abilities and their resources for completing the
9 project. And then again, capacity building and
10 partnership. These are really high priorities for the
11 Monitoring Program and we're looking for clear evidence
12 that this has been built into projects. And then we of
13 course also look at the cost and benefits of each
14 project submitted. Next slide.

15
16 Step three is Proposal evaluation.
17 Again we have made some modifications, but those
18 modifications and this whole process, the intent is to
19 prioritize again high quality projects. We have made
20 modifications and one of the reasons for that is to
21 ensure that there's transparency in the Proposal
22 evaluation process and that Proposals are evaluated
23 consistently every cycle.

24
25 Proposals are reviewed and evaluated by
26 the Technical Review Committee. And that's an
27 InterAgency Committee of senior technical specialists.
28 And they have representatives from all of the Agencies
29 involved in the Federal Subsistence Program and include
30 biologist and anthropologists. Next slide.

31
32 So the key modifications that we've
33 made to this process include -- I mentioned those five
34 criteria that we're looking for in Proposals. And when
35 we announce that funding is available and that we're
36 seeking Proposals, we include in that announcement very
37 specific guidelines that let people know exactly what
38 we're looking for in the Proposals and how their
39 Proposals will be evaluated according to each of those
40 criteria.

41
42 We also have implemented a process
43 where each participating Agency on the Technical Review
44 Committee only has one vote in the process, so many
45 Agencies that are involved have multiple people. For
46 instance, there are two people from the Office of
47 Subsistence Management that are on the Technical Review
48 Committee. We provide a consolidated review of each
49 Proposal. And there's only one review, not two. We
50 also ask that Agencies recuse themselves from providing

1 reviews on any projects that their Agency has submitted
2 or is a co-principal investigator for. So if -- using
3 OSM again -- or I'll use the Forest Service. If the
4 Forest Service is on a Proposal, they can stay in the
5 room and answer questions if they're asked, but they're
6 not ranking their own Proposals. Next slide.

7

8 So the Technical Review Committee
9 develops the draft Monitoring Plan based on this
10 Proposal evaluation. And they evaluate and score each
11 Proposal for again the five criteria that are listed on
12 the screen. And the final score determines the ranking
13 of each Proposal within each Region. Next slide.

14

15 Step five is where we are now. And
16 that is receiving comments and input from the Regional
17 Advisory Councils. This is what we would like to do
18 today, is to hear from you all about any comments that
19 you have on the TRC -- the work that the TRC has done
20 related to the Southeast Proposals. And we're
21 particularly interested in comments that have to do
22 with telling us whether the Proposals -- how well the
23 Proposals are aligned with your priority information
24 needs; comments that you might on the rankings or the
25 Proposal summaries, which are in your book; and then on
26 the process that I've outlined here.

27

28 And then next step -- Terry, the next
29 slide, please -- is Federal Subsistence Board review
30 and final Monitoring Plan. In the next step, the ISC,
31 the InterAgency Staff Committee, will review the
32 process and also all of the comments that are provided
33 by the Councils and the rankings that are provided by
34 the Technical Review Committee. They will then -- the
35 Board then synthesizes the comments and they provide
36 recommendations about the final Monitoring Plan. Those
37 go back to the Office of Subsistence Management and
38 then the Monitoring Plan is then finalized in OSM.
39 Next.

40

41 So specific to the Southeast Region,
42 I'm just going to do a very quick overview. Again,
43 this is in your book. And you'll find it starting on
44 page 128. Terry, could you go on to the next slide?

45

46 So this slide shows there the funding
47 has gone in the Southeast Region since 2000, the year
48 2000. But this trend has changed. This shows the
49 Agencies or organizations -- the general categories
50 where funding has gone. This trend has changed in the

1 past five or six years in that there is now less funds
2 going to the State on project for a variety of reasons.
3 But this slide is specific to the past 14 -- 15 years.
4 I'm sorry. 127 of your book. Terry, can we go to the
5 next slide.

6

7 Projects in the Southeast Region, as
8 you know, are funded through the Department of
9 Agriculture. The priority information needs that were
10 considered in 2016 for the Southeast Region are on page
11 128. And then Terry, if you can advance the slide, you
12 will see the ranked table of projects for the Southeast
13 Region on page 129, and also on the screen.

14

15 There are summaries of each of these
16 projects and the justification for the ranking that was
17 provided by the Technical Review Committee. They start
18 on page 130 of your book. But I'll just quickly go
19 through these projects. Five projects were submitted
20 for the Southeast Region. They're listed here in rank,
21 order. And again this ranking is based on the
22 Technical Review Committee work.

23

24 The first ranked number one is Eek Lake
25 Subsistence Sockeye Salmon Project. This project will
26 estimate sockeye salmon escapement into Eek Lake using
27 underwater video to sample for age, sex, and length.

28

29 Number two is Sarkar Creek Sockeye
30 Salmon Stock Assessment. This project aims to estimate
31 escapement into the Upper Sarkar watershed with two
32 video equipped net weirs. And they will also collect
33 information about age, sex, and length.

34

35 Number three, Hatchery Creek Sockeye
36 Stock Assessment. It's a continuation project.

37

38 Number four is Virginia Lake Sockeye
39 Stock Assessment. And they will be looking at -- they
40 would like to look at sockeye returning to Virginia
41 Lake using double redundant open net weirs and
42 underwater digital video recorders.

43

44 And number five is the Stikine Eulachon
45 or Eulachon Stock Assessment. They're seeking to
46 estimate timing distribution and relative abundance.
47 Next slide.

48

49 So just to return back to step five,
50 which is where we are now, this is a really critical

1 step for the program. Again, the information that you
2 all provide today will be coupled with the rankings
3 from the Technical Review Committee and those will be
4 forwarded to the Board. And this slide here again is a
5 reminder of the types of comments that you may want to
6 share with us and some of the information we're looking
7 for and would love to talk with you all about.

8

9 So with that, I think I'll -- I'd love
10 to answer any questions or to hear your comments on the
11 information.

12

13 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Jennifer.
14 I have a question. Do you -- you know, I remember we
15 prioritized our list. But I apologize. I don't
16 remember what our list was. Do you have our list of
17 the projects that we prioritized?

18

19 MS. HARDIN: I do not have that list.
20 I'm sorry. I don't.

21

22 MR. SUMINSKI: Good afternoon, Mr.
23 Chairman, Council. Terry Suminski with the Forest
24 Service. We didn't actually prioritize the list, but
25 the list of projects is on page 128 in the priority
26 information needs that we came up with. We typically
27 don't prioritize them because we don't know what
28 proposals we're actually going to receive. So -- but
29 if you look at page 128, that's the list of projects
30 that we came up for our priority information needs.

31

32 CHAIRMAN BANGS: I just thought I
33 remembered us -- a few of us going through and putting
34 a list of what -- because of the information and
35 testimony, we had prioritized a list of projects in the
36 order that we felt were most important. I just thought
37 that's why we did it.

38

39 MR. SUMINSKI: Mr. Chairman, you might
40 be thinking of the last cycle when we were at this
41 point in the process, where we had the list of projects
42 or proposals that we received. And then we went
43 through a ranking -- you know, a ranking exercise at
44 that point. But typically when we do the priority
45 information needs, we don't -- it's just kind of the
46 wish list that we talked about, not -- we didn't really
47 get into ranking them at that point.

48

49 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Thank you.

50

1 Any questions from the Council.
2
3 Patty.
4
5 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you. On this page
6 129, so the program only got five Proposals to review?
7
8 MS. HARDIN: That's correct.
9
10 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair. And so
11 you've ranked -- the InterAgency Staff Committee has
12 prioritized them as one is the most important and down?
13 And so I see it's like \$2,081,792. Is there enough
14 funds for all those projects?
15
16 MS. HARDIN: Thank you. Through the
17 Chair. The rankings that you see on page 129 were from
18 the Technical Review Committee and those were based on
19 evaluating those five criteria that I talked about.
20 And so those -- number one would be the project that
21 received the highest score based on those five
22 criteria.
23
24 In terms of funding, funding has been
25 provided by the Department of Agriculture in past
26 years. And it's uncertain what the amount of funds
27 that will be available this year.
28
29 And Terry may want to add to that.
30
31 MR. SUMINSKI: Mr. Chairman or Through
32 the Chairman. Ms. Phillips, right now we're actually
33 -- given our funding for 2016, there's three of our
34 continuing projects that we're not going to be able to
35 fund. And that's the Hatchery Creek, the subsistence
36 portion of Redoubt Lake sockeye and the Eek Lake
37 sockeye projects.
38
39 So given that, unless something changes
40 budget-wise we probably won't have any funds available
41 to fund any of these new 2016 projects.
42
43 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Ms. Needham.
44
45 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
46 Can you explain -- I've obviously written a lot of
47 Proposals to the FRMP program. And we're kind of on
48 this now two-year cycle of when Proposals are accepted,
49 but we have four-year projects that started two years
50 ago that seemed to be like a bulk of the projects. The

1 last time we received like ten or eleven projects and
2 then in this two-year kind of "off-cycle" we tend to
3 receive less Proposals. Can you explain that shift and
4 why you're not just doing this on every four-year
5 basis?

6

7 Especially given that now that we're on
8 the "two-year" interim piece of it that there likely
9 isn't going to be funding to fund all of this.

10

11 MR. SUMINSKI: Yeah. Through the
12 Chair. Ms. Needham. I'm not sure why the -- you know,
13 why two years rather than four years other than the
14 fact that waiting four years may be too long. You
15 know, if new needs come up. And the thing is even
16 though we may not have funds at this moment, as long as
17 the projects are approved, if funds to become available
18 we can -- we have a basically shelf stack where we
19 could pick them up and start them.

20

21 But as two versus four, I think it's
22 just -- you know, I don't know if it would be a good
23 idea to wait four years. And, you know, for how
24 quickly things seem to change in fisheries management.

25

26 Thank you.

27

28 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Ms. Phillips.

29

30 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Chairman
31 Bangs. Mr. Suminski, I'm a little confused now. You
32 said three projects are continuing projects. And you
33 said Eek Lake, Hatchery Creek, and Redoubt are
34 continuing projects that won't be funded. But they're
35 not part of this list on page 129. And if they're not,
36 then please explain that to me.

37

38 MR. SUMINSKI: Through the Chair. Ms.
39 Phillips. The three projects that I mentioned --
40 continuing projects that were not funded, those are
41 three of the eleven projects that were approved in the
42 2014 cycle. So those are four-year project that
43 started in 2014 and will, you know, end in 2017. We
44 won't be able to fund the -- basically the last two
45 years of those three projects. And that's what I mean
46 by continuing projects. And these -- the projects on
47 page 129 are a new set of projects that would -- if
48 funded, would start in 2016, in addition to our
49 continuing projects. Does that make sense?

50

1 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Follow-up, Patty.

2

3 MS. PHILLIPS: So does that put these
4 projects on page 129 below on the priority list from
5 the continuing projects?

6

7 MR. SUMINSKI: Through the Chair. Ms.
8 Phillips. At this point, yes. But, you know, that
9 could be a comment that you may want to make. Maybe
10 one of these is -- you know, the 2016 list might be
11 more important than one of the others.

12

13 That's certainly within your
14 prerogative to make those comments.

15

16 Thanks.

17

18 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

19

20 Ms. Needham.

21

22 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
23 Along those lines, is it possible to get a list of the
24 other projects that were submitted during the 2014
25 cycle, to kind of remind ourselves what were on those
26 lists so we could compare them to this new list?

27

28 MS. HARDIN: We could certainly that
29 list, but if for the moment, if you look on page 143,
30 it's not the easiest way to track it down, but you'll
31 be able to see a list of all of the projects that have
32 been funded in the Southeast Region. And I believe the
33 2014 projects begin on page 144. And they begin with
34 the number 14.

35

36 MS. NEEDHAM: Follow-up. I guess I was
37 wondering about the projects and their rankings as
38 well. Like the rankings that they were so that we know
39 if we want to make comment on these projects, if these
40 are at the end of the ranking list, if we know whether
41 or not we feel any of these projects should be moved up
42 in the overall ranking if money should become available
43 in 2016.

44

45 MR. SUMINSKI: Through the Chair. Ms.
46 Needham, I do have them in front of me. We could make
47 that available to you. I could also read them. I know
48 it's not the easiest way to do it, but do you want me
49 to do that.

50

1 MS. NEEDHAM: If you can read them and
2 I can mark them down on this table that Ms. Hardin
3 referred us to, that might work.

4
5 MR. SUMINSKI: Okay. First top
6 priority was the Unuk River, 14-607.

7
8 Second was Kanalku Lake sockeye, 14-
9 608.

10
11 Number three was Hetta Lake. That's
12 14-603.

13
14 And then -- did you find it?

15
16 MS. NEEDHAM: Yes.

17
18 MR. SUMINSKI: Okay. Falls Lake, 602.

19
20 Hatchery Creek is 605. That probably
21 won't be -- oh, that won't be funded at this point.

22
23 Then Sitkoh Lake is 611.

24
25 Neva Lake is 612.

26
27 Klag Lake, 609.

28
29 Kook Lake, 610.

30
31 Klawock, 606.

32
33 Redoubt, 601.

34
35 And Eek Lake sockeye is 604.

36
37 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Cathy.

38
39 MS. NEEDHAM: Okay. So then the -- at
40 the current expected funding level, you would be able
41 to fund in 2016 the first four projects? About first
42 four or five? Is that what you said? You said
43 Hatchery Creek would not likely have continued funding
44 and that was number five on the list.

45
46 MR. SUMINSKI: Through the Chair. Ms.
47 Needham, no. Just Hatchery Creek, Redoubt, and Eek are
48 not funded at this point. Hatchery Creek is ranked
49 number five, but when we made this priority we had an
50 idea that we may not need to continue Hatchery Creek

1 because of the -- we have enough information and the
2 stock seems to be doing better after the fish pass or
3 the barrier improvements. So that was one that we
4 thought could probably be not continued just because
5 it's not as big an issue as it was at the time.

6

7 So it boils down to the fifth project
8 and the last two on that list are the ones that we're
9 talking about not continuing funding.

10

11 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any other questions.

12

13 Cathy.

14

15 MS. NEEDHAM: So is there a big
16 difference between the two Hatchery Creek projects
17 then? Is that because it was proposed again?

18

19 MR. SUMINSKI: Yeah. And we wouldn't
20 fund the other one either. Sorry.

21

22 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Is there any
23 other questions about the.....

24

25 Cathy.

26

27 MS. NEEDHAM: On the new projects, the
28 2016 projects, are you going to go through them in a
29 little bit more detail and talk about like which ones
30 have partnerships and where they're coming from? On
31 Table B1 that Ms. Hardin referred to, it has like the
32 partnering organizations that have proposed -- who is
33 proposing it. And are you going to go through that for
34 each of these five?

35

36 MR. SUMINSKI: Through the Chair. Ms.
37 Needham, so you're just interested in the partners
38 project? Or do you want -- what kind of detail would
39 you like. Because the summaries of all the projects --
40 the executive summaries start on page 133.

41

42 MS. NEEDHAM: Right. I guess one of
43 the criteria and one of the important things that this
44 Council has commented on in the past are projects'
45 ability to build local capacity and work in
46 partnership. And so I like how that other table was
47 done. And this one doesn't necessarily have it. So
48 because it's written out, I have to really dig for the
49 partnering opportunities.

50

1 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Anyone else.
2
3 (No comments)
4
5 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.
6
7 MS. HARDIN: Thank you.
8
9 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Patty.
10
11 MS. PHILLIPS: Is that the end of our
12 comments. I mean aren't we supposed to be making
13 comments to that. I thought you were just taking
14 questions now. What's going on.
15
16 CHAIRMAN BANGS: We were taking
17 questions. And now we need to go forward with whatever
18 is what you want us to do now. What comments or what
19 kind of priorities we have on the list.
20
21 MS. HARDIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We
22 would love to hear from you. Any comments you have
23 about what we've listed on the screen up there or
24 anything -- any other comments that you want us to know
25 and that you want the Federal Subsistence Board to know
26 when they're looking at these Proposals as well.
27
28 MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair, if I may.
29 Gene Peltola, Junior, Assistant Regional Director for
30 the Office of Subsistence Management. As you're
31 obviously aware today that we changed the process with
32 regard to FRMP. And the reason we did that is outside
33 the Southeast with all the other Regions the majority
34 of the funding comes from the Fish and Wildlife
35 Service. With continuation projects and new starts,
36 that's anywhere between \$2,000,000 and \$2,500,000 a
37 year. We have recently -- OSM Fish and Wildlife
38 Services, like all other programs recently experienced
39 sequestration, which was really hard hit. But if you
40 look at the program overall, as early as 2009 we had
41 almost \$16,000,000 for the Federal Subsistence Program.
42 Today we have a lot less than that. More than a third
43 reduced in that time frame.
44
45 Within the Service, because money is
46 coming from the Service for a majority of the projects
47 throughout the Regions, outside of Alaska there is very
48 little knowledge, exposure to subsistence. Because of
49 that it has been a very easy line item to attack. So
50 within the Fish and Wildlife Service funding realm

1 we're fighting the Asiatic carp infestation in the
2 Midwest. We're fighting under-funded hatcheries
3 throughout the Nation. And so we're potentially easy
4 targets to reduce.

5
6 So we looked at FRMP, which is our
7 biggest outflow of funding throughout the Regions, and
8 we tried to make it more transparent, more equitable.
9 Hence some of the changes you've seen. Like example
10 given OSM. We have two reps that serve on the TRC that
11 represents one vote or one say in how we rank the
12 Proposals. In the history review we try to address
13 what critiques there have been with regard to the
14 program. At times we've had very well-developed, very
15 thought out, very well-designed projects which may not
16 necessarily address a subsistence need or requirement.
17 We've funded those.

18
19 The budget environment is not as rosy
20 as we would like it to be, so we're trying to actually
21 insulate the program in addition to educate within our
22 own Agency the important of subsistence, how it is
23 funded. A lot of the projects throughout the various
24 Regions, we wouldn't have funding whether it be from
25 the State or any other Federal programs if it wasn't
26 for FRMP. That's the message we've been trying to
27 send.

28
29 If you recall, like Mr. Bangs talked
30 about, our Chair, in the past we have come up with a
31 list of TRC made recommendations to fund and not fund.
32 We don't do that anymore. And hence we asked you what
33 your priorities were. One of the outcomes of that is
34 that it seemed like some projects may get funded over
35 others even though they may not have had a strong tie
36 to a subsistence need depending on the strength of the
37 lobbying that may occur whether it be at the Board or
38 such. So we tried to make it a more equal playing
39 field.

40
41 Now with regard to Southeast, we look
42 to our sister Agent, the Forest Service to address in
43 conjunction with yourself what your priority
44 information needs are down here. Yes. We still want
45 your input. We would like to have your comments on
46 what aspect of a Proposal, what Proposal is more
47 meaningful say in your opinion than others. How can it
48 be approved -- improved, not approved. Improved. That
49 is the type of comments we're looking for so when we go
50 to the Board saying here's the ranking from all the

1 projects from one to however many received. And we can
2 take those comments from each individual RAC and say
3 here are their particular thoughts about the projects
4 -- the sweeter projects from their Region.

5
6 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

7
8 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Gene.

9
10 I'm just at a loss for -- you know, I
11 mean I look at the list from two years ago when we
12 prioritized them. And just for instance as an example,
13 Eek Lake was number twelve and now we're at number one.
14 And I'm just trying to wrap my head around the change
15 in the process and understand why, you know, the needs
16 that we felt were very important to the problems that
17 we're hearing testimony and problems in escapement.
18 And now just I feel like it's turned upside-down. I'm
19 just not sure if this is -- I don't know if it's a good
20 thing for us or not. And I'm just not sure how to deal
21 with it.

22
23 MR. PELTOLA: Yeah, Mr. Chair, if I
24 may. That is a similar concern that's been expressed
25 to OSM from other Regions as well. And that's why
26 we've gone to try to minimize the lobbying. And
27 whether it be from -- we didn't want to pick one Region
28 against the other. We didn't want to pick one Regional
29 Council Member against the other. And we tried to come
30 up with a process that addresses those higher needs, as
31 identified.

32
33 And being exposed to the process here
34 for years, since I came into this position, from the
35 outside looking in, granted, yeah, it's an OSM project.
36 But there's a lot of lobbying going on, whether it's in
37 a public forum or private forum and even to the point
38 where phone calls are made to myself. And at least
39 with the Fish and Wildlife Service aspect funding
40 aspect of it, which is outside the Southeast, the
41 ultimate decision lies with the ARD of OSM because it's
42 Fish and Wildlife Service money in order to fund
43 something or not.

44
45 The approach we've tried to take is
46 that we're trying to get away from what some have
47 described as arbitrary and capricious decisions on
48 whether to fund or not fund something. So we came up
49 with the criteria. Got input from the different
50 Agencies, different individuals, and we modified the

1 way we did things. And example that is recusing
2 yourself. The program tried that in the past where
3 they actually would ask a biologist to leave the room
4 when they discuss a program. But also that may be the
5 individual that is most knowledgeable about a Proposal
6 being presented because it may come from their area,
7 their Agency. So they could still provide input on the
8 importance of a project, but they don't have
9 necessarily a vote or per se in the process. So we
10 asked Agencies to recuse themselves from funding
11 projects which come from their Agencies or they're co-
12 sponsors on, so to speak. Each of the Bureaus, each of
13 the Agencies gets one vote.

14
15 And we came up with the criteria. And
16 we do take very seriously the priority information
17 needs from each -- in each Region. Now, what we're
18 faced with is at times, you know, we have a formula
19 that says we're going to spend X amount of money in one
20 Region and X amount of money in the other. And we have
21 two potential options. And that is one, to take that
22 money and fund projects elsewhere. Or we could take
23 that and forward funds so to speak a second year of a
24 project. And so we don't run into the situation where
25 we run at a deficit. And I'm not being critical of any
26 Agency, but that's one way you could try to insulate
27 the program.

28
29 And the question that I think Ms. Cathy
30 had earlier about, you know, a two-year versus a four-
31 year. Some of the most expensive project that FRMP
32 funds are enumeration projects. They're where those
33 runs into the hundreds of thousands a year. Those are
34 typically -- those types of projects are a multi-year.
35 Three or four-year projects. And I'm not saying all of
36 them are, but a significant portion of those are. And
37 it's really hard to fund the front end of a four-year
38 project like that and then all of a sudden stop.
39 Because that may be the only enumeration project you
40 have in a particular drainage or an area to base
41 management decisions on.

42
43 And so that's -- and there's others
44 like harvest surveys. You know, where those are just
45 multi-year. And they may be a lower dollar figure.
46 And it's easier for us to fund, you know, something
47 like that on a lower temporal, you know, basis.
48 Because some of those are designed only for two or
49 maybe three years at the most, where a large amount of
50 the higher dollar ones are those where we help operate

1 via funding to go through. And those are typically our
2 four-year projects.

3

4 And then some of the -- we have some
5 genetic sampling projects which we're funding
6 throughout the different Regions where those take a
7 larger data set. And some of those are three and four-
8 year funding also.

9

10 Thank you.

11

12 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

13

14 I'd like to hear from -- some other
15 comments from the Council on their feelings. I'm still
16 not sure how this is good for us as far as us being an
17 active part in this process. I understand you're
18 looking for comments on these projects as far as
19 ranking and stuff, but I felt there was other projects
20 that we had talked about in the past that may have been
21 more necessary for the needs of this Region. And I'm
22 just not sure.

23

24 So does anybody else have -- oh.

25

26 Gene.

27

28 MR. PELTOLA: You know, and that type
29 of project which you're referring to -- you know,
30 Project X, which may be important then that's typically
31 the type of comment we are looking for as a program.
32 What is -- you know, and the comment like you made
33 earlier, Mr. Chair. That this was a high priority for
34 this Regional Advisory Council and we notice that it
35 was a lower -- we said it was -- you know, that type of
36 comment that you just expressed earlier is exactly the
37 type of thing we're looking for to bring towards the
38 Board when the final packet is brought forth to them.

39

40 Now, I can't guarantee that the Board
41 itself will not take and throw out everything we've
42 done. That is potentially their prerogative. But
43 comments such as the one you made earlier would carry a
44 lot of weight when it gets to the Board when you say
45 that, you know, we feel it's very important to continue
46 this -- the second half of this project or point to a
47 new start or vice versa. And that can carry a lot of
48 weight for the Board. And it is a very meaningful
49 comment.

50

1 And we're not trying to diminish the
2 role of the Regional Advisory Council whatsoever, but
3 we're trying to come up with a process that would
4 minimize that lobbying effort. And I'm not accusing
5 the Southeast RAC of doing that whatsoever, but
6 generally speaking there are some RACs that are really
7 effective at lobbying and have pushed some of their
8 proposals through, which may not necessarily have been
9 the best expenditure of the FRMP dollar for the program
10 overall.

11
12 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

13
14 So Ms. Needham.

15
16 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, I'm wondering
17 if it would be appropriate for us to go through these
18 short pieces of each of the projects that were written,
19 starting on page 130. There's only five Proposals, but
20 looking at them and highlighting what we think are
21 important components and why. So that when the Staff
22 go back to the Federal Subsistence Board they know why
23 we might have supported Proposals. It doesn't have to
24 be in a priority type order, but it could just say we
25 feel that this project has merit. That it addresses,
26 you know, a subsistence priority for the Region. It
27 has good cooperation. It brings matching funds to the
28 table. I mean whatever is kind of important.

29
30 And that would give feedback that this
31 Council would have input on these Proposals before it
32 goes to the Board. That's just possibly one way of
33 handling it.

34
35 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any feedback. Any
36 other ideas. It sounds like a useful tool to put forth
37 our feelings. I'm not really sure how we want to go
38 about it or if the rest of the Council wants to
39 consider that. I'd like to hear some other comments.
40 If people are interested in expressing our needs for
41 what we think is important and what we want to move
42 forward.

43
44 Mr. Douville.

45
46 MR. DOUVILLE: I agree with Cathy. But
47 on the other hand, perhaps we need to wrap up our
48 lobbying.

49
50 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Patty.

1 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
2 In terms of the new projects that the Technical Review
3 Committee has ranked, I do agree we should make
4 comments on that. But I also think we should comment
5 on the 2014 projects that they've ranked one through
6 ten. And, you know, from my recollection, the legacy
7 projects have been consistently a priority for the RAC.
8 I mean something like Hetta or Eek, where we have long
9 term, consistent data, and it gives us -- or like Klag
10 Bay. I mean that's not even on the list. Oh, yeah.
11 It is. But it's long term, consistent data that we
12 want to -- because they're -- and they're to me -- I
13 call them legacy projects because we can look to them
14 as like baseline for a sub-Region or a sub-Unit.

15
16 And then also the genetic sampling is
17 something that we wanted to continue. And, you know,
18 is this -- which one of these is our genetic sampling.
19 Is any of them a genetic sampling one.

20
21 And then Kanalku has always been a
22 priority because of, you know, the subsistence needs
23 not being met and the stream conditions being -- not
24 knowing some of the data that we needed to know.

25
26 So that's -- you know, I think the 2014
27 projects should stay ahead of the 2016 projects. Are
28 they 2016 projects that -- okay.

29
30 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

31
32 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Patty.

33
34 And a thing that I've come to realize
35 over the years of doing these -- and prioritizing and
36 picking projects that we felt were important. And it
37 will change from sometimes year to year just because of
38 what testimony we get about a problem that seems like
39 it's a very important thing. And, you know, Kanalku
40 came up and there's these other projects that really
41 stand out as far as a need in our Region that's more
42 important than we thought of last year.

43
44 So I would agree with Patty that we
45 don't want to let go of some of these old projects, but
46 I also would like to be able to -- have our projects
47 that we feel are very important new projects.

48
49 Patty.

50

1 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
2 And I just want to further add that, you know, I would
3 agree with the subsistence person from the -- you know,
4 Terry Suminski, that if we don't need to fund Hatchery
5 Creek because, you know, things have changed to where
6 we don't need that anymore, then we should agree with
7 that and take it off the priority ranking list.

8
9 Thank you.

10
11 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yeah. I would agree
12 with Patty on that. And I think that we need to maybe
13 read through our priority list and the list of projects
14 that we had in the previous meeting that we discussed
15 this and think about it. And think about where our
16 priorities are as far as what's important to our
17 Region, regardless of how they ranked them. And, you
18 know, the lobbying part of it shouldn't play into our
19 feelings.

20
21 Patty.

22
23 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
24 I think also another priority of how we rank projects
25 is that if they were disbursed regionally. And we
26 didn't want it, you know, all in one area if we could
27 -- that's why there were legacy projects that were
28 spread across the region that we continued to rank as
29 higher priority. Because they were disbursed across
30 the region.

31
32 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

33
34 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Patty.

35
36 Frank.

37
38 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
39 was just curious about, you know, we had put ranking on
40 certain systems. And then, you know, like I would like
41 to see Hoktaheen something going on in that place.
42 Because that place is hit by so many communities that
43 it's -- you know, nothing ever goes on there. I mean
44 nothing for justifying it to be closed or kept open or
45 anything like that.

46
47 But what I'd like to know is how this
48 ranking came about and when we ranked something that
49 didn't -- wasn't considered. Am I wrong or what. You
50 know, because I -- you know, I'd like to know. You

1 know, because, you know, we -- what we believe is
2 important, why is it not important to you.

3

4 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

5

6 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Frank.

7

8 Jennifer.

9

10 MS. HARDIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

11 First of all, I just wanted to just point out that the
12 Technical Review Committee ranked only the Proposals
13 that we received. And so I do see that the stock of
14 concern that you mentioned in your priority information
15 needs, but we didn't receive a Proposal related to that
16 issue. So when I mentioned earlier step one, where we
17 -- we're really looking to the Councils to develop
18 their list of priorities for each cycle. And then also
19 we're really wanting researchers to work with you all
20 to -- early so that we receive Proposals that address
21 the priority information needs that are most important
22 to the Council and in the Region.

23

24 So we will be emphasizing that as we
25 move forward for 2018, that we're really wanting people
26 to start early and working with the Council and with
27 the local communities to ensure that Proposals are
28 submitted that reflect the priority information needs,
29 but also the particulars within the list. Because you
30 have a long list here of needs. And we're limited in
31 what we can review. We can only review the Proposals
32 that we receive.

33

34 CHAIRMAN BANGS: So Gene.

35

36 MR. PELTOLA: Yes, Mr. Chair. Thank
37 you. A byproduct of the system which was in place up
38 until this year with regard to FRMP is if you recall
39 that TRC would recommend to fund or not fund the
40 position. And we always have a lot more demand or
41 requests than what we have for funding. So we go
42 through -- now, under the old system we'd go through
43 the TRC. They'd make a recommend to fund or not fund.
44 Then we'd go through the ISC and we'd get to the Board.
45 A lot of the projects which were funded in the past
46 were the ones that had whole concurrence so to speak,
47 where the TRC, the ISC, and the Board all agreed that
48 something should be funded.

49

50 Now that is taken out in the sense that

1 we have -- say we receive 60 Proposals overall through
2 FRMP. And those -- based on the criteria we have, they
3 come up with a rank, one through sixty. All those
4 sixty are potentially still in play, as opposed to like
5 when we had the fund or not fund recommendation.
6 Because that was the first cut. And then after that we
7 looked for all those Proposals typically which had
8 concurrence from, you know, the RAC support, the ISC
9 support, the TRC support, and the Board. And those are
10 typically the majority of the projects that got funded.

11
12

13 Now this is similar to the Southeast
14 what the funding situation is not as clear as it could
15 be. At times our budgeting situation is similar to
16 that where we have a list. Like I said, all 60, you
17 know, theoretical Proposals are still in play. And if
18 we get funding we might be able to get 35 or 42 or 49
19 on that list. So but there's a potential for us to get
20 further on down. And that's one of the reasons why we
21 changed from that recommended or not recommended list.
22 You know, recommend for funding or not. And we just go
23 through on the TRC. Actually, they do a hard job in
24 the sense that not everybody's going to be happy with
25 what they do. But they have a very, very serious and
26 -- responsibility that is a challenge to do. We want
27 to make sure it's scientifically sound. We want to
28 make sure that it addresses a subsistence need.

29
30

31 Example would like I mentioned earlier,
32 a harvest survey. I've seen projects in the past
33 funded where they're -- and this is theoretical from
34 years ago, but basically you go into a fishing site and
35 say how is fishing this year. And if they happen to
36 have a full net, the fishing is good. But if they
37 happen to have an empty net, the fishing is bad. And
38 there isn't a direct correlation so to speak with
39 regard to what is in the river. It's what is at that
40 time. Now that addresses a subsistence need because it
41 addresses harvest -- subsistence harvest. But the
42 design might serve the program a lot better if it was a
43 bit different.

44
45

46 And that's -- we're trying to get --
47 and honestly what is driving this is the potential for
48 and what we've experienced to date is a declining
49 budget environment. Trying to make sure that we're
50 able to fund the most meaningful projects with regard
to the program.

50

1 So thank you, Mr. Chair.

2

3 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

4

5 So where do we go from here. What does
6 the Council want to do. Any ideas. Do we want to go
7 through the five that were the only ones that were --
8 the Proposals that were submitted. Is that -- this
9 boils down to all we have a chance at or I don't know.
10 What does the Council -- how does the Council feel.

11

12 Harvey.

13

14 MR. KITKA: Mr. Chair, I really, really
15 hate to say this, but it seems like this is almost a
16 top down situation, where the top is coming and saying
17 this is what we've got to do. I think this RAC has the
18 responsibility to say no, this is not the way it's
19 supposed to be. Everything should come from the bottom
20 and work its way up. I don't agree with Proposals
21 coming from the top. I think it should come from the
22 people and then work its way up.

23

24 Thank you.

25

26 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Harvey.

27

28 Any other thoughts.

29

30 Terry.

31

32 MR. SUMINSKI: I just wanted to kind of
33 maybe get you thinking about this. But to me, remember
34 these lists aren't ranked against each other. The 2014
35 isn't ranked against the 2016. Just the 2016 projects
36 are ranked against each other. Those five projects
37 that we received. That's one thing. That kind of gets
38 back to why the -- if you look at the two lists, why
39 Eek is so different, you know, in its ranking.

40

41 But another thing to think about is
42 since -- you know, since we talked about priority
43 information needs, you know, Sarkar has come up as kind
44 of an emerging issue. And so that one concerns me.
45 That's one I would -- you know, personally would like
46 to get some funding for. You know, and I -- and it's
47 maybe those type of comments that -- I know Mike's
48 concerned about Sarkar. He's some issues down there.
49 You know, and I can't say we'd be able to reach it
50 given our funding level, but that -- to me that's

1 something that we should look at.

2

3 You know, so I don't know if that might
4 help get you started, but just something to think
5 about.

6

7 Thank you.

8

9 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Douville.

10

11 MR. DOUVILLE: It was a high-ranking
12 one when we discussed it and made our recommendation,
13 but, you know, I'm not fully grasping what's going on
14 here for whatever reason. We made our recommendation.
15 And that always worked before. And if they didn't get
16 funded, well they didn't get funded. But the
17 importance of us giving them -- giving our opinion on
18 the ranking was important. So whether or not they get
19 funded or not was another thing, but at least I would
20 think you would go from one, two, three and at least
21 fund them in the order -- or consider funding them in
22 the order that we put them. Because we thought about
23 it. And we're familiar with what's going on.

24

25 Sarkar has been over-fished, I believe.
26 But, you know, there are some issues with it. And we
27 can't deal with it because the fishery takes places
28 Statewide. But, you know, having the information to
29 show what's going on there might put some credibility
30 into a Proposal that goes before the Board of Fish.
31 That type of thing I think would be important. But I
32 don't know. It's come back to us kind of scrambled
33 here. And it's nothing like what we did. But from
34 what I'm getting out of it, you want us to comment on
35 the list that you presented to us, not the one we
36 presented to you.

37

38 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mike.

39

40 And I have to agree. And I agree with
41 Harvey as well. It just doesn't -- I just don't
42 understand. But I think Gene helped explain it from
43 their perspective, but I just don't feel comfortable
44 ranking projects that I wasn't really thinking were
45 important -- as important to us as the ones that we had
46 originally thought of. And Sarkar is an important one
47 which I'm -- I'm glad to see that on the list. But I
48 don't know.

49

50 Any other comments or thoughts.

1 John.

2

3 MR. YEAGER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
4 Personally, I have questions on a couple of these
5 projects and how they even came to evolve. So any kind
6 of discussion on a per project basis would benefit me
7 and give me that opportunity, if that is agreeable with
8 our Council Members. But I don't have a solution as to
9 that mechanism yet.

10

11 CHAIRMAN BANGS: If that would help the
12 Council if we went through the Proposals one-by-one.
13 We've got five of them to go through. If we could go
14 through them fairly speedy and figure out what's
15 important to us or if they're not important at all,
16 would that help the Council.

17

18 I'd like some more comments if I could
19 get some. If that's okay with the Council, we could go
20 that direction. I'm trying to figure out what you guys
21 want.

22

23 Art.

24

25 MR. BLOOM: Yeah. I guess I'll just
26 add my observations here. It seems like there's always
27 way more projects than could possibly be funded. And
28 we can rank them somewhat, but then we get to this
29 point where these five -- these have had Proposals
30 made. And those Proposals have been ranked by this
31 Technical Review Committee for many things. I'm sure
32 there are many criteria, but mainly they're being
33 ranked for how successful the Committee thinks these
34 projects would be.

35

36 And since there are the only five that
37 has Proposals, there doesn't seem to me there are any
38 others that would come into play for the 2016 cycle.
39 These are the five we have to work with. They've been
40 ranked by the Technical Review Committee for their
41 potential to succeed. I guess we could just maybe add
42 something that if there are strong feelings on the
43 Council as to why there would be a different order of
44 these five. If they were -- if like the fifth one was
45 way more important to us than the first one, we could
46 say that.

47

48 But that's -- that seems to be where we
49 need to go.

50

1 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Art.

2

3 Mike.

4

5 MR. DOUVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
6 would like -- Eek Lake may be important, but the Hetta
7 is really the most important one. Eek is a later run
8 and it's a smaller run. They're bigger fish, but just
9 a stone's throw away. Patty was saying the importance
10 of trends though. But you have Hetta just across the
11 street. So I think that Sarkar not having any out of
12 there and a lot of access to it, which you don't have
13 in Hydaburg or down in Cordova Bay would be an -- would
14 rank above it because of the access from all
15 directions. And the exploitation from all directions,
16 I guess for lack of a better term. But since you have
17 Hetta already there, that is giving you some sort of a
18 trend.

19

20 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Mike.

21

22 I think the point that I'd like to make
23 in regards to Art's observations is that we have some
24 projects that are ongoing that we could continue that
25 aren't on the list, but there are projects that have a
26 history. And that's what -- like Hetta, for instance,
27 and those may or may not be something that the Council
28 wants to encourage to continue, but there are projects
29 that are underway and potential to be continued.

30

31 So not necessary these five is what I'm
32 thinking is the only ones we have a choice to encourage
33 that they pursue. So I don't know. What does the --
34 any other thoughts.

35

36 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can you identify
37 those.

38

39 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Well, Hetta's one of
40 them. And there's others that I'm sure I -- not off
41 the top of my head. Cathy probably.....

42

43 Cathy.

44

45 MS. NEEDHAM: Maybe that list that
46 Terry had would be good to be put on the board to look
47 at in conjunction with these five Proposals. In terms
48 of the comments, I generally agree that the continuing
49 projects, you know, that have been prioritized by this
50 Council on that funding cycle, it would be good for us

1 to make comment about whether or not we feel any of
2 these new Proposals preclude any of the existing
3 projects. I think I'm hearing that they don't
4 necessarily, but we should provide comment back to the
5 Federal Subsistence Board on that point specifically.

6

7 And then maybe request in the future,
8 in two years when we go through this again that when
9 the new projects come in in two years that the Regional
10 Advisory Council also at the same time get a list of
11 continuing projects so that comparison can be made
12 easier in the future.

13

14 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Cathy.

15

16 Okay. Harvey.

17

18 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This
19 last year was one of the prime example of something
20 happening that we don't know what happened. Klag Bay
21 for one normally has at least 10,000 fish return. This
22 year they had a grand total of maybe 3,000. But I
23 think it was under. They had 1,000 fish that got
24 caught in the saltwater and about 1,000, maybe 1,200
25 made it up the stream to spawn. But nobody knows why
26 it just collapsed like that so bad. And a lot of our
27 streams in Southeast are starting to have kind of the
28 same problem. But for many, many years Klag Bay has
29 always been good.

30

31 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Harvey.

32

33 Mr. Larson.

34

35 MR. LARSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And
36 I don't want to muddy the waters here, but I think it's
37 important for everyone to remember that when you look
38 for instance on page 128 of -- and we talk about the
39 priority information needs, that's the property of the
40 Council. So that is your work product. That's what
41 the rest of this program is based on. So if that's --
42 when we move forward in the future, my recommendation
43 is for the Council to review those priority information
44 needs, make sure that they are in fact the Council's
45 priority information that actually meets your needs,
46 they need to be reviewed on a regular basis. And that
47 list needs to be forwarded to OSM. They in fact can
48 then work with that list. But those priority
49 information needs belong to you.

50

1 That's right.

2

3 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Robert.

4

5 Cathy and then Patty.

6

7 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Chair, I understand
8 Mr. Larson's comment, but if you look at these priority
9 information needs, these are the priority information
10 needs for 2016 funding cycle. And so when we were
11 talking about comparing them to projects that are
12 continuing and ongoing, those projects don't even make
13 this list. So Kanalku's not on here. The ones that
14 are currently funded aren't even on this list. This is
15 a list of separate priority information needs for this
16 funding cycle.

17

18 And so I think that if that's the case,
19 we need to have the whole -- well, I guess Kanalku is
20 on there for in-season harvest, but not the stock
21 status trends. And so then we need to see all of the
22 priority information needs. Not just for this funding
23 cycle.

24

25 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you.

26

27 Patty.

28

29 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
30 So I've taken page 144 and I've ranked it based on what
31 Terry was telling us for the number 14. And I placed
32 it here right next to page 129, which is the Table 1 of
33 the five projects. And now Robert Larson is talking
34 about, you know, what are our priority information
35 needs. And it seems like we have a strong -- based on
36 our prior ranking, we have a strong emphasis on stock
37 assessment.

38

39 And then we already said Hatchery Creek
40 can come off because that's information we don't need.
41 We hear from Mr. Douville that while we would like
42 information from Eek, we have the legacy project at
43 Hetta. But if we get funding to do all the projects,
44 we'd like to keep Eek on there, but maybe not as high
45 as some of these others.

46

47 And the Sarkar Creek sockeye, we have a
48 lack of information and so that meets a technical and
49 scientific merit. I think that should rank higher of
50 all. It should rank higher. And eulachon, because we

1 don't know if they're going to show up or not, should
2 be ranked the very lowest. Because you send those guys
3 out in the field. And we think they're going to show
4 up and they don't show up. And then they get out of
5 the field and then the eulachon show up.

6
7 I mean so I don't know. That's -- I
8 still want to stay with our legacy projects.

9
10 So thank you, Mr. Chair.

11
12 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Patty.

13
14 Any other comments.

15
16 (No comments)

17
18 CHAIRMAN BANGS: I agree with Patty. I
19 think the Sarkar Creek, out of these five, is more
20 important than any of the others. And I'd like to see
21 the other projects that are ongoing, the legacy
22 projects at least continue in the future if that's
23 where the funding runs out on these projects that we
24 really would like to see happen and the other projects
25 continued.

26
27 But I don't -- I'm concerned about, you
28 know, Klag Lake now. It's a new thing that is
29 something that's important right now. And maybe that
30 would be something that we would want to consider.

31
32 Patty.

33
34 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Oh. Sorry, Mr. Chair.
35 I said moving up on the ranking? Because it's ranked
36 number eight.

37
38 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Well, how does the
39 Council feel. I think it's.....

40
41 Terry.

42
43 MR. SUMINSKI: Mr. Chairman, Klag Lake
44 is one of those ongoing projects and it's approved
45 through 2017.

46
47 MS. PHILLIPS: Oh, okay.

48
49 MR. SUMINSKI: And at this point, we're
50 showing it as funded for next year. So you don't

1 really have to prioritize that.

2

3 And just to kind of put -- just to
4 address Cathy's comment a little bit, it's true, yeah.
5 On page 128, that priority information need does not
6 include the ongoing projects. Because that would just
7 be redundant. So these are ones that are in addition.
8 You know, when we discussed this earlier, we had our
9 ongoing projects and then we talked about well, what in
10 addition to what we already have going would you like
11 to see information on. And that's what this list is.

12

13 Now when we come back to you in two
14 years for the 2018 monitoring plan, all those
15 continuing projects will no longer be approved. So
16 they will be back on the list, you know, and you'll be
17 able to sort through the list along with any others
18 that you might have.

19

20 So hopefully that kind of puts it in
21 perspective with the process. Does that -- thanks.

22

23 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Suminski,
24 for that clarification. The reason why I brought it up
25 for clarification was because Mr. Larson recommended
26 that this Council look at the priority information
27 needs. And the only list that's in front of us is this
28 list. And I didn't want other members to be confused
29 by the fact that those other projects that are ongoing
30 aren't even on that list. And I didn't want us to
31 necessarily focus specifically on that if we had
32 comments like Klag being important or Hetta being
33 important systems as well.

34

35 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Patty.

36

37 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
38 And thank you, Terry. I mean because you also
39 clarified my mis-thinking. So the list on 144, all of
40 those have been funded except for Redoubt Lake and
41 Hatchery Creek. And then the Unuk River eulachon,
42 right? Is that what you said?

43

44 MR. SUMINSKI: At this point, all the
45 projects that start with a 14 on page 144, those are
46 all currently funded this year. It's for 2016, this
47 coming season, we don't have enough money to fund Eek
48 Lake, Hatchery Creek, and Redoubt. So that's this
49 coming year. Yeah.

50

1 MS. PHILLIPS: This year.
2
3 MR. SUMINSKI: Oh. Well, I think you
4 said the Unuk, which.....
5
6 MS. PHILLIPS: Oh, what was the other
7 one.
8
9 MR. SUMINSKI: It's -- I'm not sure
10 what I said first, but anyways the three projects are
11 Hatchery Creek, Eek Lake, and Redoubt Lake. Those are
12 the ones that we don't have enough funding at this
13 point to fund in this coming field season.
14
15 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Terry.
16
17 Cathy.
18
19 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So
20 for clarification, they're approved for funding, but
21 you don't have enough money to actually fund them. So
22 they're -- essentially if you actually found money
23 under a rock somewhere, you would hand it over because
24 those -- they wouldn't have to be re-approved, right?
25
26 MR. SUMINSKI: That's exactly correct.
27 Thank you.
28
29 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay.
30
31 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.
32
33 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Patty.
34
35 MS. PHILLIPS: Where is the Eek
36 project? I don't see it. I mean.....
37
38 MR. SUMINSKI: Through the Chair. Ms.
39 Phillips, it's 604. And that one -- yeah. 14-604.
40 And you're right. It's not on this list. What
41 happened with Eek is we were able to find enough money
42 this last year to start it for 2015. We didn't fund it
43 in 2014. This is probably getting into way too much
44 detail, but we didn't have enough money to fund it in
45 2014, but we were able to find enough money to fund it
46 in 2015. So it's only been operating -- this was the
47 first year that it operated. So it was basically a low
48 priority that didn't get funded the first year that it
49 was approved, but it got funded the second year it was
50 approved. And now we're saying we can't continue it

1 for the third year that it was approved.

2

3 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you.

4

5 MR. SUMINSKI: So yeah. You're too
6 good at catching all those little details.

7

8 (Laughter)

9

10 MS. PHILLIPS: I just wondered.

11

12 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Terry.

13

14 Any other comments or ideas of how we
15 should proceed or are we good with the comments we've
16 given them. Do we want to change that priority list on
17 the record. Like we spoke about moving Sarkar above
18 Eek Lake, as far as the Council's concerned on the new
19 projects. Drop the eulachon. What's the Council --
20 how does the Council feel about that.

21

22 (No comments)

23

24 CHAIRMAN BANGS: No comments. So this
25 isn't an action item, but we could discuss more or we
26 could move on. If we felt like we've covered enough
27 issues that gave them the comments that we feel are
28 important to Staff to take to the Board. I don't know.
29 Where does the Council want to go.

30

31 John and then Albert.

32

33 MR. YEAGER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
34 still have a question. And I guess just due to lack of
35 any other kind of direction, I'll just ask it right
36 now. I'm curious about the 16-602, the Virginia Lake
37 sockeye salmon stock assessment on page 129. So that
38 project is funded? And was it designed to be a
39 cooperative effort with another group?

40

41 MR. SUMINSKI: Through the Chair. Mr.
42 Yeager, that is not funded at this point. That's one
43 that's recommended for approval for the 2016 Monitoring
44 Plan. That was one of the Proposals we did receive for
45 the 2016 Monitoring Plan. And it is -- if you look on
46 page 135 there's a little more detail on the project.
47 That was proposed by the Wrangell Cooperative
48 Association, with the co-investigators Ben Van Alen,
49 with the Forest Service, and Dennis Reed and Martin
50 Hutten, from the Wrangell District of the Forest

1 Service. And the project was generated by Mr. Ashton,
2 with the Tribe. And so they put together the project
3 proposal to basically assess sockeye with a double-
4 redundant net weir similar to some of our other
5 projects.

6
7 And if you noticed, that was not on
8 your list of priority information needs. So that one
9 has a little bit higher bar in the evaluation process
10 because it doesn't -- you know, it has to have some
11 compelling reason to be on the list that -- basically
12 on the list that you didn't ask for. So that's why it
13 didn't rank quite as high as the others. If that's --
14 is there any other information you were looking for
15 with that?

16
17 MR. YEAGER: So with that explanation
18 there, is any -- so Wrangell Cooperative Association
19 came to the Forest Service and asked to have the
20 Virginia Lake stock monitored and have cameras put in
21 and things like that. Was -- and I have their Wrangell
22 Cooperative Association Tribal Board Meeting Fisheries
23 Management Report from August 31st, where it explains
24 in detail funding that the Wrangell Cooperative
25 Association is trying to obtain for some of these
26 projects. And this one here, objective one, evaluate
27 current sockeye run and associated habitat at Mill
28 Creek and Virginia Lake to determine course of action
29 to increase the care and capacity of the watershed.

30
31 Is that ever taken into consideration
32 that when funding is established for this project, that
33 there might be funding already coming from a different
34 source? Does that affect how much is spent by the
35 Forest Service on this?

36
37 MR. SUMINSKI: Through the Chair. Mr.
38 Yeager, they may be referencing this Proposal in the
39 report you have. They may be the same funding source.
40 Because I don't -- I'm not aware -- they didn't mention
41 in this Proposal any other sources of funding that were
42 going to contribute to this -- the Proposal that we
43 received. So if there is, they sure didn't mention it
44 in their Proposal. So hopefully that addresses your
45 question.

46
47 Thank you.

48
49 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Terry.
50

1 Anyone else.

2

3 Patty.

4

5 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

6 So my comment is the priority information needs that I

7 consider priorities are the technical and scientific

8 merit and the partnership and the capacity building.

9 And I find, you know, that component of the partnership

10 and capacity building to almost be equal to technical

11 and scientific merit. And would like to see that. But

12 that's my opinion.

13

14 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Patty.

15

16 Jennifer.

17

18 MS. HARDIN: Through the Chair. Ms.

19 Phillips, just a note that at this point the five

20 criteria that are listed are weighted equally.

21

22 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Any other
23 comments from the Council on this issue.

24

25 Mike.

26

27 MR. DOUVILLE: So we have a list of

28 five that have Proposals. Are we going to rank those

29 then in priority as far as the Council feels or where

30 are we going.

31

32 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Does the Council want
33 to rank them. And change it or keep it the same. I

34 don't know. It looks like there's already been a

35 comment about putting Sarkar Creek project as number

36 one. Deleting the Hatchery Creek because it's already

37 funded or doesn't need to be looked at, from what I

38 heard. And possibly not worrying about the Stikine

39 eulachon stock assessment. Or is that something that

40 we want to keep on the list just in case you have

41 funding for. Which I would think would be a good

42 thing, but I don't know what the rest of the Council

43 feels. Is that what we're looking at. Moving the --

44 changing the priority list here.

45

46 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.

47

48 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yes, Patty.

49

50 MS. PHILLIPS: Well, I was making my

1 earlier comments based on this mis-idea in my head that
2 we were going to re-rank the whole list of the 2014
3 projects. But I would like to keep the 24 projects
4 that weren't funded above -- on the list. And then the
5 2016 projects would be like below them on the list.
6 But we could rank those. I mean I don't know how you
7 guys fell. But Hatchery Creek comes off of both
8 projects. Off 2014 and 2016. Because we said it's no
9 longer needed to fund.

10

11 Can we agree to remove Hatchery Creek
12 from 2014 project list and 2016 project list. I think
13 we can agree to that.

14

15 MR. DOUVILLE: So move.

16

17 (Laughter)

18

19 MS. PHILLIPS: Second.

20

21 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. So we have a
22 motion to remove the Hatchery Creek from the list on
23 both the 2014 and 2016. I guess the Council -- and
24 does Council have any discussion on that.

25

26 Harvey.

27

28 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

29 Sorry. I just -- maybe I'm like Patty, but I -- if
30 these are the only five that put in Proposals, how can
31 we change or do anything other than what's there
32 already. And if -- well, they put in Proposals for Eek
33 Lake and Hatchery Creek, but they stopped funding on
34 them. But they're putting in new Proposals for it, so
35 -- and they're the only ones that put in Proposals; is
36 that right?

37

38 MS. HARDIN: Through the Chair. These
39 are the only Proposals that we received for the
40 Southeast Region for 2016.

41

42 CHAIRMAN BANGS: So I would suggest if
43 we have a tendency to want to change the list order,
44 that we do that and move on.

45

46 MS. PHILLIPS: We have a motion, Mr.
47 Chair.

48

49 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. So the motion
50 is to remove Hatchery Creek sockeye salmon population

1 assessment from the list. All those -- any more
2 discussion.

3

4 MR. HERNANDEZ: Do we have a second.

5

6 CHAIRMAN BANGS: We have a second. The
7 second was by Patty. It was made -- the motion was
8 made by Mike. We were still having -- or Don.

9

10 (Laughter)

11

12 CHAIRMAN BANGS: So you so moved,
13 right?

14

15 MS. PHILLIPS: He said so moved.

16

17 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yeah.

18

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think that Patty
20 should start.....

21

22 (Laughter)

23

24 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Oh, okay.

25

26 Okay. So we don't have a motion on the
27 floor until Patty so moves.

28

29 Art.

30

31 MR. BLOOM: Thanks. So for those of us
32 who are newer to the process, could you explain the
33 rationale behind removing Hatchery Creek. You know, I
34 haven't heard it discussed in any detail in the four
35 meetings I've been to. So -- and there are other who
36 haven't been to four meetings. So in order to vote on,
37 could you just give us a quick rationale. Someone.

38

39 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yeah. It's Terry.

40

41 Can you explain it again, please?

42

43 MR. SUMINSKI: Yeah. Mr. Chair, as I
44 mentioned earlier with Hatchery Creek, there were some
45 improvements to the barrier falls below the weir on
46 that system. And that was -- I don't trust my memory.
47 It's been a few years. And we have seen increased
48 escapement through that weir. And we -- and it seems
49 to be the result of fish being able to negotiate that
50 barrier easier. So we're less concerned about it going

1 into the future with as far as assessment goes. So
2 that's kind of a quick synopsis. If we want to get
3 into a lot more detail, I'd have to do a little
4 research.

5
6 Thank you.

7
8 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Douville.

9
10 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman, we need to
11 take a couple of steps back here I think. Because when
12 Patty made her statement, I asked do you so move. And
13 you.....

14
15 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay.

16
17 MR. DOUVILLE:took it as a
18 motion. So we need to go back to there.

19
20 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. I'm sorry,
21 Mike. I thought you said you so moved.

22
23 MR. DOUVILLE: No.

24
25 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay.

26
27 So Patty, do you have anything.

28
29 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Chairman
30 Bangs. And I apologize, Mr. Douville. I thought you
31 said so move.

32
33 I move to remove Hatchery Creek sockeye
34 salmon assessment 14-605 and 16-601 from the ranking
35 for fisheries monitoring projects.

36
37 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Do we have a second.

38
39 MR. BLOOM: Second.

40
41 CHAIRMAN BANGS: It's been seconded by
42 Mr. Bloom. Motion made by Ms. Phillips.

43
44 Discussion. Any more discussion.

45
46 Mr. Douville.

47
48 MR. DOUVILLE: I have a question for
49 Patty. What would be the purpose of removing -- I
50 guess it's already funded, right? It's not funded?

1 Okay. What would be the purpose of removing it?

2

3

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

4 Mr. Douville, so what we've heard from OSM Office of
5 Subsistence Management is that there is sequestration.
6 And the amount of money coming to Fisheries Monitoring
7 Projects in the State of Alaska is being significantly
8 diminished. And so they don't have enough funds to
9 fund all these projects and we need to from our Region
10 decide what are the more important projects that can be
11 funded.

12

13

And we hear from Mr. Suminski that
14 Hatchery Creek -- there were concerns at Hatchery
15 Creek, but the concerns at Hatchery Creek have been
16 mitigated by improvements to the barrier falls at
17 Hatchery Creek and now they're getting greater
18 escapement. So that could be removed from the list of
19 projects that need to be funded in terms of stock
20 assessments because they already know they're getting
21 greater stock assessment.

22

23

CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Patty.

24

25 Is there any more discussion on the
26 removal of Hatchery Creek from both lists of priority
27 needs.

28

29

Yes, Frank.

30

31

MR. WRIGHT: Well, see by increasing
32 escapement, is it continuous? Or is it -- how often?
33 Is it every year?

34

35

MR. SUMINSKI: Through the Chair. Mr.
36 Wright, it's only been a matter of a few years since
37 the improvements were made to the barrier falls. It
38 has improved in those years; however, like any system,
39 you know, it changes. So it may not be necessary to
40 remove it from the list. It might just be maybe
41 supporting the idea that it's not a top priority at
42 this time. And if, you know, by some miracle we got a
43 bunch of money, maybe it wouldn't hurt to continue to
44 monitor it.

45

46

But I understand what Patty's saying.
47 In the times of the funding shortage maybe we should
48 skip over it to reach some of these other more pressing
49 needs. I think that's probably a -- maybe a little bit
50 better way of thinking about it.

1 Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Terry.

4

5 Cathy.

6

7 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So
8 the current -- the 2014 Hatchery Creek project is
9 currently approved for funding. So if the funding
10 amount went down past where Hatchery Creek fell in
11 terms of the priority ranking set for the 2014, it
12 would -- the money would go towards that project and
13 not necessarily another project that's lower on the
14 list or one of these five projects -- one of these four
15 projects; is that correct?

16

17 MR. SUMINSKI: Through the Chair. Ms.
18 Needham, I'm not sure exactly if I understand what
19 you're saying. Maybe I'm getting tired. But there's
20 -- I think for next year -- let's just talk about next
21 year. If we got extra money, my recommendation would
22 be not to spent it on Hatchery Creek and maybe try to
23 pick up Sarkar or Eek. You know, that -- is that kind
24 of getting at what you're saying? Maybe I missed it.
25 Sorry.

26

27 MS. NEEDHAM: For the current funding
28 -- the current funding cycle -- the approved funding
29 cycle now, Hatchery Creek was an approved project that
30 ranked number five in 2014. And now you're saying that
31 right now it most likely won't get funded because there
32 are not enough funds to go beyond projects one through
33 four. But if all of a sudden there were money found
34 under a rock -- sometimes it happens. It happened last
35 year when Eek got additional money. Does that mean
36 that the new -- the additional funds, would it go next
37 to number five on the list, which is Hatchery? Or
38 would it go towards the 2 -- or would it go into the
39 pot of money -- are the pots of money separate or the
40 same? That's the question.

41

42 And then -- because Hatchery's kind of
43 a high-ranking project in terms of the overall projects
44 that are currently funded and the ones that we're being
45 asked to look at now. And so in order to think about
46 how -- what Patty's saying in terms of taking it off
47 the list entirely, what does it do to that currently
48 funded project and is that where we really want to go
49 with it.

50

1 MR. SUMINSKI: Through the Chair. Ms.
2 Needham, I think for next year we're actually funding
3 well beyond the number five project. We'll be able to
4 pick up all the way down to -- well, without Hatchery
5 Creek it would be eight projects.

6
7 MS. NEEDHAM: So Hatchery Creek's.....

8
9 MR. SUMINSKI: Yeah. And like you
10 said, the -- you know, this was the priority that was
11 established by the Board in 2014. We feel that's
12 changed a little bit for the reasons we talked about
13 with Hatchery Creek. By removing Hatchery Creek from
14 number five, we're able to move farther down the list.
15 So we'd fund all but Hatchery and the bottom two,
16 Redoubt and Eek next year. That's what the plan is at
17 this point given our funding.

18
19 You know, if more funding was found,
20 you know, what Patty's saying is that she would
21 recommend that we pick up Redoubt and Eek. And then if
22 we could keep going, it sounds like Sarkar would be our
23 next project that we would fund.

24
25 Does that kind of summarize? That's
26 what I'm thinking.

27
28 So okay. Thank you.

29
30 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Terry.

31
32 Cathy, did you have something else?
33 Or.....

34
35 MS. NEEDHAM: Well, we have a.....

36
37 (Interruption)

38
39 MS. NEEDHAM: Is that me? Are you
40 messing with me?

41
42 (Laughter)

43
44 MS. NEEDHAM: We have a motion on the
45 floor that included the Hatchery Creek 14 funding
46 proposal, so that's why I'm asking that question. Does
47 that mean that we can't -- like we sought to vote on
48 this motion that Patty has put forward to us and it
49 included that particular piece of it. And it sounds
50 like that can't be done because Hatchery will likely be

1 funded under 2014 anyway. So does it matter in terms
2 of prioritizing? We're removing it from the priority
3 list.

4

5 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Cathy.

6

7 Patty.

8

9 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
10 mean I can rescind my motion with the concurrence of
11 the second. But maybe we should just move it to the
12 bottom of the priority ranking list both -- of the
13 entire both lists. Would that be better. I mean I
14 could make that motion. I mean but we're getting good
15 discussion. We're fine-tuning it. I'm sorry it has to
16 go to this length.

17

18 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Well, I think it's
19 good to -- at least I think it helps everyone to
20 understand it a little bit better. Because it is very
21 confusing. And we've been doing for so many years and
22 so many projects aren't before us, but they're still
23 ongoing. And it makes it hard to follow.

24

25 But Patty, did you have something else?

26

27 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair, I ask to
28 rescind my motion with concurrence of the second.

29

30 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Art.

31

32 MR. BLOOM: I was just going to ask if
33 we could just amend your motion to re-order the
34 priority of those three projects. We just -- and I
35 would offer that amendment. Would the Chair entertain
36 that.

37

38 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Patty.

39

40 MS. PHILLIPS: He asked you a question.

41

42

43 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Oh. Art.

44

45 MR. BLOOM: May I offer an amendment
46 then to the motion that's on the floor.

47

48 CHAIRMAN BANGS: And that would be
49 to.....

50

1 MR. BLOOM: That would be to re-order
2 the three projects 14-601, 604, and 605 to make 605 the
3 last of those three in priority. So rather than re --
4 that's my motion. My amendment.

5
6 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. I'm not sure if
7 that's the right way to go about it, but it -- because
8 we have a motion on the floor to remove it from the
9 list altogether. And I don't know if we just need to
10 go past that or rescind it and then come up with a new
11 -- that would be easier and more clean.

12
13 Mr. Larson.

14
15 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair, we have a main
16 motion on the floor. The maker of the motion has asked
17 to rescind that motion with the approval of the second.
18 And that's the stage that we're at. Is we need to have
19 either a affirmative respond from the second or a
20 negative response from the second. If it's
21 affirmative, then we're back. We don't have a main
22 motion on the floor. If it's negative and they want to
23 keep this motion on the floor from the second, then
24 it's appropriate to amend. But we need an answer from
25 the second.

26
27 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Art.

28
29 MR. BLOOM: Okay. I -- then the answer
30 is negative. And I offer the amendment.

31
32 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. So now we have
33 a motion on the floor that's amended to put it at the
34 bottom of the list. Is that the way I gathered your
35 amendment? On both lists, the Hatchery Creek projects
36 would be put to the bottom of the priority lists.

37
38 And we need a second on the amendment.

39
40 MR. HERNANDEZ: Second.

41
42 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. It's been moved
43 by Art Bloom to put -- to amend the Proposal to move
44 the Hatchery Creek sockeye project to the bottom of
45 both priority lists. And it's been seconded by Don
46 Hernandez.

47
48 Discussion.

49
50 Patty.

1 MS. PHILLIPS: Is that both 14-605 and
2 16-601.
3
4 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Mr. Bloom, is that
5 what your intentions were?
6
7 (Nods affirmatively)
8
9 CHAIRMAN BANGS: That's an affirmative.
10
11 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you.
12
13 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Any more discussion.
14
15 (No comments)
16
17 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Question's been called
18 for on the amendment to move the project list to the
19 bottom of the -- project of the Hatchery Creek to the
20 bottom of both lists.
21
22 Do I have a question called for on the
23 amendment.
24
25 MS. PHILLIPS: Question.
26
27 CHAIRMAN BANGS: The question's been
28 called for on the amendment. All those in favor, say
29 aye.
30
31 IN UNISON: Aye.
32
33 CHAIRMAN BANGS: All those opposed, say
34 nay.
35
36 MR. HOWARD: Nay.
37
38 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. There's one
39 nay; is that correct? And the rest are -- so the
40 amendment motion carries.
41
42 So now we're back to the amended.....
43
44 MS. PHILLIPS: Main motion.
45
46 CHAIRMAN BANGS:main motion, as
47 amended.
48
49 MS. PHILLIPS: And there was one
50 abstained.

1 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. And one
2 abstained. I'm sorry. I didn't get that.
3
4 Okay. So now we have a motion --
5 amended motion to move the Hatchery Creek to the bottom
6 of both priority lists.
7
8 Any discussion.
9
10 MR. HOWARD: Mr. Chair.
11
12 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Yes, Mr. Howard.
13
14 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
15 I have one question. It shows that Hatchett Creek is
16 working -- it shows it's a combination project between
17 the U.S. Forest Service and the Organized Village of
18 Kasaan. Now, also being on the Tribal Council with
19 Indian Community Association, when you move this type
20 of project down a priority list or decide to take it
21 off altogether, it seems to me that we would ask the
22 Organized Village of Kasaan if this is something they
23 would like or something they agree with before we
24 decide to make a decision like this. Am I wrong?
25 Wouldn't that be a part of the process?
26
27 I mean I'd be kind of upset if I wasn't
28 at this type of meeting and then I hear that you guys
29 bumped one of the ACA projects down the list without
30 checking with the Community Association to begin with.
31 I'm just -- I guess that would be the question. Is the
32 Organized Village of Kasaan in agreement with your
33 thoughts on no longer needing this project or it being
34 a priority.
35
36 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
37
38 MR. SUMINSKI: Through the Chair. Mr.
39 Howard, chances are they're not in agreement with it.
40 It's just the way that we work the program, is based on
41 priority list. And we fund down the list till we run
42 out of money. And typically we wouldn't -- you know,
43 to be honest with you, I'm very kind of personally
44 upset that we're losing an excellent cooperator in this
45 situation. But we do have to stay -- hold true to our
46 priorities and we can only buy what we have money for.
47 I don't know how else to answer that question.
48
49 Thank you.
50

1 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Terry.

2

3 I think it's important to remember that
4 all these projects are -- we look at the importance and
5 the capacity building, but it's important to address
6 the problems that are most important. And it's not
7 necessarily trying to put the Organized Village of
8 Kasaan out of work, but it's important that we do these
9 projects as importance, not necessarily based on the
10 capacity of building with these other groups. So
11 anyway, I hope that explains it.

12

13 Frank.

14

15 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. Well,
16 the way I -- so far what I understand is that if the
17 money comes through all these projects will be funded
18 anyway, right? So even if we put Hatchery at the
19 bottom and if the funding comes through and more money
20 comes through, we can put another project underneath at
21 six. So wherever we put the ranking, money comes
22 through, it'll be funded.

23

24 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Frank.

25

26 Okay. We have an amended motion on the
27 floor -- or a main motion on the floor now as amended.

28

29 Any other discussion.

30

31 MR. KITKA: Call the question.

32

33 CHAIRMAN BANGS: The question's been
34 called for. All those in favor of the Proposal to move
35 the Hatchery Creek sockeye salmon projects to the
36 bottom of both lists, respond by saying aye.

37

38 IN UNISON: Aye.

39

40 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Those opposed, say

41 nay.

42

43 MR. HOWARD: Nay.

44

45 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. We have one

46 nay.

47

48 MS. NEEDHAM: Abstain.

49

50 CHAIRMAN BANGS: One abstained. And

1 the motion carries. Thank you.

2

3 Okay. At this point I think -- I don't
4 know about you guys. But I think we need to rest on
5 this issue overnight maybe. And maybe we could resume
6 a little bit of discussion in the morning. Get our
7 thoughts together as far as what direction we want to
8 go. And try not to have to spend too much time in the
9 morning. But I think we need to -- I think we all need
10 to look at it and think about it a little bit before we
11 move forward. Is that -- that's something that you
12 guys will both be here tomorrow in the morning?

13

14 (Nods affirmatively)

15

16 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. That's what I
17 would propose. If that's okay with the Council, I'd
18 like to just put this to rest for the night.

19

20 Okay. So I have one -- a couple of
21 other things.

22

23 Thank you guys for your help and
24 patience.

25

26 Okay. I'd like to ask Tom Whitford --
27 put him on the spot.

28

29 (Laughter)

30

31 MR. WHITFORD: Mr. Chairman, Council
32 Members. I'm Tom Whitford, the Regional Subsistence
33 Program Leader for the Forest Service. And since Gene
34 left early, he asked me to give some service awards.
35 So I'll just read these off of what's on these plaques.

36

37

38 The first award is going to Mike
39 Douville. It's in recognition of his years of service
40 to the Federal Subsistence Management Program as a
41 member of the Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional
42 Advisory Council for the years 2000 to 2015.

43

44 (Applause)

45

46 MR. WHITFORD: Okay. The next
47 certificate goes to Cathy Needham. Needham. Close
48 enough?

49

50 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You're in trouble.

1
2 MR. WHITFORD: Okay.
3
4 (Laughter)
5
6 MR. WHITFORD: This is in recognition
7 of her years of service to the Federal Subsistence
8 Management Program as a member of the Southeast Alaska
9 Subsistence Regional Advisory Council for the years
10 2009 to 2014.
11
12 (Applause)
13
14 MR. WHITFORD: And the third
15 certificate of appreciation goes to John Yeager in
16 recognition of his years of service to the Federal
17 Subsistence Management Program as a member of the
18 Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council
19 for years 2010 to 2015.
20
21 (Applause)
22
23 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Thank you, Tom.
24
25 Okay. I'd like to recess until
26 morning. And I think there's a dinner thing tonight
27 for those of you who wanted to go to dinner at the
28 Glacier Bear Lodge.
29
30 Is that correct?
31
32 MR. LARSON: That's correct.
33
34 CHAIRMAN BANGS: What time does the bus
35 leave?
36
37 MR. LARSON: It leaves at 5:30.
38
39 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. So we'll recess
40 till.....
41
42 MR. LARSON: It's quarter till.
43
44 (Laughter)
45
46 MR. LARSON: That was the schedule.
47
48 (Laughter)
49
50 CHAIRMAN BANGS: Okay. Well, I'll work

1 the schedule out after we recess here. And we'll meet
2 tomorrow morning at 8:30.

3

4 (Off record)

5

6 (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public in and for the state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 145 through 292 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the SOUTHEAST FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME II taken electronically on the 28th day of October in Yakutat, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by under my direction and reduced to print to the best of our knowledge and ability;

THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 14th day of November 2015.

Salena A. Hile
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My Commission Expires: 09/16/18